

County of San Mateo  
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Grading and construction for a new single-family residence, extension of public street right-of-way, extension of underground utilities and variance for reduced side yard setback.
2. **County File Number:** PLN 2018-00320
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department  
455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Olivia Boo, Project Planner; oboo@smcgov.org
5. **Project Location:** San Juan Avenue , north of Columbus Street, in the unincorporated El Granada area of San Mateo County (vacant parcel).
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 047-137-100
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Gerald Siu, P.O Box 413, Millbrae, CA 94030.
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** N/A.
9. **General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential
10. **Zoning:** R-1/S-17/DR/CD (One-Family Residential District/S-17 Combining District/Design Review/Coastal Development)
11. **Description of the Project:** A Coastal Development Permit, Grading Permit, Variance and Design Review for the construction of a new 2,466 sq. ft., two -story single-family residence with an attached 400 sq. ft. garage on a 5,533 sq. ft. size parcel that includes: 1) a 3.5 ft. side yard setback where 10 ft. is required, 2) a total combine side yard setback of 13 ft. where 15 ft. is required, and 3) to extend and improve the San Juan Avenue right-of-way to provide access to the parcel. No tree removal is proposed and 312 cubic yards of grading is proposed for access improvements and building foundation.
12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The 5,533 sq. ft. size parcel is vacant and located on the northwest side of San Juan Avenue, north of Columbus Street, in a single-family urbanized area. There are some undeveloped parcels to the south, east and west. There is sparse development to the north, including undeveloped land covered with low growing vegetation and mature trees. Deer Creek is located northwest, 93 feet, from the parcel. Associated riparian vegetation is located 30-feet from the project parcel further to the east.
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.?:** A referral was not sent due to the project site being located in an urbanized area. It is not expected that the project property hosts any paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Should historical resources be found, mitigation measures are included.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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

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

<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
<b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is located outside of the Cabrillo Highway 1 County Scenic Corridor and is not expected to have adverse impact to views from residential areas, public lands, roads or water bodies. The property is located in El Granada, an urbanized area developed with single family residences. The nearest body of water is located approximately 93 feet west of the project site, on an adjacent parcel that is developed with a single-family residence. The neighborhood is developed with single-family residences on sloped topography. The subject parcel slopes down and away from San Juan Avenue. The subject parcel will not have impacts to any existing scenic views. Although the San Juan Avenue right-of-way is located within the Highway 1				

County Scenic Corridor, any right of way improvements will be at grade level. The subject parcel has existing mature trees along the parcel boundaries, the trees are located on the adjacent parcels. The proposed single-family residence will employ brown wood siding, white trim and gray stone accent and will be partially screened by the existing mature trees located on adjacent parcels. The design of the proposed residence will step down slope from the street and give the appearance of a single-story residence from street view. This design helps reduce the bulk and scale of the proposed residence and will not have a substantial adverse effect on views from the road. On January 9, 2020, the Coastside Design Review Committee (CDRC) recommended approval of the residence based on findings that include compliance with applicable Design Review standards such as the design of the residence, its compatibility with the neighborhood, use of materials and colors, and landscaping.

**Source:** County General Plan, Scenic Corridor Map; Google Earth/Maps; Project Plans; San Mateo County Geographic Information System.

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

**Discussion:** Although the project site faces the San Juan Avenue right-of-way, which is located within the Highway 1 County Scenic Corridor, proposed right of way improvements to extend San Juan Avenue as required to provide access to the subject parcel will be at grade level and not impact or intrude on views. The subject parcel has been utilized as open space with low growing vegetation and no trees and contains no historic buildings or rock outcroppings. The property is undeveloped and has a 28% downslope from the street level where the future road extension of San Juan Avenue will be located.

**Source:** Project Plans.

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 parcel is zoned R-1/S-17/DR/CD (Single-Family Residential/S-17 Combining District/Design Review/Coastal Development) and is located in an urbanized area of El Granada adjacent to existing single-family residences to the west, south and east. The neighborhood is predominantly developed with existing single-family residences with a handful of vacant parcels across the street on San Juan Avenue, to the west across Vallejo street (a paper street) and to the north is sparse development and undeveloped land. The project does not propose a significant change to the existing topography of the parcel, which has a downslope of 28% from San Juan Avenue. The property is not located on a ridgeline. The project proposed 312 cubic yards of grading and, the proposed single-family residence will be built with the slope and not cause a significant change in topography. As discussed, the subject parcel has existing mature trees along the property boundaries, these trees are located on adjacent parcels. These trees will help screen the proposed house. No tree removal is proposed for the project.

On January 9, 2020, the Coastsides Design Review Committee (CDRC) recommended approval of the residence based on findings that include compliance with applicable Design Review standards such as the design of the residence, its compatibility with the neighborhood, use of materials and colors, and landscaping.

**Source:** Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County GIS.

1.d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** This project is located within a Design Review (DR) District. Lighting standards within the DR District require reducing the overall number of exterior lights and designing/locating exterior lights so as to confine and direct rays downward, onto the subject property, and prevent glare towards the surrounding area. While the property does not currently have any light sources, there is an existing single-family residence adjacent to the south and to the east, across San Juan Avenue, which has existing light sources. The presence of the proposed exterior lights where none had existed before would increase overall nighttime ambient lighting of the area. The proposed exterior lights are certified dark sky compliant and meet the design review standards and reduce light pollution to the extent feasible. The project was reviewed and approved by the CDRC who found the project to be in compliance with the DR exterior lighting standards. **Source:** Project plans

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

**Discussion:** The nearest Scenic Corridor is the Cabrillo Highway County Scenic Corridor which includes San Juan Avenue, the area that is proposed to be improved to provide access to the subject parcel. The design of the proposed residence will step downslope from the San Juan Avenue right-of-way and give the appearance of a single-story residence from street view. This design helps reduce the bulk and scale of the proposed residence and will not have a substantial adverse effect on views from the Cabrillo Highway County Scenic Corridor. Minimal visual impacts are expected.

**Source:** Project Site; San Mateo County GIS.

1.f. If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project is located within the S-17 Design Review District and complies with all applicable General Plan, Local Coastal Program (LCP), and Zoning Provisions.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County Local Coastal Program; San Mateo County General Plan.</p>				
1.g. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site itself does not have trees but is surrounded by mature trees located near the property boundaries on adjacent parcels and adjacent to a riparian corridor on adjacent parcels. The project site is located in a heavily vegetated single-family residential Midcoast Design Review District area. Though two stories in height, the appearance and scale of the residence will be reduced due to its deep location within the lot. The design of the proposed residence will step downslope from the San Juan Avenue right-of-way and give the appearance of a single-story residence from street view; this design helps reduce the bulk and scale of the proposed residence. The proposed single-family residence will employ brown wood siding, white trim and gray stone accent.</p> <p>The project is required to comply with the Design Review Standards as reviewed and approved by the CDRC on January 9, 2020 and the project will have a less than significant impact on the visual quality of the area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.</p>				

<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				X

California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is located within the Coastal Zone. The parcel is identified as "Urban and Built-Up Land" on the California Important Farmland Finder and the California Farmlands of Statewide Importance Map. The parcel is not located within an area that is mapped or designed as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. As such, the project will not convert Farmland to a non-agricultural use.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County Geographic Information System; California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Finder Map, <a href="https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/">https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/</a>; California Department of Conservation - San Mateo County Important Farmland Map, 2023.</p>				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is not contracted or encumbered by an Open Space Easement or a Williamson Act Contract, nor are there any surrounding lands under Contract or encumbered by an Open Space Easement. The project parcel is located near the County's Urban/Rural boundary with a handful of undeveloped, vacant parcels nearby also zoned for single-family residential use. Land north of the project site, across San Juan Avenue, is zoned Planned Agriculture District (PAD). As such, the construction of a single-family residence is not expected to conflict with surrounding single-family development nor agriculturally zoned parcels located near the project parcel.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; San Mateo County GIS</p>				
2.c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is not designated as Farmland (see response to Section 2.a). Forest land is defined as land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for the management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits (PRC 12220(g)). The project site does not contain trees. Existing trees are located along the property boundaries on adjacent parcels.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Finder Map, <a href="https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/">https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/</a> ; Public Resources Code.</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 subject parcel is located within the Coastal Zone. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has identified the non-irrigated Land Capability Class ratings of the soils on the project parcel as Grade 3-Fair, MmE2 soil. The project parcel is zoned for single-family</p>				

residential development and has not been used for agricultural purposes or the cultivation of agricultural commodities in the past. There is no current agricultural use of the project site or adjacent properties. The proposed development would not result in the significant loss of agricultural land or soil capability.

**Source:** Zoning Maps; Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey; San Mateo County General Plan Productive Soil Resources Soils with Agricultural Capability Map; Local Coastal Program Midcoast Agriculture Map.

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

**Discussion:** See Section 2.d for further discussion.

**Source:** Zoning Maps; Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey; San Mateo County General Plan Productive Soil Resources Soils with Agricultural Capability Map.

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

**Discussion:** The project parcel is zoned for single-family residential development (R-1/S-17/DR/CD) and is not located in a Timberland Preserve Zoning District nor is timber harvesting a permitted use on this property. The project site does not contain trees. The proposed development of a single-family residential structure is an allowed use in the R-1 (single-family residential) District. The project does not conflict with the zoning, would not require a rezoning of the area, nor interfere with timberland production elsewhere on appropriately zoned lands.

**Source:** San Mateo County Zoning Maps; Public Resources Code; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.

**3. AIR QUALITY.** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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



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

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the BAAQMD's 2017 CAP. The project and its operation involve minimal hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide: CO<sub>2</sub>) air emissions, whose source would be exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal cars of construction workers), whose primary fuel source is gasoline, during its construction. Due to the site's residential location and assuming construction vehicles and workers are based in commercial areas (either on the Coastside or Bayside), potential project air emission levels from construction would be increased from general levels. However, any such construction related emissions would be temporary and localized and would not conflict with or obstruct the Bay Area Air Quality Plan. Similarly, once constructed, ongoing use of the single-family residence would have minimal impacts to air quality standards. The BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As defined in the BAAQMD's 2017 CEQA Guidelines, 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 control measures have been included in the Mitigation Measure below.

**Mitigation Measure 1:** The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, including those listed below:

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- b. Apply water two times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking, and staging areas at construction sites. Also, hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- c. Sweep daily all paved adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them.
- d. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 miles per hour.
- e. 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.
- f. 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.
- g. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) that can be blown by the wind.
- h. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible after disturbance.
- i. Install erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadway and/or into Deer Creek.
- j. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on and off site shall be covered.

k. Roadways and building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

l. A publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the project site regarding dust complaints shall be posted. 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.

**Source:** BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017; Project Plans.

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

**Discussion:** The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is a State designated non-attainment area for Ozone, Particulate Matter (PM10), and Fine Particulate Matter (PM-2.5). On January 9, 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to determine that the Bay Area attained the 24-hour PM-2.5 national standard. However, the Bay Area will continue to be designated as "non-attainment" for the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard until the BAAQMD submits a "re-designation request" and a "maintenance plan" to the EPA and the proposed re-designation is approved by the EPA. A temporary increase in PM-2.5 in the project area is anticipated to occur during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. Therefore, any increase in these criteria pollutants would be significant. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations will reduce the potential effects of increased PM-2.5 to a less than significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 would minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction to a less than significant level.

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

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

**Discussion:** Sensitive receptors are facilities or land uses such as schools, hospitals, or residential areas where people live, play, convalesce, or a place where sensitive individuals spend significant amounts of time. Sensitive individuals, such as children and the elderly, are those most susceptible to poor air quality.

The project site is located in a residential area with sensitive receptors (i.e., single-family residences) located to the west, south, and east of the project parcel. Pollutant concentrations associated with the occupation of the single-family residential structure are expected to be less than significant. However, though pollutant emissions generated from the construction of the proposed project will primarily be temporary in nature, they have the potential to negatively impact nearby sensitive receptors. As such, implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 will minimize potentially significant exposure of pollutants to nearby sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.

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

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

**Discussion:** Once operational, the proposed project, which includes the construction of a single-family residence and improving and extending the San Juan Avenue right-of-way to access the proposed residence will not result in adverse emissions. The project has the potential to generate emissions during construction such as noise and odor. However, any such odors will be temporary and are expected to be minimal.

**Source:** Project Plans.

4. <b>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		

**Discussion:** A Biological Impact Report conducted by Coast Ridge Ecology notes an intermittent creek, Deer Creek and its riparian corridor, is located approximately 93 feet northwest of the proposed building envelope of the project. The project site is outside of the required 30-foot riparian buffer zone of Deer Creek.

**California red-legged frog (CRLF) and San Francisco garter snake (SFGS)**

There is moderate potential for dispersal habitat for the California red-legged frog (CRLF) and the San Francisco garter snake (SFGS); no other special-status species or habitats were present or reasonably expected to occur in the project area. CRLF have been documented within 1,000 feet of the site while SFGS have been documented within 1.25 miles of the site and there is a moderate potential for CRLF to utilize the project site as dispersal habitat. The SFGS occur in marsh, swamps, wetlands and adjacent upland habitats. Three occurrences were found within 3.0 miles of the site, including Denniston Creek, which is 1.25 miles northwest of the project site. There is a moderate potential for SFGS to disperse through the project site. Construction activities and residential use may result in impacts to water quality due to erosion and stormwater runoff. Also, indirect impacts to SFGS and CRLF may occur. Mitigation measures will reduce impacts to less than significant levels for CRLF and SFGS.

**Mitigation Measure 2:** A Qualified Biologist shall perform a pre-construction survey for SFGS and CRLF within 48 hours prior to any site disturbance, and inspect and provide guidance on installation of a wildlife exclusion fence. Any vegetation or potential burrows within the construction zone that may provide cover or conceal SFGS or CRLF will be inspected by the Qualified Biologist prior to

ground disturbance or grading activities. The wildlife exclusion fence should be constructed along the north and east sides to prevent the potential for CRLF and/or SFGS from entering the work area. Fencing shall be installed before any grading or disturbance on the property. The fence should be maintained throughout the construction period. The Qualified Biologist will also provide an environmental training to all crew workers that work on the construction site and keep a record of those trained. If either SFGS or CRLF are observed on the property, they must be avoided, and construction related activities must cease immediately until such time as the Qualified Biologist can document that all individuals have left the site unharmed.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** Best management practices for proper erosion control and control of dust and toxins during construction should be implemented in order to prevent any impacts to jurisdictional waters in the vicinity of the project site. Design and implement appropriate control measures for both stormwater and erosion. This may include straw wattles, silt fencing, and/or stormwater containment and treatment measures incorporated into the project design. Construction equipment should also be clean and free of mud and debris that could bring in seeds of invasive plant species.

### **Riparian Corridor**

The native riparian species within Deer Creek is less than 10% cover and does not meet the LCP definition of riparian vegetation, therefore the riparian buffer zone for Deer Creek, an intermittent creek, is 30 feet from the midpoint of the Creek. The proposed building envelope for the project is 94 feet from the centerline of the creek.

### **Wildlife Corridor**

The area of Deer Creek that borders the subject property may be used as a local wildlife corridor for common and opportunistic wildlife species. Rancho Corral de Tierra is a large protected open space area located approximately 500 feet to the north of the project site. The project is not expected to significantly impact potential wildlife corridors.

### **Nesting birds**

Nesting birds may occur on the property in trees adjacent to the project site. The project is unlikely to impact nesting raptors as there are no trees on the project site and no tree removal is proposed.

Mitigation Measure 4\_ A preconstruction nesting bird survey for bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) shall be conducted by a Qualified Biologist within 2 weeks of project construction, if the project is initiated during the nesting bird season (February 15 to August 31). If birds, including raptors, are detected to be nesting on or adjacent to the property, buffer zones will be determined based on consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

### **Special-Status Species**

In a 2003 biological report there was a potential of 136 special-status species recorded within a six quadrangle area around the project site, with 22 species recorded within a 3-mile radius. Nearly all of the 136 species are unlikely to occur on the project site due to the lack of suitable habitat present on the property.

### **Western Monarch Butterfly**

The western monarch butterfly is not a federal or state protected species but it is considered imperiled by several organizations. Blue gum eucalyptus groves are located near the project site and provide low potential habitat for monarchs. There is a low potential during the overwintering season for monarchs to use forested areas adjacent to the site.

### **Western pond turtle**

The western pond turtle can be found in ponds, marshes, rivers, streams, irrigated ditches. No occurrences of western pond turtle have been documented within 3 miles of the site due to a lack of surveys in the area (versus a confirmation of species absence). Deer Creek, near the project site, does not provide suitable habitat for this species due to shallow water depth in the creek.

Plant species

**Hickmans**

There is a low possibility for Hickman's cinquefoil to occur. Hickmans cinquefoils is a federal and state endangered perennial herbaceous plant found in coastal freshwater riparian areas and meadows near small streams in open or forested areas; one occurrence was found 2.75 miles northwest of the project site. There is a very low potential for Hickmans cinquefoil to occur in the grasslands on the project site.

Northern maritime chaparral, valley needle grassland and coastal terrace prairie grassland were not observed and are not expected to occur on the project site.

**Trees**

Within approximately 100 feet from the proposed building envelope, there is a eucalyptus grove of trees that has potential overwintering habitat for western monarch butterfly, though no monarch butterflies were observed during the site visit. Within the tall grasses, shrubs and trees on the property, there is potential for nesting birds. There is the potential for Mediterranean grassland and invasive exotic plant species to occur.

**Mitigation Measure 5:** To minimize any impacts to the Deer Creek riparian corridor from construction of the project, invasive species such as pampas grass (*Cortaderia* sp.), eucalyptus saplings, Himalaya blackberry and English ivy shall be removed from where they are encroaching into the property, and California native plants should be incorporated into the landscape plan for this area. This will prevent further establishment of invasive species and enhance this area with additional native riparian plant cover.

**Mitigation Measure 6:** A Qualified Biologist shall perform at least one reconnaissance level rare plant survey on the property during the flowering season (April- August) when Hickman's cinquefoil plant s visible and identifiable. This survey should also be timed to include a visit to a nearby reference population. If Hickman's cinquefoil is detected, extent of the occurrence should be documented, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and CDFW should be consulted on appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures.

**Source:** Coast Ridge Ecology biological report, Project Location.

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.  <b>Source:</b> Coast Ridge Ecology biological report.</p>				
4.c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh,				X

vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Per the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory Mapper, there are no wetlands located within the project area or in the urbanized area of El Granada</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Wetland Mapper.</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.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Coast Ridge Ecology biological report.</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> See discussion under 4.a.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Coast Ridge Ecology biological report.</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> There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans associated with the project parcel.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Community Conservation Plans Map (April 2019).</p>				
4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wildlife Refuge System (accessed March 2021).</p>				
4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project scope does not involve the removal of trees.</p>				

**Source:** Project plans.

<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> Based on the developed project site being located in a highly urbanized area, it is not expected that the project property hosts any paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Should historical resources be found, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 7:</b> In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archaeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interiors' Professional Qualification Standards for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit to the Community Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. In addition, an archaeological report meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards detailing the findings of the monitoring will be submitted to the Northwest Information Center after monitoring has ceased. No further grading or site work within 50 feet of the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 8:</b> If a newly discovered resource is, or is suspected to be, Native American in origin, the resource shall be treated as a significant Tribal Cultural Resource, pursuant to Public Resources Code 21074, until the County has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 9:</b> In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The applicant shall then immediately notify the County Coroner's Office and possibly the State Native American Heritage Commission to seek recommendations from a Most Likely Descendant (Tribal Contact) before any further action at the location of the find can proceed. All contractors and sub-contractors shall be made aware of these requirements and shall adhere to all applicable laws including State Cultural Preservation laws. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project proposal; Project location.</p>				
5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?		X		

**Discussion:** Based on the developed project site being located in a highly urbanized area, it is not expected that the project property hosts any archaeological resource. Should archaeological resources be found, mitigation measures 7 and 8 shall be implemented.

**Source:** Project location.

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

**Discussion:** Based on the developed project site being located in a highly urbanized area, it is not expected that the project property hosts any paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Should human remain resources be found, mitigation measure 9 shall be implemented.

**Source:** Project location

**6. ENERGY.** Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	

**Discussion:** The project will use on-site electricity or energy from a nearby existing power pole located along San Juan Avenue. Energy consumption associated with the grading and construction project would be limited to minimal construction equipment (i.e., construction vehicles) which would be limited and temporary for the implementation of the project.

**Construction**

The project would require consumption of non-renewable energy resources primarily in the form of fossil fuel (e.g., fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for construction equipment and automobile for general site maintenance of the proposed single-family residence. Transportation energy use during construction would come from the construction equipment, haul trucks and construction employees' 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 grading work. Most construction equipment during grading will likely be diesel powered and electricity powered equipment.

**Operation**

During operations, energy consumption would be associated with vehicle maintenance trips. The project is for a new single-family residence and to create improved access to the parcel by extending the San Juan Avenue right-of-way. Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) provides electricity to the project area.

**Source:** Project Plans.



6.b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project includes construction of a new single-family residence and to create improved access to the parcel by extending the San Juan Avenue right -of-way. The project scope is not expected to cause demand for energy resources that would conflict or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				

<p><b>7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:</p>				
	<p><i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i></p>	<p><i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i></p>	<p><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></p>	<p><i>No Impact</i></p>
<p>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:</p>				
<p>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?</p> <p><i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i></p>			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Faults in closest proximity to the project site include the San Gregorio-Seal Cove fault located 0.7 miles to the west. Landslide area is located approximately 480 feet to the northeast of the project site. A liquefaction zone is located 40 feet to the west of the project site. While located relatively close to the faults listed above, the project site is not located in a mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or a special study area where a fault rupture is likely to occur. Project construction will not cause a direct or indirect potential rupture of a known earthquake fault.</p> <p>The project geotechnical report prepared by J. Yang and Associated, dated March 1, 1999, notes the project site could be affected by an earthquake. Three active faults are known to exist within the vicinity of the project site. The structures shall be designed to accommodate earthquake vibrations in compliance with building code.</p> <p>All grading should be carried out as described on pages 6-10 of the geotechnical report and shall be in compliance with the building code.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County Geographic Information System (GIS), J. Yang and Associates Geotechnical Report.</p>				

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 7.a (i). All grading should be carried out as described on pages 6-10 of the geotechnical report, and shall be in compliance with the building code.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, J. Yang and Associates Geotechnical Report.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?				x
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located within a liquefaction area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project site, San Mateo County GIS.</p>				
iv. Landslides?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located within a landslide area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project site, San Mateo County GIS.</p>				
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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is not located near any coastal cliffs or bluffs.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The construction of the project involves 312 cubic yards (c.y.) of grading for the single-family residence and the San Juan right-of-way improvements.</p> <p>These grading activities are not considered significant in nature, are confined to the project site, and require a Grading Permit. While the single-family residence and access road improvements are not expected to result in significant erosion or loss of topsoil, project construction may result in erosion. To reduce erosion, the applicant has included an erosion control plan to contain soil on the site during construction and ensure that sediment does not flow into the creek located at the front of the property. The erosion control plan in conjunction with adherence to Mitigation Measure 1.i will prevent the loss of topsoil and reduce onsite erosion.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
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?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 7.a.  <b>Source:</b> J. Yang and Associates Geotechnical Report.</p>				
7.d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The future construction of the property will be subject to the California Building Code in effect at the time, which would require compliance with seismic code standards to maximize structural integrity.  <b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
7.e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located within the urban mid-coast area and is able to tie into the existing wastewater infrastructure via a new lateral connection to Granada Community Services District. The wastewater purveyor has indicated that the current wastewater system has the ability and capacity to serve the project parcel. The proposed project would not require the use of a septic system or other alternative wastewater disposal system. Therefore, there would be no impact.  <b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.</p>				
7.f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Based on the developed project site being located in a highly urbanized area, it is not expected that the project property hosts any paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Mitigation Measures 7 , 8 and 9 in Section 5.a will ensure that if any resources are encountered potential impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels.  <b>Source:</b> Project proposal; Project location.</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 vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal vehicles of construction workers) and machinery associated with the proposed grading and construction of the single-family residence, and extension of the San Juan Avenue right-of-way will result in the temporary generation of GHG emissions along travel routes and at the project site. 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 is not likely to generate significant amounts of greenhouse gases, Mitigation Measure 1 will ensure that any impacts are less than significant.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				
8.b. Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP) identifies implementation measures for the reduction of GHG emissions resulting from development consistent with state legislation, including construction idling. The majority of GHG emissions from the project are expected to occur during the construction phase, primarily from vehicle exhaust. GHG emission from the habitation of the single-family residence and improvement of the San Juan Avenue right-of-way will be associated with vehicle trips, will not conflict with the EECAP, and are expected to be less than significant. Furthermore, the construction of one single-family residence and right-of way extension is below the BAAQMD GHG screening criteria of 56 dwelling units for single-family development. As such, operational project GHG emissions would be less than significant.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, 2022 San Mateo County Climate Action Plan (CAP).</p>				
8.c. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As defined by Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g), forestland is land that can support 10% native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for the management of one or more forest resources including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. The 5,533 sq. ft. project parcel does not contain more than 10% native tree over in its current condition, and no tree removal is proposed.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Public Resources Code, Section 12220(g); San Mateo County CAP; Project Plans.</p>				
8.d. Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to				X

accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project is not located on or near a coastal cliff/bluff. As such, the project will not expose people or structures to significant risk involving coastal cliff/bluff erosion resulting from sea level rise.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.</p>				
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 parcel is located 0.5 miles from the Pacific Ocean and sits approximately 165 feet above sea level. As such, the project will not expose people or structures to significant risk involving sea level rise.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; Project Plans; San Mateo County GIS.</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> The project site is not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project site is located in FEMA Flood Zone X, which is considered a minimal flood hazard area (Panel No. 06081C0138F, effective August 2, 2017). FEMA Flood Zone X areas have a 0.2% annual chance of flooding, with areas with one (1) percent annual chance of flooding with average depths of less than 1-foot. Therefore, the project impact would be less than significant.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County GIS.</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> The project parcel is not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by FEMA.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0138F, effective October 2, 2017.</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				X

transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence and development/extension of the San Juan Avenue right-of-way. The construction of the project does not involve the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.</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 Section 9.a. above for discussion.</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 project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence and extension of a right-of way and does not involve the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. Though no public or private schools are located near the subject property, Wilkinson school is located 0.6 miles from the subject property. As the project is not located within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school no impacts are expected to occur.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location, San Mateo County GIS.</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 California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) maintains an online database system - Geotracker - that contains Statewide environmental data for Leaking Underground Storage Tank sites (LUSTs). LUSTs can cause significant public health and safety impacts due to contamination of drinking water aquifers, exposure to contaminated soil, and inhalation of vapors.</p> <p>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 Geo Tracker Map.</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	
---	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The project site is located 1 mile east of the Half Moon Bay Airport, a public airport operated by the County Department of Public Works. Development within certain proximities of the airport are regulated by the Final Half Moon Bay Airport and Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), as adopted by the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) on September 2014. The overall objective of the ALUCP safety compatibility guidelines is to minimize the risks associated with potential aircraft accidents for persons and property on the ground in the event of an aircraft accident near an airport and to enhance the chances of survival of the occupants of the aircraft involved in an accident that occurs beyond the runway environment. The ALUCP contains safety zone land use compatibility standards that restrict land use development that could pose particular hazards to the public or to vulnerable populations in the event of an aircraft accident.

The project parcel is located within the Airport Influence Area (Safety Zone 7), where the risk level for accidents is considered to be low. The Airport Influence Area (AIA) does not prohibit single-family residential use. The proposed development will not exceed any airspace clearance thresholds.

Based on the discussion above staff has determined that the project complies with the safety compatibility criteria of the Half Moon Bay Airport and poses a less than significant impact.

**Source:** Airport and Land Use Compatibility Plan, Project location.

9.f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

**Discussion:** The proposed single-family residence will be located on a privately owned parcel. The project involves the construction of a single-family residence and extension of the San Juan Avenue right-of-way in order to access the parcel from San Juan Avenue. Construction vehicles will be required to park along the edge of San Juan Avenue.

The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. The proposed project is not expected to impede, change the configuration of, or close any roadways that could be used for emergency purposes. However, if the project requires the partial closure of San Juan Avenue for construction purposes, the implementation of the mitigation measure below will reduce any such impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure 10:** If any constraints are encountered that would confine traffic to one lane along San Juan Avenue, the applicant shall be required to submit a traffic control plan, consult with, and obtain an encroachment permit from the Department of Public Works (if required) prior to any such road closures. If any such road closure is required, the Department of Public Works shall notify the Coastside Fire Protection District and Sheriff's Department to ensure that any such road closure does not impede emergency access.

**Source:** Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.

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 adjacent to a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and a Very High Fire Severity Zone (State Responsibility Areas). However, the project was reviewed and received conditional approval from the Coastside Fire Protection District subject to compliance with the California Fire Code. No further mitigation, beyond compliance with the standards and requirements of the Coastside Fire Protection District, is necessary.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, Project Plans; San Mateo County GIS, Coastside Fire Protection District.</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> Refer to the discussion contained within Section 8.f.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; County GIS Maps; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0138F, effective October 2, 2017.</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> Refer to the discussion contained within Section 8.f.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; County GIS Maps; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0138F, effective October 2, 2017.</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> In addition to the discussion contained under Section 8.f, no dam or levee is located in close proximity to the project parcel. Therefore, there is no risk of flooding due to failure of a dam or levee.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County GIS; San Mateo County General Plan Hazards Maps.</p>				
9.k. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not in located in a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow hazard zone.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County GIS Maps; San Mateo County General Plan Hazards Maps.</p>				



<b>10. HYDROLOGY AND AND WATER QUALITY.</b> 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	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project would result in 2,128 sq. ft. of new impervious surface area and has the potential to generate polluted stormwater runoff during construction and operation. The construction of the project is required to comply with the County's Drainage Policy requiring post construction stormwater flows to be at, or below, pre-construction flow rates. The applicant is required to submit an updated drainage report at the building permit stage for review and approval by the Building Drainage Section . Based on the drainage report and review by the Building Drainage Section the project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County GIS, Dominguez Associates LLC Drainage Report.</p>				
10.b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is vacant. Any development on a vacant parcel would create additional impervious surface areas which could potentially impact groundwater supplies. The project would create 2,128 sq. ft. of new impervious surface area to include the roof of the structure, driveway, and uncovered porch. Runoff from these surfaces would be directed to an onsite drainage system that would allow surface water to infiltrate into the groundwater system. The project does not contain any wells nor does the project propose to create any new wells. The project would connect to the Coastside County Water District's water supply system.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; Dominguez Associates LLC Drainage Report</p>				
10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				

i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project does not involve the alteration of the course of a stream or river. The project involves the construction of 2,128 sq. ft. of impervious surface associated with the single-family home, driveway, and patio. The proposed development on the project parcel will include drainage features that have been conditionally approved by the Building Drainage Section and does not involve work within the bed or banks of Deer Creek. Mitigation Measure 2 along with the submitted drainage and erosion control plans will address potential impacts during construction activities. As such, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the site nor result in substantial erosion or siltation. Upon mitigation, the project will have a less than significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location.</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> Though the project will create 2,128 sq. ft. of impervious surface area, the project has been designed to meet the County's drainage standards. These standards include requiring post construction stormwater flows to be at or below pre-construction flow rates. The applicant is required to submit an updated drainage report at the building permit stage for review and approval by the Building Drainage Section.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</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				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Pursuant to the discussion in Section 10.a , the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; Dominguez Associates LLC Drainage Report.</p>				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed development does not involve the alteration of the course of a stream or a river. Additionally, the project is not located in a floodway or flood zone as identified by FEMA. Though Deer creek is located northwest of the project site, the project is not expected to impede or redirect flood flows. No mitigation is necessary. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; County GIS Maps; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0138F, effective October 2, 2017.</p>				

10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; San Mateo County GIS Maps; San Mateo County Hazards Maps; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0138F, effective October 2, 2017.</p>				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project includes drainage measures to ensure all impervious surfaces resulting from the project are in compliance with County standards for size and capacity. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See response to 10.e.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project will create 2,128 sq. ft. of impervious surface area. A proposed on-site drainage system has been designed to direct roof runoff and increased surface flows into approved on site drainage systems to reduce water velocity and retain water so that it can percolate into the ground. Through the construction and implementation of the proposed on-site drainage system, increased runoff from impervious surface areas will not create a significant impact. No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Dominguez Associates LLC Drainage Report.</p>				

<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 would result in infill development of a parcel near the boundary of an urban area adjacent to existing single-family development to the east, west and south. The</p>				

project does not include a proposal to divide lands or include development that would result in the division of an established community.

**Source:** Project Plans; Project Location.

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

**Discussion:** Staff has reviewed the project and has not found a conflict with applicable policies of the County's Local Coastal Program (LCP). The project is requesting a Variance for reduced side setback of 2.5 feet, where 10 feet is required (street facing side yard) for a total combined site yard of 13 feet where 15 feet is required for the applicable S-17/Design Review (DR) Zoning District regulations. Planning approval is required but no mitigation measures are necessary, no significant impacts are expected to occur.

**Source:** Project Plans.

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

**Discussion:** The project scope includes the construction of a single-family residence and right-of-way improvement of San Juan Avenue for access to the subject parcel within a single-family zoned area. Existing single-family residences are located to the west, south, and east of the project parcel. The project site will be accessed from San Juan Avenue and would be connected to existing municipal water and sanitary services provided by Granada Community Services District and Coastside County Water District.

**Source:** Project Plans.

**12. MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

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

**Discussion:** The proposed project neither involves nor results in any extraction or loss of mineral resources. Therefore, the project poses no impact.

<b>Source:</b> Project Plans.				
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
<b>Discussion:</b> See response to 12.a.				
<b>Source:</b> Project Plans.				

<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 proposed project would not produce any long-term significant noise sources. However, the project can generate excessive short-term noise associated with construction and grading activities. The short-term noise generated during grading and construction activities will 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, County Ordinance Code, Section 4.88.360 (Noise Control).</p>				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project will consist of construction vehicles. The work is expected to generate minimal and short term increases in ground-borne vibration and ambient noise associated with the house and road work. However, such increases will be temporary and localized and the project impacts are not expected to be excessive to require mitigation.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
13.c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

**Discussion:** Although the project site is within 1 miles of the Half Moon Airport, there is minimal exposure to airplanes flying overhead, which only results in short term noise.

**Source:** Site location.

<b>14. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> 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	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed single-family residential structure, proposed San Juan Avenue right-of-way extension will require the extension of existing underground utility infrastructure from Coastside County Water District and Granada Community Services District but this would not induce any significant population growth. Therefore, the project poses no significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.</p>				
14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed single-family residence will be located on a vacant parcel; therefore, no existing housing will be displaced during the construction and operation/ habitation of the proposed project. The project poses no impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				

<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 single-family residence will occur completely on the privately owned subject parcel and the street extension involves the public right-of-way. Given that the project results in the addition of one single-family residence within a residentially zoned area, any increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities would be minor. This increased use will not result in impacts of such a significant level that physical deterioration of any such facility will occur or be accelerated. The project will result in the fire authority (Coastside Fire Protection District) expanding their service to include the subject parcel. However, as the subject parcel is located immediately adjacent to an existing residence already served by the fire authority, the expansion of service to include the subject parcel is minor and will not impact the fire authority's ability to respond to emergencies or service the area. There is no expectation that the proposed project will disrupt acceptable service ratios, response times or performance objectives of fire, police, schools, parks, or any other public facilities or energy supply systems.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; Coastside Fire Protection District.</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 (future occupants of and visitors to the new residence) would not significantly increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. The current accessibility to, and use of, Rancho Corral de Tierra Park (located approximately 200 feet to the northeast) will not be affected by the project. Potential project impact on the use of neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities would be less than significant and significant physical deterioration of any such facilities as related to the project is not expected to occur or be accelerated from the construction of a single-family residence. Therefore, the project poses no impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> See sources in 16.b. Project Location, San Mateo County GIS</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

**Discussion:** The project (future occupants of and visitors to the new residence ) would not significantly increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. The current accessibility to, and use of, Rancho Corral de Tierra open space (located approximately 700 feet to the north) will not be affected by the project. Potential project impact on the use of neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities would be less than significant and significant physical deterioration of any such facilities as related to the project is not expected to occur or be accelerated from the construction of a single-family residence. Therefore, the project poses no impact.

**Source:** Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.

**17. TRANSPORTATION.** Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17.a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking?			X	

**Discussion:** As proposed, and as required by the conditional approval of the Coastside Fire Protection District, the extension of San Juan Avenue is designed to meet the minimum access standards for emergency vehicles. The development of a single-family dwelling is exempted from the development and implementation of a traffic impact analysis and mitigation plan. Traffic trips (comprised of both owners/tenants and guests) generated by the new residence is not expected to introduce a significant increase in vehicles on San Juan Avenue and thus will pose no significant safety impact to other vehicles, pedestrians or bicycles. The adequacy of access along San Juan Avenue, to and from the site, has been reviewed by both the County's Department of Public Works and the Coastside Fire Protection District, who have concluded that such access complies with their respective policies and requirements. Therefore, the project poses a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

**Source:** Project Plans; San Mateo County Department of Public Works; Coastside Fire Protection District.

17.b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) *Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts?*

*Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.*

			X	
--	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** Due to its location in the urban Midcoast El Granada area east of Highway 1, the project is located within 0.2 to 0.4 miles to several public transit stops. The site's proximity to public transit would reduce VMT associated with the proposed single-family residence. In addition, given that the project includes only one single-family residence, traffic generated by the project would not have a substantial effect on the operation of local roadways and intersections, nor does the project include any modifications to the existing circulation system in the project vicinity that would result in



a traffic safety hazard. The proposed residential use of the parcel would be compatible with the existing urban residential development in the project area. Therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

**Source:** Project Plans; San Mateo County GIS.

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 parcel will be served by an extension of San Juan Avenue. The new portion of San Juan Avenue is required to meet emergency access requirements per the Coastsides Fire Protection District and line of sight distance requirements per the Department of Public Works to ensure that ingress and egress onto the parcel does not conflict with traffic or create a dangerous approach. The project does not propose the permanent utilization of equipment that would be incompatible with the existing vehicular traffic on San Juan Avenue and/or any of the other connecting roads. No mitigation is necessary.

**Source:** Project Plans; Project Location.

17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The project includes improving San Juan Avenue to access the proposed property. Upon review of the proposed roadway extension, the Coastsides County Fire Protection District conditionally approved the project.

**Source:** Project Plans; Coastsides Fire Protection District.

<b>18. TRIBAL 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>
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				X

Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is vacant and is not listed in the California Register of Historical Resources. Furthermore, the project is not listed in a local register of historical resources, pursuant to any local ordinance or resolution as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1 (k).</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; California Register of Historical Resources.</p>				
<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.)</p>		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 5.a.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 11 :</b> In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall cease until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resources in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource. Those measures shall be approved by the County Planning Department prior to implementation and prior to continuing any work associated with the project.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 12 :</b> Any inadvertently discovered tribal cultural resources shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting the traditional use of the resource, and protecting the confidentiality of the resource.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; California Register of Historical Resources.</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	

**Discussion:** The proposed single-family residence would extend existing utility lines and connect to and receive sewage and water services from the Granada Community Services District and Coastside County Water District. The proposed project does not involve or require any water or wastewater treatment facilities that would exceed any requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. In addition, the project would connect to existing PG&E infrastructure for electric power.

The project would result in 2,128 sq. ft. of impervious surface area and has the potential to generate polluted stormwater runoff during project operation. The permanent 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. The proposed drainage system design, which has been reviewed and approved by the Building Drainage Section, would accommodate the proposed project and ensure pre-construction runoff levels are maintained or reduced. Based on these findings, the project impact is expected to be less than significant.

**Source:** Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County GIS; Dominguez Associates LLC Drainage Report

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:** The water needs related to the construction and habitation of a single-family residence are not high intensity uses and are not expected to tax the existing water supply. The proposed single-family residence is required to extend the existing water line. Furthermore, the Coastside County Water District has reviewed the project, confirmed that the project parcel has a connection to the system, and indicated that they have adequate water capacity to serve the project. No adverse impacts are expected to occur.

**Source:** Project Plans; Coastside County Water District.

19.c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The proposed single-family residence would extend the existing sewer line and connect to and receive sewage services from the Granada Community Services District. The proposed project does not involve or require any wastewater treatment facilities that would exceed any requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**Source:** Project Plans; Granada Community Services District.

19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** Construction of the proposed project is expected to generate solid waste on a temporary short term basis. The project will also result in the ongoing generation of solid waste after its construction as is typical for residential uses. As with the surrounding properties located in the Midcoast, the project site will receive municipal trash and recycling pick-up service by the local waste management company. Though solid waste generation is not expected to result in inadequate landfill capacity, the County's local landfill facility (Ox Mountain Landfill) has as a capacity/service life until 2034.

**Source:** Project Plans.

19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
---	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The solid waste generated by a new single-family residence is expected to be minimal. The project would receive solid waste collection service from the local waste management company and is required to adhere to County ordinances with respect to waste reduction and recycling. As a result, impacts related to Federal, State, and local management statues governing solid waste are not anticipated and no mitigation is required.

**Source:** Project Plans.

**20. WILDFIRE.** If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X

**Discussion:** The project is located at the outside edge of a High Fire State Responsibility Area as identified by the County's GIS maps. The Coastside Fire Protection District has issued conditional approval for the project. The proposed single-family residence is not expected to impair an emergency response plan or evacuation plans.

**Source:** Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.

20.b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The new residential structure constructed as a part of the project would include fire-resistant features that conform to modern fire and building codes, as well as fire detection or extinguishing systems. The newer residential structure would not be as vulnerable to fire as older structures are. The likelihood that a major structural fire will expand into a wildland fire before it can

be brought under control is therefore significantly reduced. Similarly, wildfires will be less able to burn the building because of the preventative measures in place.

**Source:** Project Plans; Project Location.

20.c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

X

**Discussion:** The project does involve an extension of an existing road, San Juan Avenue. The project does not involve a new fuel break, emergency water source, power line or other associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

**Source:** Project Plans.

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

X

**Discussion:** The proposed on-site drainage facilities have been sized and appropriately placed to retain stormwater on-site and allow it to percolation into the ground. 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 from flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

**Source:** Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.

**21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

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

important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Without mitigation the project could potentially impact biological and cultural, resources. Mitigation measures have been included to reduce these 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.)				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Based on the discussions in the previous sections, the project's potential impacts with respect to air quality, water, noise, cultural resources, and other topics discussed within this document will be limited to the construction phase of the project and were determined to be less than significant with mitigation. Due to the "stand-alone" nature of this project in conjunction with the recommended mitigation measures contained throughout this document, this project would have a less than significant cumulative impact upon the environment and no evidence has been found that the project would result in broader regional impacts.</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 proposed project is to construct a new single-family residence on a vacant parcel adjacent to other developed parcels and extend the San Juan Avenue roadway to access the subject parcel. Based on the discussions in the previous sections where project impacts were determined to be less than significant or mitigation measures were required to result in an overall less than significant impact, the proposed project would not cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.</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	

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

<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></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>Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below:</p> <p>a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.</p> <p>b. Apply water two times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking, and staging areas at construction sites. Also, hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.</p> <p>c. Sweep daily all paved adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them.</p>		

- d. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 miles per hour.
- e. 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.
- f. 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.
- g. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand etc.) that can be blown by the wind.
- h. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- i. Install erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadway and/or into Deer Creek.

**Mitigation Measure 2:** - A Qualified Biologist shall perform a pre-construction survey for SFGS and CALF within 48 hours prior to any site disturbance, and inspect and provide guidance on installation of a wildlife exclusion fence. Any vegetation or potential burrows within the construction zone that may provide cover or conceal SFGS or CRLF will be inspected by the Qualified Biologist prior to ground disturbance or grading activities. The wildlife exclusion fence should be constructed along the north and east sides to prevent the potential for CRLF and/or SFGS from entering the work area. Fencing shall be installed before any grading or disturbance on the property. The fence should be maintained throughout the construction period. The Qualified Biologist will also provide an environmental training to all crew workers that work on the construction site, and keep a record of those trained. If either SFGS or CRLF are observed on the property, they must be avoided and construction related activities must cease immediately until such time as the Qualified Biologist can document that all individuals have left the site unharmed.

A reconnaissance level rare plant survey in the spring, a pre-construction nesting bird survey and incorporating California native plants into the proposed landscaping plan.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** Best management practices for proper erosion control and control of dust and toxins during construction should be implemented in order to prevent any impacts to jurisdictional waters in the vicinity of the project site. Design and implement appropriate control measures for both stormwater and erosion. This may include straw wattles, silt fencing, and/or stormwater containment and treatment measures incorporated into the project design. Construction equipment should also be clean and free of mud and debris that could bring in seeds of invasive plant species.

**Mitigation Measure 4:** A preconstruction nesting bird survey for bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBT A) shall be conducted by a Qualified Biologist within 2 weeks of project construction, if the project is initiated during the nesting bird season (February 15 to August 31 ). If birds including raptors are detected nesting on or adjacent to the property, buffer zones will be determined based on consultation with CDFW.

**Mitigation Measure 5:** To minimize any impacts to the Deer Creek riparian corridor from construction of the project, invasive species such as pampas grass ( Cortaderia sp.), eucalyptus saplings, Himalaya blackberry and English ivy shall be removed from where they are encroaching into the property, and California native plants should be incorporated into the landscape plan for this area. This will prevent further establishment of invasive species and enhance this area with additional native riparian plant cover.

**Mitigation Measure 6:** A Qualified Biologist shall perform at least one reconnaissance level rare plant survey on the property during the flowering season (April- August) when this plant is visible and identifiable. This survey should also be timed to include a visit to a nearby reference



population. If Hickman's cinquefoil is detected, extent of the occurrence should be documented, and USFWS and CDFW should be consulted on appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures.

**Mitigation Measure 7** : In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archaeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interiors' Professional Qualification Standards for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit to the Community Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. In addition, an archaeological report meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards detailing the findings of the monitoring will be submitted to the Northwest Information Center after monitoring has ceased. No further grading or site work within 50 feet of the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred.

**Mitigation Measure 8** : If a newly discovered resource is, or is suspected to be, Native American in origin, the resource shall be treated as a significant Tribal Cultural Resource, pursuant to Public Resources Code 21074, until the County has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative.

**Mitigation Measure 9** : In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The applicant shall then immediately notify the County Coroner's Office and possibly the State Native American Heritage Commission to seek recommendations from a Most Likely Descendant (Tribal Contact) before any further action at the location of the find can proceed. All contractors and sub-contractors shall be made aware of these requirements and shall adhere to all applicable laws including State Cultural Preservation laws. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).

**Mitigation Measure 10** : If any constraints are encountered that would confine traffic to one lane along San Juan Avenue, the applicant shall be required to submit a traffic control plan, consult with, and obtain an encroachment permit from the Department of Public Works (if required) prior to any such road closures. If any such road closure is required, the Department of Public Works shall notify the Coastside Fire Protection District and Sheriff's Department to ensure that any such road closure does not impede emergency access.

**Mitigation Measure 11** : In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall cease until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resources in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource. Those measures shall be approved by the County Planning Department prior to implementation and prior to continuing any work associated with the project.

**Mitigation Measure 12** : Any inadvertently discovered tribal cultural resources shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting the traditional use of the resource, and protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

**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.

*Olivia Boo*

(Signature)

May 3, 2023

Planner

Date

(Title)

Attachments

1. Plans
2. Coast Ridge Ecology biologist report, dated February 13, 2019