

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Farm Labor Housing
2. **County File Number:** PLN 2000-00031
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** San Mateo County Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Rob Bartoli, 650/363-1857
5. **Project Location:** 12511 San Mateo Road, Half Moon Bay
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 056-321-040 (18 acres)
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Kerry Burke
34 Amesport Landing
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
8. **General Plan Designation:** Agriculture/Rural
9. **Zoning:** PAD/CD (Planned Agricultural District/Coastal Development)
10. **Description of the Project:** The applicant is proposing to renew an existing Coastal Development Permit and Planned Agricultural District Permit for three farm labor housing units. The applicant also is proposing to amend said permits to add, six new additional farm labor housing units to be located adjacent to the existing. The project includes the construction of a new septic system to accommodate the additional units.
11. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project parcel is accessed via a driveway located off of San Mateo Road/Highway 92. The property has a developed area that consists of multiple green houses, two single-family homes, three Farm Labor Housing units and agricultural support structures. The property is bounded by Diggs Creek to the west and Pilarcitos Creek to the south. The proposed area of development is located in an area that is currently developed with two greenhouses. The parcels surrounding the subject property are used for agriculture uses.
12. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None
13. **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, has consultation begun?:** *(NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to*

discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code Section 21083.3.2.). Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality). The County of San Mateo has not received any requested consultations pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.1.1.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

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 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 CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources. Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. AESTHETICS. 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 significant adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?			X	
<p>Discussion: The six new Farm Labor Housing (FLH) units will be located over 400 feet from San Mateo Road/Highway 92. The property is developed with two dwelling units, several green houses, three FLH units, and agricultural support structures. The property is also heavily vegetated along the western property line. The new structures will be at the rear of the property and will be screened by the existing structures on the property. No grading for the project site is proposed. There are no proposed changes to the three existing FLH units on the property. The project is within the Half Moon Bay Road County Scenic Corridor, however, due to the nature of the structures and site, the visual impact is less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans and County Maps.</p>				

1.b. Significantly damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no rock outcroppings to be disturbed nor are there any trees proposed for removal. The property is developed with a number of structures, however the one greenhouse that is proposed to be removed does not have historic qualities. The project is not within a State-designated Scenic Corridor.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans and County Maps.</p>				
1.c. Significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline?				X
<p>Discussion: See the discussion provided to question 1.a. above.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
1.d. Create a new source of significant light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
<p>Discussion: The new FLH units will not create a new source of significant light or glare. The new units will be screened by vegetation and existing structures from neighboring properties, so any light produced from the habitation of these units will be lessened by the screening. However, to further reduce any potential impact, the following mitigation is recommended:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 1:</p> <p>Any exterior lights shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the subject property and prevent glare in the surrounding area. Any proposed lighting shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department during the building permit process to verify compliance with this condition.</p> <p>Source: Project Description and Project Plans.</p>				
1.e. Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project site is located within the Half Moon Bay Road County Scenic Corridor. The proposed FLH units will be located over 400 feet from San Mateo Road/Highway 92. The new FLH units are screened by vegetation and existing structures on the property. The FLH units will be painted a color that will match and blend with the existing structures or vegetation on the site. Therefore, the proposed structures will not negatively impact the visual resources within this section of the Half Moon Bay Road County Scenic Corridor.</p> <p>Source: County Maps.</p>				

1.f. If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				X
<p>Discussion: The subject site is not located in a Design Review overlay district and does not conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions.</p> <p>Source: County Maps.</p>				
1.g. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?			X	
<p>Discussion: See the discussion provided to question 1.a. above.</p> <p>Source: County Maps.</p>				
<p>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forestland, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a. For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
<p>Discussion: The parcel on which the proposed project is located within the Coastal Zone, thus, the question is not relevant to this project at this site.</p> <p>Source: County Maps.</p>				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
<p>Discussion: The property is under Williamson Act Contract (AP69-03) entered into by Tom, Elsie, and Eugene Pastorino in 1969. The existing crop/flower production is considered an agricultural use. Construction of the proposed Farm Labor Housing units is consistent with the Williamson Act</p>				

Contract as they will be used to house individuals that will be working on the property in support of the agricultural uses. The contract covers one parcel, for a total of 18 acres. The property is in compliance with the Williamson Act income requirements for crop production. The San Mateo County Agriculture Advisory Committee has reviewed the Williamson Act contract and approved a parcel size exception for this contract, as the parcel is considered to be highly productive, even though the minimum parcel size of 40 acres is not met. San Mateo County Agriculture Advisory Committee also found that the property is in compliance with the allowed compatible uses on the property.

The location of the new FLH units will be within the existing footprint of a vacant greenhouse. The majority of the agriculture operations on the property occur within greenhouses. The areas where row crops are located are on the eastern portion of the property, which is located on the opposite end of the property from the proposed development. Existing farm roads will separate the greenhouses from the proposed development. There are no Open Space Easements on the parcel.

Source: Zoning Maps and Williamson Act Index.

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	
--	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The definition of forestland (PRC Section 12220(g)) is “land that can support 10% native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.” The subject area proposed for the new FLH units does not meet the definition of forestland and no trees are proposed for removal as part of this project.

The project site is not considered to be Prime Agricultural Land under the San Mateo County General Plan as soils in the project area have a Storie Index rating of Grade 2 (where Grade 1 is prime) and a Land Classification of 3. In addition, as the greenhouse is vacant, it does not meet the income requirement for Prime soils as well. The area that is proposed to be converted to development totals 0.2 acres of the 18 acre parcel. The area where the new FLH units are proposed is developed with two greenhouses that are proposed for removal. The majority of the property is developed with greenhouses, which are in active use for plant and crop cultivation.

While the project would result in the conversion of Farmland (containing non-prime soils), the area of the new FLH unit will support the on-going agriculture operations on the property and will not impact the agricultural operations on the property.

Source: Zoning Maps, Department of Conservation San Mateo County Important Farmland 2014 Map.

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

Discussion: The subject parcel is located within the Coastal Zone. The Natural Resources Conservation Service has classified the project site as containing soils that have a soils Class I, II, III, and IV rating (irrigated). On the 18-acre parcel, approximately 11.5 acres are prime soils and 6.5 acres are non-prime soils. The area that is proposed to be converted for the six new FLH units and utilities are in an already developed area. The vacant greenhouse in the proposed development area will be demolished. The project will reserve the bulk of the acreage of the property for agricultural activities, which occur in other greenhouses on the property and field on the eastern property line. No division of land is proposed. Therefore, while the project would result in the conversion of Farmland (containing non-prime soils), is in an existing developed area on the site, and has clear delineation from the agricultural operations, and would not impact the ongoing agricultural operations on the property. No changes are proposed to the existing FLH units on the property. Thus, the project poses minimal impact.

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

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

X

Discussion: The project area is considered to be non-Prime Agricultural Land under the San Mateo County General Plan. The area that is proposed to be converted to development totals 0.2 acres of the 18 acres. The Farm Labor Housing units will be located in a disturbed area where agricultural activities are not present, as the existing greenhouse is not in use. There is no expectation that the FLH unit would result in any damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land.

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

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))?

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

X

Discussion: The site is not in or near a Timberland Preserve Zoning District and no rezoning is proposed. The project site is zoned Planned Agricultural District (PAD). FLH is an allowed use in the PAD Zoning District subject to the approval of a PAD permit and Coastal Development Permit and any other applicable land use permits.

Source: San Mateo County Zoning Maps, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.

<p>3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
3.a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X		
<p>Discussion: The Bay Area 2010 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.</p> <p>The project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the BAAQMD's 2010 CAP. The project and its operation involve minimal hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO₂) air emissions, whose source would be from trucks and equipment (whose primary fuel source is gasoline) during its construction. The impact from the occasional and brief duration of such emissions would not conflict with or obstruct the Bay Area Air Quality Plan. Regarding emissions from construction vehicles (employed at the site during the project's construction), the following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure that the impact from such emissions is less than significant:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 2: The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. b. Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown by the wind. c. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard. d. 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. e. Sweep adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them. f. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.). g. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 miles per hour. h. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways and water ways. i. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. <p>Please also see the discussion to question 7.1. (Climate Change; Greenhouse Gas Emissions), relative to the project's compliance with the County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>Source: BAAQMD, Sustainable San Mateo Indicators Project.</p>					

3.b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X		
<p>Discussion: The project would not violate any construction-related or operational air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation. See the discussion provided to question 3.a. and Mitigation Measure 1 above.</p> <p>Source: BAAQMD, Sustainable San Mateo Indicators Project.</p>				
3.c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
<p>Discussion: The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is a State non-attainment area for 1-hour and 8-hour ozone and particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10). Although the Environmental Protection Agency has ruled that the Bay Area Basin has attained the 2006 national 24-hour PM2.5 standard, the Bay Area is still classified as non-attainment for PM2.5 until such time the area is re-designated by the Environmental Protection Agency.</p> <p>The impact of the six new FLH units would not result in a significant impact to air quality in the immediate area or the air basin.</p> <p>Source: BAAQMD.</p>				
3.d. Expose sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations, as defined by BAAQMD?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a rural area with no sensitive receptors, such as schools, located within the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to significant levels of pollutant concentrations.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans and Google Maps.</p>				
3.e. Create objectionable odors affecting a significant number of people?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project, once operational, would not create or generate any odors. The project has the potential to generate odors associated with construction activities. However, any such odors would be temporary and would be expected to be minimal. Construction-related odors would not have a significant impact on large numbers of people over an extended duration of time. Thus the impact would less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Description.</p>				

3.f. Generate pollutants (hydrocarbon, thermal odor, dust or smoke particulates, radiation, etc.) that will violate existing standards of air quality on-site or in the surrounding area?			X	
<p>Discussion: During project construction, dust could be generated for a short duration. To ensure that the project impact will be less than significant, see Mitigation Measure 2 described in 3.a.</p> <p>Source: BAAQMD and Project Plans.</p>				
<p>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
4.a. Have a significant 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?			X	
<p>Discussion: No tree or vegetation removal is necessary to accommodate the new or existing FLH units. The project area is separated from the riparian vegetation abutting Diggs Creek and Pilarcitos Creek by an existing paved farm road. The new FLH units will be 50 feet from the riparian vegetation from Diggs Creek, while it is more than 100 feet from riparian vegetation Pilarcitos Creek.</p> <p>The subject parcel not is mapped for critical habitat for any endangered or protected species. The proposed project is located in a highly disturbed area, as it is already developed with a structure and lacks riparian vegetation. An existing farm road separates the proposed project location and the riparian vegetation on the site. As the development will be outside of the required riparian vegetation buffers and the property is not mapped as critical habitat for sensitive or special status species, the project will have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: California Natural Diversity Database, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>				
4.b. Have a significant 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?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project parcel does include riparian habitat; however, the proposed project will be located 50 feet from the riparian vegetation from Diggs Creek, while it is more than 100 feet</p>				

<p>from riparian vegetation Pilarcitos Creek. An existing road separates the project area from the top of the bank of the creek. The subject property (including the project site) is not located within any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or includes any native wildlife nursery.</p> <p>Source: County Maps and Project Plans.</p>				
4.c.	Have a significant adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X
<p>Discussion: The site does not contain any wetlands. No work will occur in Diggs Creek or Pilarcitos Creek.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans and County Maps.</p>				
4.d.	Interfere significantly with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X	
<p>Discussion: See the discussion provided to question 4.a. above.</p> <p>Source: Project Description.</p>				
4.e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?			X
<p>Discussion: There are no trees in the direct proximity of the project site, nor does the project require any such removal. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans and Project Description.</p>				
4.f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?			X
<p>Discussion: The subject parcel is not encumbered by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: County Maps.</p>				

4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
<p>Discussion: The subject parcel is not located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: County Maps.</p>				
4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel includes no oak woodlands or other timber woodlands. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
<p>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.a. Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?				X
<p>Discussion: Neither the project parcel nor the project site hosts any known historical resources, by either County, State, or Federal listings. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: California Register of Historical Resources.</p>				
5.b. Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?		X		
<p>Discussion: Neither the project parcel nor the project site hosts any known archaeological resources. However, the following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure that the impact is less than significant:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3: In the event that should cultural, paleontological, or archaeological resources be 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 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. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).</p> <p>Source: Site Survey.</p>				

5.c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
<p>Discussion: Neither the project parcel nor the project site hosts any known paleontological resources, sites, or geologic features. However, Mitigation Measure 3 (as cited above) is added to ensure that the impact is less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Site Survey.</p>				
5.d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
<p>Discussion: No known human remains are located within the project area. The nearest known and still existing cemetery is over 1 mile from the project site. In case of accidental discovery, Mitigation Measure 3 is recommended.</p> <p>Source: Site Survey.</p>				
<p>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a. Expose people or structures to potential significant adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
<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 significant 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>Discussion: The site is not within the area delineated on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map.</p> <p>Source: Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project area is located within the Violent shaking scenario for a Probabilistic Seismic Hazard event. The principal concern related to human exposure to ground shaking is that it can result in structural damage, potentially jeopardizing the safety of persons occupying the structures. However, the project would be designed and constructed to meet or exceed relevant</p>				

standards and codes. In the event that the project is required by the County to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report, the applicant would implement any recommendations identified (or would implement comparable measures) for the construction of the new FLH units. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.				
Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Earthquake Shaking Potential Map.				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?			X	
Discussion: The property has been determined by the ABAG to be at high risk for liquefaction during a seismic event.				
Source: ABAG Earthquake Liquefaction Scenarios Map.				
iv. Landslides?			X	
Discussion: The project site is located in an area determined to be low susceptible to landslides.				
Source: San Mateo County Landslide Risk Map.				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion? <i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i>				X
Discussion: The site is not on a coastal bluff or cliff. The project site is located approximately 1.95 miles from the coast.				
Source: San Mateo County maps				
6.b. Result in significant soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
Discussion: The project would incur only minor land vegetation removal within the project area and associated trenching to accommodate associated infrastructure. Relative to potential erosion during project construction activity, the following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure that the impact is less than significant:				
Mitigation Measure 4: Prior to the issuance of the Building permit for the property, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plan shall also limit application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program “General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines,” including:				

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

Source: Project Description.

<p>6.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>			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The property has been determined by the Association of Bay Area Governments

<p>(ABAG) to be at low risk for liquefaction during a seismic event. All construction will be reviewed by the County Geologist. In the event that the project is required by the County to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report, the applicant would implement any recommendations identified (or would implement comparable measures). Therefore, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: ABAG Maps.</p>					
6.d.	Be located on expansive soil, as noted in the 2016 California Building Code, creating significant risks to life or property?			X	
<p>Discussion: The principal concern related to expansive soil is that it can result in structural damage, potentially jeopardizing the safety of persons around the structures. However, all new facilities would be designed and constructed to meet or exceed relevant standards and codes. In the event that the project is required by the County to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report, the applicant would implement any recommendations identified (or would implement comparable measures). Therefore, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: California Building Code.</p>					
6.e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project will require a septic system for the new FLH units. The proposed septic system plan has been submitted to the San Mateo County Environmental Health Service for their review. The design for the system has been preliminarily approved by Environmental Health. The applicant will be required to submit plans during the building permit stage. No changes to the existing septic systems on the property are proposed. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Description.</p>					
<p>7. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:</p>					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a.	Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
<p>Discussion: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHE) includes CO₂ emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. The construction of the FLH units would involve some vehicles during construction and residents in vehicles making traveling to and from the unit. 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</p>					

<p>the project scope is not likely to generate significant amounts of greenhouse gases, Mitigation Measure 2 is recommended for the project.</p> <p>Source: Project Scope.</p>					
7.b.	Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
<p>Discussion: This project does not conflict with the County of San Mateo Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP).</p> <p>Source: EECAP.</p>					
7.c.	Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?				X
<p>Discussion: The definition of forestland (PRC Section 12220(g)) is “land that can support 10% native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.” The project site does not host any such forest canopy. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Planning Maps.</p>					
7.d.	Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located along a coastal cliff or bluff which would be at risk due to rising sea level.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Maps.</p>					
7.e.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
<p>Discussion: The site is not on the coast and would not expose structures or infrastructure to accelerated costal cliff/bluff erosion due to sea level rise. The project site is located approximately 1.9 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Maps</p>					
7.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate		X		

Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
<p>Discussion: The project site is located within a flood hazard area on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). The site is located in a FEMA Flood Zone A, which has the possibility to be inundated by 1% annual chance flooding. The property is not located within a floodway. The existing greenhouse is currently located in this Flood Zone. The following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure that the impact is less than significant:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5: All structures located in the Floodplain shall meet the latest adopted California Building Standards. An elevation certificate will be required from a licensed surveyor.</p> <p>Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0260E, Effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
7.g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?		X		
<p>Discussion: See 7.f., above.</p> <p>Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0260E, Effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
<p>Discussion: No transport of hazardous materials is associated with this project.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
8.b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The use of hazardous materials is not proposed as part of the project.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				
8.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or				X

proposed school?				
<p>Discussion: The emission of hazardous materials, substances, or waste are not proposed as part of the project. The project parcel is not located within any such distance to an existing or proposed school.</p> <p>Source: Project Description.</p>				
8.d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in an area identified as a hazardous materials site.</p> <p>Source: Project Maps, Planning Maps.</p>				
8.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 for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, Planning Maps.</p>				
8.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, Planning Maps.</p>				
8.g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. All improvements are located within the parcel boundaries, thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services.</p>				
8.h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences				X

are intermixed with wildlands?				
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is located within a Moderate Fire Hazards Severity Zone. Given that the parcel is not identified as being a high risk location, there is no expected impact.</p> <p>Source: Cal-Fire Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps.</p>				
8.i. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?		X		
<p>Discussion: As noted in 7.f., the project site is located within a flood hazard area on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). The site is located in a FEMA Flood Zone A, which has the possibility to be inundated by 1% annual chance flooding. The property is not located within a floodway. The existing greenhouse that is to be demolished is currently located in this Flood Zone. Mitigation Measure 5 would reduce this issue to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0260E, Effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
8.j. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?		X		
<p>Discussion: See 8.i., above.</p> <p>Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0260E, Effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
8.k. 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>Discussion: No dam or levee is located on or near the subject parcel.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan Hazards Map.</p>				
8.l. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p>Discussion: The site is not in a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow hazard zone. It is not on the coast, in a landslide area, or near a lake or the Bay.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan Hazards Map.</p>				
<p>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9.a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements			X	

(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))?				
<p>Discussion: The project is required to treat all runoff on-site. A drainage analysis of the proposed project will be submitted to the Department of Public Works for their review.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
9.b. Significantly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere significantly with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
<p>Discussion: The property currently relies on an existing domestic water connect from Coastside County Water District, which has conditionally approved this project. It is not anticipated that the new FLH units will have an impact on groundwater.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
9.c. Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in significant erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project is not within a watercourse. The project will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern on the site. New development on the site will include drainage features approved by the Department of Public Works (DPW). Relative to the potential impacts during project construction, Mitigation Measure 3, added under the discussion to Question 6.b., will ensure that, all issues taken together, the project will represent a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
9.d. Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or significantly increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	

Discussion: See 9.c., above.				
Source: Project Plans.				
9.e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide significant additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
Discussion: See 9.c., above.				
Source: Project Plans.				
9.f. Significantly degrade surface or groundwater water quality?			X	
Discussion: No degradation of surface or groundwater water quality is expected with the proposed project.				
Source: Project Plans.				
9.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?			X	
Discussion: See 9.c., above.				
Source: Project Plans.				
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10.a. Physically divide an established community?				X
Discussion: The 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.				
10.b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
Discussion: The project has been reviewed for conformance, and found to not conflict, with applicable policies of the County Local Coastal Program (LCP) and applicable PAD zoning				

<p>regulations. Staff concludes that the discussion in response to questions under Sections 1, 2, 4, and 6 of this document speaks to conformance with applicable and respective LCP “Visual Resources,” “Agriculture,” “Sensitive Habitats” and “Hazards” Components policies. Likewise, the discussion under Sections 1, 2 and 9 of this document concludes compliance with the PAD zoning regulations, specifically the District’s “Substantive Criteria for Issuance of a Planned Agricultural Permit,” which this project requires. Finally, the discussion under Sections 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 of this document speaks to conformance with applicable and respective General Plan’s “Visual Quality,” “Soil Resources,” “Vegetative, Water, Fish and Wildlife Resources,” “Historical and Archaeological Resources,” “Natural Hazards,” “Man-Made Hazards” and “Water Supply” Elements policies. Thus, the project poses no significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County General Plan, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.</p>					
10.c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: There is no known conservation plan that covers the project parcel.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan.</p>					
10.d.	Result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not propose a use that would result in the congregation of more than 50 people on a regular basis.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					
10.e.	Result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not introduce new activities which are not currently found within the community. The project is six new FLH units and the renewal of three existing units on the property.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans and Project Location.</p>					
10.f.	Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?				X
<p>Discussion: The project proposes improvements to serve only the subject property. These improvements are completely within the parcel boundaries and do not serve to encourage off-site development of undeveloped areas or increases the development intensity of surrounding developed areas, thus, the project poses no such impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					

10.g. Create a significant new demand for housing?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is meeting a demand for housing for farm labors at the property. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
<p>11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no known mineral resources in the project area.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, San Mateo County General Plan, Project Location.</p>				
11.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no known mineral resources in the project area.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, San Mateo County General Plan, Project Location.</p>				
<p>12. NOISE. Would the project result in:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12.a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
<p>Discussion: Upon operation, the project would not produce any audible noise. The County Noise Ordinance does not apply to construction noise. The impact of noise at night is much greater than noise generated during the day, as reflected in the Noise Ordinance's more stringent overnight limits. Limiting construction to the workday will allow nearby residents to enjoy quiet at their properties. The following mitigation measure is recommended to limit any potential construction impact to a less than significant level:</p>				

<p>Mitigation Measure 6: Noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Saturdays. Said activities are prohibited on Sundays, Thanksgiving, and Christmas (San Mateo Ordinance Code Section 4.88.360).</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p>				
12.b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	
<p>Discussion: Some ground-borne vibration is expected during the construction, however, the vibration will be minimal thus the impact will be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, County Noise Ordinance.</p>				
12.c. A significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
<p>Discussion: A temporary increase in ambient noise levels during the construction phase of the project is expected. However, due to the project scope, this is not expected to be significant or prolonged. During post-construction, no additional ambient noise is expected.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p>				
12.d. A significant temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
<p>Discussion: See 12.c., above.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p>				
12.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, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
12.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located in such an area.</p>				

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.				
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Induce significant 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>Discussion: The population growth will not be significant due to the construction of six FLH unit. The average size of an American family is 3.14 persons. The average size of an American household is 2.58 persons. The applicant projects that 6-10 new laborers will live in the new FLH units. All proposed improvements are completely within the subject parcel's boundaries are sufficient only to serve it. Thus, the project poses less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Description.</p>				
13.b. Displace existing housing (including low- or moderate-income housing), in an area that is substantially deficient in housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will create six new housing units for farm labors and renew the permit for three existing units on the property. No units will be removed and no residences will be displaced.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in significant 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>
14.a. Fire protection?				X
14.b. Police protection?				X
14.c. Schools?				X
14.d. Parks?				X

14.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				X
<p>Discussion: The result of the project will be six FLH units in an area characterized by, agricultural uses, single-family houses, and FLH units. This project will not require the construction of any new facilities. The project will not disrupt acceptable service ratios, response times or performance objectives of fire (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection has reviewed and approved plans), police, schools, parks or any other public facilities or energy supply systems. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
<p>15. RECREATION. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that significant physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project will create six (6) new FLH units. The impact of use would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
15.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
<p>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system,				X

including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
<p>Discussion: As discussed previously, all of the site improvements are to occur completely on the subject privately owned parcel. These improvements provide compliant standard and emergency access to the site. The project does not involve a level of development that would adversely impact any plan, ordinance, or policy which establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
16.b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
<p>Discussion: No. See discussion under 16.a., above.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
16.c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in significant safety risks?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not include any element which would result in changes to air traffic patterns.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
16.d. Significantly increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not include any incompatible uses or impacts related to a design feature. An existing driveway from San Mateo Road/Highway 92 will provide access to the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
16.e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

<p>Discussion: The proposed improvements will provide adequate emergency access. The proposed plans have been reviewed and approved by Coastside Fire Protection District.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
16.f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X
<p>Discussion: No impacts. See discussion under 16.a., above.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
16.g. Cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?				X
<p>Discussion: No. The proposed project site improvements do not introduce a use not currently found within the project area or result in changes outside of the parcel boundaries. There are no expectations of increases or changes to pedestrian patterns in the area.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
16.h. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
<p>Discussion: No. The subject parcel is 18 acres total in size. The proposed project will maintain adequate and routine access to the parcel. The site will have adequate space to accommodate parking associated with the new and existing FLH units. Therefore, there is more than adequate areas to provide compliant parking on-site.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
<p>17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17.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				X

historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)				
<p>Discussion: The project site is not listed or eligible for listing 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>Source: Project Location, State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation, Listed California Historical Resources, San Mateo County General Plan.</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>Discussion: The project will result in no change to the use of the project area as the property is already developed with FLH units, greenhouses, and two single-family dwellings. Proposed improvements are confined to the immediate project area and include minor grading and minor drainage improvements.</p> <p>The project is not subject to Assembly Bill 52 for California Native American tribal consultation requirements, as no traditionally or culturally affiliated tribe has requested, in writing, to the County to be informed of proposed projects in the geographic project area. However, in following the NAHC's recommended best practices, the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize any potential significant impacts to unknown tribal cultural resources:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 7: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources shall be taken prior to implementation of the project.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 8: In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall stop until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resource in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource, and those measures shall be approved by the Current Planning Section prior to implementation and continuing any work associated with the project.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 9: 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>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, California Assembly Bill 52.</p>				

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18.a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will require that a new septic system for the new Farm Labor Housing units. The proposed septic system plan has been submitted to the San Mateo County Environmental Health Services for their review. The design for the system has been preliminarily approved by Environmental Health. The applicant will be required to submit plans during the building permit stage. The project will not exceed any requirements from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
18.b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
<p>Discussion: See 18.a., above.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
18.c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
<p>Discussion: On-site drainage measures will be included to ensure that the site will continue to accommodate pre-construction flows. However, these measures are relatively minor in nature and will not result in significant environmental effects.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
18.d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
<p>Discussion: The new FLH units will be served an existing domestic water connection from Coastside County Water District. No expansion of these water systems are proposed. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				

18.e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
<p>Discussion: No impact. The project area is not served by a municipal wastewater treatment provider.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
18.f. Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
<p>Discussion: While the FLH unit would create a slight increase in demand on the solid waste disposal service already serving the parcel, there has been no evidence received to suggest that the increase in demand would adversely affect any existing capacities. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>				
18.g. Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<p>Discussion: The project would not have any impacts on solid waste requirements, and the project would not generate any solid waste.</p> <p>Source: Project Scope.</p>				
18.h. Be sited, oriented, and/or designed to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy; incorporate water conservation and solid waste reduction measures; and incorporate solar or other alternative energy sources?			X	
<p>Discussion: The Green Building Ordinance requires the use of water conserving fixtures, effective insulation, and other features that reduce water use and increase energy efficiency of residential buildings.</p> <p>Source: California Building Code.</p>				
18.i. Generate any demands that will cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity?				X
<p>Discussion: Given the answers in response to the questions posed in this section, the project will not cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity. Thus, the project poses no</p>				

<p>impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Description.</p>				
<p>19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>19.a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, significantly 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>			X	
<p>Discussion: No sensitive habitats are mapped in the project area. Areas proposed for disturbance are limited and the majority of the parcel will remain in its current state. the analysis contained within this document, these potential significant impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of all included mitigation measures</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
<p>19.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>			X	
<p>Discussion: Without mitigation, the project could potentially generate significant impacts to air quality, primarily due to dust generation. Measures to address this temporary impact were discussed under Question 3.b. To the best of staff’s knowledge, there are no other large grading projects proposed in the immediate project area at the present time. Because of the “stand alone” nature of this project and the relatively finite timeframe of dust generation, this project will have a less than significant cumulative impact upon the environment. No evidence has been found that the project would result in broader regional impacts, and there are no known approved projects or future projects expected for the project parcel. This type of development is consistent with the County Zoning Regulations. This project does not introduce any significant impacts that cannot be avoided through mitigation.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				

19.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
<p>Discussion: As discussed previously, the project will add one new Farm Labor Housing unit. The construction will be regulated by State Codes. Visual impacts will be mitigated by Mitigation Measure 1. Construction air quality impacts will be mitigated by Mitigation Measure 2. Construction traffic impacts will be mitigated by Mitigation Measure 4. Construction noise impacts will be mitigated by Mitigation Measure 6.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				

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

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

<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.		X
Other mitigation measures are needed.	X	
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> Any exterior lights shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the subject property and prevent glare in the surrounding area. Any proposed lighting shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department during the building permit process to verify compliance with this condition.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 2:</u> The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown by the wind. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard. 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. Sweep adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.). Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 miles per hour. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways and water ways. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. <p><u>Mitigation Measure 3:</u> In the event that should cultural, paleontological, or archaeological resources be 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 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. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 4:</u> Prior to the issuance of the Building permit for the property, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project</p>		

site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plan shall also limit application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

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

Mitigation Measure 5: All structures located in the Floodplain shall meet the latest adopted California Building Standards. An elevation certificate will be required from a licensed surveyor.

Mitigation Measure 6: Noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Saturdays. Said activities are prohibited on Sundays, Thanksgiving, and Christmas (San Mateo Ordinance Code Section 4.88.360).

Mitigation Measure 7: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources shall be taken prior to implementation of the project.

Mitigation Measure 8: In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall stop until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resource in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource, and those measures shall be approved by the Current Planning Section prior to implementation and continuing any work associated with the project.

Mitigation Measure 9: 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
X MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

(Signature)

Date

(Title)

Attachments:

1) Vicinity Map

2) Project Plans

RJB:aow – RJBCC0252_WAH.DOCX