County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Mukaeda Residence (Cypress Avenue, Moss Beach)

2. **County File Number:** PLN2020-00070

3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo, Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063

4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Camille Leung, Project Planner, 650/363-1826, cleung@smcgov.org (email is preferred method of communication)

5. **Project Location:** Undeveloped property located on Cypress Avenue, in unincorporated Moss Beach/Seal Cove area of San Mateo County. The project site can be accessed from Cypress Avenue, which is a public roadway.

6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** APNs 037-221-020 and 037-221-030; 5,643 sq. ft.

7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Edward C. Love, 720 Mill Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

8. **Owner:** Randolph Mukaeda, 105 Rosa Flora Cir., South San Francisco, CA 94080

9. **General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential; Urban

10. **Zoning:** One-Family Residential/Combining District (Minimum Lot Size 5,000 sq. ft.)/Design Review District/ /Geological Hazard District/Coastal Development District (R-1/S-17/DR/GH/CD)

11. **Description of the Project:** The project requires a Design Review Permit (DRP), a Coastal Development Permit (CDP), and Merger, for the construction of a new 2-story, 1,971 sq. ft. residence with a 1,015 sq. ft. attached garage on a 5,643 sq. ft. legal parcel (Certificate of Compliance No. PLN2017-00532). The project site is accessed from Cypress Avenue, a public roadway which is improved at the project location. The project involves no tree removal and minor grading. The subject property is located within Zone 2 (Questionable Stability) of the County's Local Coastal Program's Seal Cove Study Area. The project is appealable to the California Coastal Commission.

12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The property is located within an existing residential neighborhood and adjoins developed parcels on the north, south, and east sides. Access is proposed from Cypress Avenue, a public roadway. The property is relatively flat. A significant size (42") Cypress tree is located on the rear property line.

13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None

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, has consultation begun?: Yes, staff has sent out project referrals to affiliated tribes.** Planning staff has consulted with the following tribes, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC): Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista, Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe, Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan, Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area, The Ohlone Indian Tribe, and Wuksache Indian Tribe (Eshom Valley Band). On March 7, 2024, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment by April 7, 2024. No substantive comments were received during the consultation period, only a request for site location.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an 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:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?			X	
Discussion: The project may be minimally visible from the Pacific Ocean and beach to the west. The Fitzgerald Marine Reserve (FMR), a public land is immediately to the west of the project site across Cypress Avenue, with beach areas within FMR located to the southwest. Although the proposed residence may be minimally visible from beach and non-beach viewing area within the FMR, the presence of mature trees on the FMR boundary and on properties between beach areas of the FMR and the property would screen views of the proposed residence from viewing locations within the FMR. Additionally, a number of two-story residences already exist on Cypress Avenue and the new residence would blend in with existing views of residences. The project's aesthetic impact from viewing locations within the residential neighborhood it is situated in would also be minimal, as the project would blend in with existing views of residences. However, as the project is located west of many existing homes, the project may have an impact on ocean views from those homes. As required for the Design Review Permit, the proposed residence will be reviewed by the County's Coastside Design Review Committee (CDRC), who will assess the project's compatibility with the neighborhood (in terms of design, scale and other applicable standards), minimize potential view impacts, and require modifications (as needed) for project compliance design review standards. Based on the foregoing, the proposed 2-story residence would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads. Source: Project Plans; County GIS Maps; Google Street View				
1.b. Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to,				X

	trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
Discussion: The project is not located within a designated scenic corridor, nor would it impact areas within a state scenic highway. The project does not involve the removal of any trees. Source: County GIS Maps; Project Plans.					
1.c.	In non-urbanized areas, 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? (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 subject property is situated within an urbanized area. The design of the proposed residence will be reviewed by the Coastside Design Review Committee. No trees are proposed for removal. The project involves minor grading which would not substantially alter the topography or ground surface features. Based on the foregoing, it is anticipated that the proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Source: Google Street View; County GIS Maps; Topographic Survey					
1.d.	Create a new source of significant light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
Discussion: The project does not involve the introduction of significant light sources that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, as the proposed single-family residence is located within an existing residential area. Additionally, proposed exterior lights are located only at the front entry and at each of the two garage doors. Furthermore, design review standards of the Design Review (DR) District require downward-directed exterior light fixtures. Source: Project plans					
1.e.	Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?				X
Discussion: The property is not situated within a state or county scenic corridor and is not located adjacent to a state highway. The project is located approximately 300 feet outside of the Cabrillo Highway County Scenic Corridor. Source: County GIS Maps; Google Street View					
1.f.	If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?			X	

Discussion: The site is located in a Design Review District. The project requires a Design Review Permit and is required to comply with applicable design review standards. The project will be reviewed by the County Coastside Design Review Committee, where modifications would be required as necessary for project compliance with applicable design review standards.

The subject property is located in the One-Family Residential/Combining District (Minimum Lot Size 5,000 sq. ft.)/Design Review District/ Geological Hazard District/Coastal Development District (R-1/S-17/DR/GH/CD). It has been found to be compliant with zoning development standards, including but not limited to setback requirements, building height, lot coverage, and maximum floor area.

The project complies with the County General Plan Medium Density Residential land use designation which allows 6.1-8.7 du/acre. As proposed, the project density is approximately 7.7 du/acre.

Source: County GIS Maps; County Zoning Regulations; Standards for Design for One- and Two-Family Residential Development in the Midcoast.

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

Discussion: Please see Sections 1.a-f above for discussion.

Source: Project Plans; County GIS Maps

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:

	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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

Discussion: The project involves an urban, residential property located within a Single-Family Residential Zoning District in the Coastal Zone, which does not contain agricultural lands, prime

soils, and is not farmed. There is no project impact to farmland, forestland, or timberland. In addition, the subject property is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Source: County GIS Maps				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
Discussion: There is no existing Open Space Easement on the property. See discussion under Section 2.a. Source: County GIS Maps				
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: See discussion under Section 2.a. Source: Project plans; County GIS Maps				
2.d. For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Section 2.a. Source: County GIS Maps				
2.e. Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Section 2.a. Source: County GIS Maps				
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: See discussion under Section 2.a.

Source: County GIS Maps

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:

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

Discussion: The project involves no tree removal, minor grading, and construction activities associated with the proposed residence.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As described in the BAAQMD's 2022 California Environmental Quality Act (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 control measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures, *All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures,* and other criteria, that, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 1.a- 1.e requires the applicant to comply with BAAQMD's *All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures*. Other applicable BAAQMD standard criteria requires that construction-related activities exclude the below listed activities (followed by staff's evaluation of project compliance):

a. Demolition: The project is undeveloped and would not require demolition of any existing buildings.

b. Simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously): Staff has added this as Mitigation Measure 1.i to require compliance with this criterion.

c. Simultaneous construction of more than one land use type (e.g., project would develop residential and commercial uses on the same site) (not applicable to high density infill development): The project involves the construction of a single-family residence only.

d. Extensive site preparation (i.e., greater than default assumptions used by the Urban Land Use Emissions Model [URBEMIS] for grading, cut/fill, or earth movement): The project will not require extensive site preparation, and would disturb approximately 5,643 square feet.

e. Extensive material transport (e.g., greater than 10,000 cubic yards of soil import/export) requiring a considerable amount of haul truck activity: The project would not involve extensive material transport requiring off-haul of approximately 40 c.y.

BAAQMD measures and compliance with criteria b. above are required by the standard mitigation measure provided below.

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

a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.

b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

f. 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 California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

Source: Project Plans; Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

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

Discussion: As of February 2023, San Mateo County is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5. On January 9, 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to determine that the Bay Area attains the 24-hour PM-2.5 national standard. However, the Bay Area will continue to be designated as "non-attainment" for the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard until the BAAQMD submits a "re-designation request" and a "maintenance plan" to EPA and the proposed re-designation is approved by the EPA. A temporary increase in the project area is anticipated during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations reduce the potential effects to a less than significant impact. Project compliance with Mitigation Measure 1 in Section 3.a. would minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction.

Source: Project Plans; Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

3.c. Expose sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations, as defined by Bay Area Air Quality Management District?			X	
Discussion: See discussion in Section 3.a. Source: Project Plans; Bay Area Air Quality Management District				
3.d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
Discussion: The project involves construction and operation of a single-family residence. While the project may result in dust and odors associated with the construction process, these emissions would be temporary and would not affect a significant number of people as the project is separated from the FMR by intervening trees and is located in a small, single-family residential area. Source: Project Plans; Bay Area Air Quality Management District				

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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: The project site is located in an established residential neighborhood between 3 developed properties and the Cypress Avenue public right-of-way. The proposed construction would not result in any tree removal. The existing 42" (DBH) Cypress tree will be preserved and protected during construction. Further, the project site contains no sensitive resources, such as riparian corridor or wetland areas, and endangered/threatened species, and involves no tree removal. However, as the project site is located within the watershed of the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS), is located across the street from the FMR, and contains a drainage swale, staff has added Mitigation Measure 2 to require a pre-construction survey for protected species, prior to vegetation removal or land disturbance. Additionally, the project is required to implement dust and erosion and sedimental control measures, per Mitigation Measures 1 and 6-8, below, to minimize the spread of dust, sediment, and polluted stormwater to off-site areas. The applicant has submitted an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. For these reasons, staff concludes that the project, as proposed and mitigated,				

would not result in a substantial adverse effect 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.

Mitigation Measure 2: The applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures to avoid direct impacts to California Red-legged Frog (CRLF), San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (SFDFW), protected nesting birds and raptors, if present during the course of activities on the site:

a. Pre-construction surveys for SFDFW houses shall be performed no less than 30 days prior construction (including ground disturbance work and/or demolition of existing structures). If stick houses are found and avoidance is not feasible, the houses shall be dismantled by hand under the supervision of a biologist. If young are encountered during the dismantling process, the material shall be placed back on the house and a buffer of 25 to 50 feet shall be established by the biologist for a minimum of 3 weeks to allow young time to mature and leave the nest. Nest material shall be moved to a suitable adjacent area for reuse. Pre-construction surveys shall be provided to the Project Planner for review and approval, prior to start of any work at the Project Site.

b. A pre-construction survey for CRLF shall be performed within 48 hours of ground disturbing activities. Non-listed species if found, may be relocated to suitable habitat outside the Project Site. If CRLF is found, work should be halted, and the USFWS will be contacted. If possible, CRLF should be allowed to leave the area on its own. If the animal does not leave on its own, all work shall remain halted until the USFWS provide authorization for work to resume. Pre-construction surveys shall be provided to the Project Planner for review and approval, prior to start of any work at the Project Site.

c. Tree and vegetation removal activities shall be initiated during the non-nesting season of from September 1 to January 31 of protected nesting birds and raptors when possible. If work cannot be initiated during this period, then nesting bird pre-construction surveys shall be performed in trees proposed for removal and suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of the project footprint. Pre-construction surveys shall be provided to the Project Planner for review and approval, prior to start of any work at the Project Site.

   If nests are found, a no-disturbance buffer shall be placed around the nest of protected nesting birds and raptors until young have fledged or the nest is determined to be no longer active by the biologist. The size of the buffer may be determined by the biologist based on species and proximity to activities but should generally be between 50 to 100 feet for songbirds and up to 500 feet for nesting raptors.

Sources: County GIS, Google Earth; Standard biological mitigation measures (Source: Sol Ecology, Inc.)

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?		X		

Discussion: Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above.

Sources: County GIS, Google Streetview				
4.c. Have a substantial 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
Discussion: Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above. Sources: County GIS, Google Streetview				
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
Discussion: Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above. Sources: County GIS, Google Streetview				
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
Discussion: Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above. Sources: County GIS, Google Streetview				
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	
Discussion: Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above. Sources: County GIS, Google Streetview				
4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?			X	
Discussion: The project is located within 200 feet of the FMR. Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above. Sources: County GIS, Google Streetview				

4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X

Discussion: The project would not involve the removal of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands.

Sources: County GIS, Google Streetview

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impacts	*Significant Unless Mitigated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
5.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?		X		

Discussion: As there are no structures on the site, there would be no project impact to historic structures. Regarding potential project impact to archaeological resources, the project involves minor earth-moving, including approximately 40 cy of cut and 0 cy of fill, and construction impacts. The project was referred to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). In a letter (Attachment C.1) dated March 20, 2024, CHRIS staff stated that the proposed project area is located in close proximity to a nearby recorded Native American archaeological site and is within an approximated boundary for another Native American archaeological site. CHRIS staff suggested that, prior to commencement of project activities, a field study by a qualified professional archaeologist shall be conducted to update the conditions of this possible site on Office of Historic Preservation's DPR 523 resource recordation forms, assess potential impacts of the proposed project activities on this site, and provide project-specific recommendations as warranted.

Mitigation measures have been incorporated as follows:

Mitigation Measure 3: Prior to commencement of grading and construction activities, a field study by a qualified professional archaeologist shall be conducted to update the conditions of this possible site on Office of Historic Preservation's DPR 523 resource recordation forms, assess potential impacts of the proposed project activities on this site, and provide project-specific recommendations as warranted.

Mitigation Measure 4: In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archeological 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 archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archeologist and any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archeologist shall be required to submit to the Director of Planning and Building for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. 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).

Sources: Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) staff dated March 20, 2024.				
5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?			X	
Discussion: Please see Section 5.a for discussion. Sources: Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) staff dated March 20, 2024.				
5.c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	
Discussion: To minimize potential impacts to human remains, the property owner shall implement the following standard mitigation measure: **Mitigation Measure 5:** The applicants and contractors shall be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains, whether historic or prehistoric, during grading and construction. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately, and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend subsequent measures for disposition of the remains. Sources: Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) staff dated March 20, 2024.				

6. ENERGY. Would the project:					
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
6.a.	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
Discussion: Energy conservation standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings were adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the California Energy Commission) in June 1977 and are updated every 3 years (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations). Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow for consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods.					

The County has adopted the 2022 Energy Code which encourages efficient electric heat pumps, establishes electric-ready requirements for new homes, expands solar photovoltaic and battery storage standards, strengthens ventilation standards, etc.

At the time of building permit application, the project would be required to demonstrate compliance with the current Building Energy Efficiency Standards which would be verified by the San Mateo County Building Department prior to the issuance of the building permit. The project would also be required adhere to the provisions of CALGreen and GreenPoints, which establishes planning and design standards for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants.

Construction

The construction of the project would require the consumption of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (e.g., fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles (transportation) and construction equipment. Transportation energy use during construction would come from the transport and use of construction equipment, delivery vehicles and haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would fluctuate according to the phase of construction and would be temporary and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure. Most construction equipment during demolition and grading would be gas-powered or diesel powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered equipment.

Operation

During operations, project energy consumption would be associated with resident and visitor vehicle trips and delivery trucks. The project is a residential development project served by existing road infrastructure and the proposed new driveway. Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) provides electricity to the project area. Due to the proposed construction of a single-family residence, project implementation would result in a permanent increase in electricity over existing conditions. However, such an increase to serve a single-family residence would represent an insignificant percent increase compared to overall demand in PG&E's service area. The nominal increased demand is expected to be adequately served by the existing PG&E electrical facilities and the projected electrical demand would not significantly impact PG&E's level of service. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during operation and construction of the project given the financial implication of the inefficient use of such resources. As such, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Source: California Building Code; California Energy Commission; County Building Division Webpage; Project Plans.

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

Discussion: The project design and operation would be required to comply with State Building Energy Efficiency Standards, appliance efficiency regulations, and green building standards. Therefore, the project does not conflict with or obstruct state or local renewable energy plans and would not have a significant impact. Furthermore, the development would not cause inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption. The project will be further review at the time of building permit application to ensure substantial compliance with applicable energy conservation requirements.

Source: County Building Division Webpage; Project Plans.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? *Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.*			X	

Discussion: Discussion: The project, including associated studies prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc. (SPG; the Project Geologist and Project Geotechnical Engineer), was reviewed by the County's Geologic and Geotechnical consultant, Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc. (CSA), and preliminarily approved by the County.

The County's review included the following Geotechnical Reports and letters submitted by the applicant, and County review letters by Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc. (CSA) shown in italics (Sources for this Section, in chronological order):

- Geotechnical Study, Cypress Avenue, Moss Beach, California, APN's: 037-221-020,030, prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated December 19, 2017
- Geotechnical Study, Mukaeda Property, Cypress Avenue, Moss Beach, California, prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated June 2020 (Included in Attachment E)
- *Project Referral - PLN2020-00070, AP Zone, prepared by CSA, dated June 16, 2020.*
- Response to Comments: Cypress Avenue, Moss Beach. (APN's: 037-221-020,030); PLN2020-00070, prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated June 24, 2020.
- Second Response to Comments: Cypress Avenue, Moss Beach (APNs: 037-221-020, 030); PLN2020-00070, prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated November 20, 2020.

- *Engineering Geologic Peer Review, RE: Mukaeda; New Residence on a Vacant Lot, PLN2020-00070, APNs: 037-221-020, "0" Cypress Avenue, prepared by CSA, dated April 14, 2022.*

- Third Response to Comments: Cypress Avenue, Moss Beach (APNs: 037-221-020, 030); PLN2020-00070, prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated April 18, 2022.

- *Supplemental Engineering Geologic Peer Review, RE: Mukaeda; New Residence on a Vacant Lot, PLN2020-00070, APNs: 037-221-020, "0" Cypress Avenue, prepared by CSA, dated April 20, 2022. (Included in Attachment E)*

Site Conditions
The lot is undeveloped. The lot is very flat and covered with grass. There is a drainage ditch down the middle of the lot that drains runoff from the developed property to the south.

Groundwater
Groundwater was encountered in the trench at a depth of 9.5 feet. Groundwater is not expected to have an impact on the construction.

Faults and Seismicity
The site is in an area of high seismicity, with active faults associated with the San Andreas fault system. The closest active fault to the site is the San Gregorio-Seal Cove fault, located perhaps as close as about 10 feet from the northwest corner of the property.

Fault Study
The Seal Cove fault is thought to exist very close to the subject property. Therefore, prior to trenching, SPG performed a desk study to identify evidence of faulting in the area. The Seal Cove fault is a section of the San Gregorio fault system and is often identified in the study area as the San Gregorio fault. The Seal Cove fault is an active fault with up to 156 kilometers of cumulative total displacement (Clark, et al, 1984). The fault is considered capable of a magnitude of up to M7-1/4. (Simpson, et al, 1997). The slip rate of the fault is estimated to be at least 4.5 mm/yr, and possible as high as 7 to 10 mm/yr (Koehler et al, 2005). The recurrence interval between maximum seismic events is estimated to be 1037 to 2205 years (Koehler et al, 2005).
SPG reviewed 16 fault studies on neighboring properties. A parcel map of the area, showing the locations of the studies, and the associated fault trenches and features identified as fault traces, is shown in Figure 6 of the June 2020 SPG report. The 16 fault studies, numbered in the reference section from 1 to 16, are identified on the corresponding parcels.

As Figure 6 shows, the most likely main trace of the fault borders the west side of the neighborhood, as identified in 3 of the studies (Numbers 9, 12, and 13). The other identified fault traces to the east are scattered and discontinuous, with no obvious major fault characteristics.

Based on SPG's desk study, it appears very likely that the Seal Cove fault follows the westward trend shown in Figure 6. The features mapped to the east are ground fractures and other minor ground disruptions likely associated with past seismic events. Some of these features may be the result of no more than a few inches of displacement at a time when the causative seismic event resulted in several feet of displacement along the main fault trace. Future events may produce similar ground disruptions in the neighborhood, either at the same locations, or at other, new locations.

Fault Trench On Subject Property
SPG excavated an 89-foot long by 10-foot deep trench across the subject property, at the location shown in Figure 2 of the June 2020 SPG report. A log of the trench is shown in Figure 3, with lithologic descriptions in Figure 4, and photographs in Figures 5a through 5c. SPG found evidence of a minor trace fault in the west end of the trench. The trench revealed a soil column entirely within the marine terrace deposit. There was a well-developed soil column, with a distinct dark brown A-horizon and a distinct orange-brown B-horizon (Units 1 and 3 in the trench log). Below the B-horizon (unit 4), the soil is grades sandier, to a sandy clay, consistent with the marine terrace deposits.

Based on SPG's studies, there is no major trace of the Seal Cove fault on the property. However, there is a minor trace that should require a 10-foot offset. The main trace is estimated to be as little as 10 feet west of the northwest corner of the property, as shown in Figure 6. The trace shown in Figure 6 is derived by connecting the mapped traces located in trenches to the north and south. The location is very approximate, since the trenches were somewhat far away. However, our fault trench on the property clearly showed that the main trace is not on the property.

SPG provides recommendations for earthwork, clearing and subgrade preparation, compaction, surface drainage, and foundation design (including recommendation of a mat slab foundation of at least 5 inches thick and underlain by at least 12-inches of non-expansive granular fill), and construction observation and testing by SPG.

Summary of County's Review by CSA

In its review letter dated April 20, 2022, CSA noted that it appeared that referenced trenches were mislocated on Figure 6 of the report submitted by SPG. In addition, CSA noted that the locations of the faults found in previous trenching, as located by the Project Geologist, indicated a potential that an active trace of the Seal Cove Fault crossed the subject property at the location where a fault trace was logged by SPG. Consequently, CSA found that it is unable to accept the findings of the Project Geologist and noted that habitable structure setbacks on the order of 50 feet are the standard of practice from active traces as defined by the State. CSA also noted that the trenching referenced north of the site described a zone of active faulting 22 meters wide and recommended that SPG consider the likelihood that encountered faulting at the subject property brackets the edge of this fault zone. CSA found that the fault trace identified by SPG at the subject property may represent a potential serious hazard to the proposed site development. CSA also found it unlikely for compelling evidence to be provided that will allow CSA to accept a finding that the fault trace identified at the subject property is not associated with significant through-going active fault rupture hazards. CSA cites that this is based on the repeated uncertainties in plotting trench locations, along with the observable continuity of identified active fault traces by multiple investigators north and south of the site.

Summary of Differing Professional Opinions

In the instance of differing professional opinions between the County's Geotechnical Section and the Project Geologist, the County allows for a peer review letter from a County-approved third party to review the project record and submit an opinion to the County. The applicant submitter the following peer review letter, which was accepted by the County.

- Geologic Review Letter: Cypress Avenue, Moss Beach (APNs: 037-221-020, 030); PLN2020-00070, prepared by David W. Buckley, President of EcoGeoBuild, dated July 27, 2023 (Included in Attachment E)

As summarized by EcoGeoBuild, in a peer review letter dated July 27, 2023, Sigma Prime (Project Geotechnical Engineer; SPG) and CSA (County's Geotechnical Consultant) could not reach agreement regarding two issues, including the location of the main active trace of the San Gregorio fault and the appropriate setback distance from the fault trace identified on the subject property. CSA is of the opinion that the fault trace identified in the trench on the subject property is the main active trace of the San Gregorio fault, and that a 50-foot setback should be applied. CSA came to this conclusion by inferring the location of the fault based on the location of a topographic high point to the north, combined with the identification of the main trace of the fault in trenches for other projects to the north and south. However, SPG concluded that the main trace is farther to the west, based on a different interpretation of the same data. In EcoGeoBuild's peer review letter, it states that it agrees with SPG's interpretation.

Opinions of Third Party Peer Reviewer

Regarding location of the main active trace of the San Gregorio fault, the peer review letter concluded that, in EcoGeoBuild's opinion, the best evidence to suggest that the trace found in the trench on the subject property is not the main trace, is the fact that the fault trace is very narrow, wedge-shaped and wider at the top, has no slickensides, no vertical offset, and no change in the geology from one side to the other. It has the distinct appearance of a minor secondary fault trace or simple pull-apart structure. Trenches to the north and south, (as mentioned above) showed the main fault trace to be several feet wide, slickensided, with vertical offsets, and distinctly different geology from one side to the other. EcoGeoBuild states that it is very clear that the trace found on the subject property is not the main trace.

Regarding the appropriate setback distance from the fault trace identified on the subject property, EcoGeoBuild understands that CSA has stated in phone conversations and emails on this and other projects in the neighborhood, that a 50-foot setback should be applied not only for the main trace, but for all secondary fault traces, no matter how minor. However, our review of SPG's documentation of past soils reports in the neighborhood shows that a 10-foot setback has been the norm since 1980, with 10-foot setbacks recommended in 13 out of 14 reports. The other report recommended a 25-foot setback. The 10-foot setback has been approved by the County as recently as 2020.

EcoGeoBuild states that it appears that the main trace of the fault is about 40 feet or more west of the secondary trace. A 50-foot setback from the main trace corresponds to a 10-foot setback from the secondary trace. The fault trench showed that the soil east of the secondary trace, and across the entire property, was completely undisturbed, down to the marine terrace deposits, which are likely more than 10,000 years old. Therefore, the likelihood that the property will experience significant ground deformation in future seismic events is low. Even so, SPG recommends a rigid mat slab foundation, as there always remains a possibility for ground deformation anywhere in the area. The recommended foundation design will minimize the impact of ground deformation of the proposed structure and keep the occupants safe from catastrophic failure. CSA has stated that an engineering solution to potential seismically induced ground failure is not an option. However, one of the most common objectives of a civil, structural, or soils engineer is to arrive at engineering solutions to potential hazards, from earthquakes, to fires, to hurricanes.

Given the conservative foundation recommendations, the low likelihood of ground failure beyond 10 feet from the secondary fault trace, and the 40 plus year history of approved projects with 10-foot setbacks, EcoGeoBuild states that it is unreasonable at this time for the County to arbitrarily require a 50-foot setback, and that the project should be allowed to proceed with a 10-foot setback. Based on the foregoing, the County is allowing the project to proceed with the proposed 10-foot setback.

Sources: See sources listed in this Section.				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
Discussion: As stated in SPG's report dated June 24, 2020, the site is located in an active seismic area. Moderate to large earthquakes are probable along several active faults in the greater Bay Area over a 30 to 50 year design life. Strong ground shaking should therefore be expected several times during the design life of the structure, as is typical for sites throughout the Bay Area. The improvements should be designed and constructed in accordance with current earthquake resistance standards. Please see Section 7.a for further discussion. Sources: See sources listed in this Section.				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?			X	
Discussion: As stated in SPG's report dated June 24, 2020, liquefaction occurs when loose, saturated sandy soils lose strength and flow like a liquid during earthquake shaking. Ground settlement often accompanies liquefaction. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are saturated, loose, silty sands, and uniformly graded sands. Loose silty sands were not encountered at the site and are not typically present in the marine terrace deposits. Therefore, in SPG's opinion, the likelihood of liquefaction occurring at the site is low. As stated in SPG's report dated June 24, 2020, differential compaction occurs during moderate and large earthquakes when soft or loose, natural or fill soils are densified and settle, often unevenly across a site. Due to the stiff and dense nature of the underlying marine terrace deposits, the likelihood of significant damage to the structure from differential compaction is low. Please see Section 7.a for further discussion. Sources: See sources listed in this Section.				
iv. Landslides?			X	
Discussion: Landsliding was not identified by the Project Geotechnical Engineer as a significant concern for this site. Please see Section 7.a for discussion. Sources: County GIS Maps; Geotechnical Review (Conducted by the County Geotechnical Section)				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion? *Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).*			X	
Discussion: Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion was not identified by the Project Geotechnical Engineer as a significant concern for this site. The project site is not located on or immediately adjacent to a coastal cliff or bluff.				

Sources: County GIS Maps; Geotechnical Review (Conducted by the County Geotechnical Section)				
7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	

Discussion: The applicant proposes an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, included on page C-2 of Attachment B, which includes measures that would contain and slow run-off, while allowing for natural infiltration. Due to the potential for erosion and sedimentation during land disturbing and earth-moving activities, the following standard mitigation measures have been included:

Mitigation Measure 6: Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the residence, the applicant shall revise the Erosion Control Plan to include the driveway area and proposed measures and additional measures as follows, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director.

Mitigation Measure 7: The applicant shall adhere to the San Mateo County-wide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including, but not limited to, the following:

a. Delineation with field markers clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses within the vicinity of areas to be disturbed by construction and/or grading.

b. Protection of adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.

c. Performing clearing and earth moving activities only during dry weather.

d. Stabilization of all denuded areas and maintenance of erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30. Stabilization shall include both proactive measures, such as the placement of hay bales or coir netting, and passive measures, such as re-vegetating disturbed areas with plants propagated from seed collected in the immediate area.

e. Storage, handling, and disposal of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.

f. Control and prevention of the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.

g. Use of sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering site and obtain all necessary permits.

h. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.

i. Limiting and timing applications of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.

j. Limiting construction access routes and stabilization of designated access points.

k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.

l. Training and providing instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding the Watershed Protection Maintenance Standards and construction Best Management Practices.

m. Additional Best Management Practices in addition to those shown on the plans may be required by the Building Inspector to maintain effective stormwater management during construction activities. Any water leaving site shall be clear and running slowly at all times.

Mitigation Measure 8: Once approved, erosion and sediment control measures of the revised Erosion Control Plan shall be installed prior to beginning any site work and maintained throughout the term of grading and construction, until all disturbed areas are stabilized. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time. Revisions to the approved erosion control plan shall be prepared and signed by the engineer and submitted to the Building Inspection Section.

Source: Project C3C6 form, Project Site Plan and Drainage Plan (Pages A-1 and C-1)

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

Discussion: Regarding potential for landslide, erosion, and liquefaction, see discussion in Sections 7.a and 7.b above. Lateral spreading, subsidence, collapse, and severe erosion were not identified by the Project Geotechnical Engineer as a significant concern for this site.

Sources: County GIS Maps; Geotechnical Review (Conducted by the County Geotechnical Section)

7.d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	

Discussion: Expansive soil was not identified by the Project Geotechnical Engineer as a significant concern for this site.

Sources: County GIS Maps; Geotechnical Review (Conducted by the County Geotechnical Section)

7.e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

Discussion: The project proposes to connect to the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD). MWSD has reviewed the project plans and the project will be subject to MWSD permitting requirements. As public sewer service is available to the project site, no septic system is proposed as part of the project.

Source: County GIS Maps; Project plans

7.f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

Discussion: The project would unlikely result in any adverse impacts on any paleontological resources, as discussed in Section 5 above. Mitigation Measure 5 has been included to prevent any adverse impacts.

Sources: Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Staff Dated January 25, 2023; Letter from Native American Heritage Commission Dated February 7, 2023

8. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
8.a.	Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	

Discussion: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO2) air emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. Construction and related grading involves GHG emissions mainly from exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal cars of construction workers, and operation of grading equipment). Due to the site's coastal location and assuming construction vehicles and workers are based largely in city or larger urban areas, potential project GHG emission levels from construction would be increased from general levels.

To ensure new development projects are compliant with the Climate Element of the County's General Plan, the County provides a Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form (Form) (Attachment D). The applicant indicated that the project will incorporate several measures recommended in the Form, including energy storage technology (e.g. solar or home battery storage system), EV charging station(s), and use of drought-resistant landscape design principles which include replacing lawns or installing new gardens with native and drought-resistant plants, utilizing mulch, installing a rain garden, and avoiding the use of invasive and/or water-intensive plant selections.

The project involves a minor amount of grading, including approximately 40 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 0 c.y. of fill, requiring off-haul of 40 c.y. (approximately 4 truckloads). The project would also require importation of drain rock and aggregate rock; however, the volume of imported rock is also anticipated to be small. The project would be required to comply with the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). Therefore, the project's generation of GHG emissions is anticipated to be less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 9: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the following measures as indicated on the applicant-completed Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form (Attachment D) or equivalent measures, to the extent feasible. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

a. Energy storage technology (e.g. solar or home battery storage system) b. EV charging station(s) c. Use of drought-resistant landscape design principles which include replacing lawns or installing new gardens with native and drought-resistant plants, utilizing mulch, installing a rain garden, and avoiding the use of invasive and/or water-intensive plant selections. Source: Project plans				
8.b. Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
Discussion: The project involves construction of a single-family residence and associated improvements. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) exempts construction and operation of residential uses from permit requirements (Regulation 2-1-113). See further discussion in Section 3. Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District				
8.c. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?				X
Discussion: As discussed in Section 2 above, the project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, as the project site does not contain forestland. In addition, the project proposes no tree removal and would result in negligible disturbance to existing vegetation. Sources: County GIS Maps; Project Plans				
8.d. Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?			X	
Discussion: The project is not located on or immediately adjacent to a coastal cliff or bluff. The project is located on flat terrain approximately 190 feet east of the bluff and beach of the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve, with an intervening street (Beach Way) separating the property and the bluff. The property is outside of the tsunami/seiche zone and is located in FEMA flood zone X as described in Section 8.f below. There is low risk of accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels. Source: County GIS Maps				
8.e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X

Discussion: See Section 8.d above. The project is not located on or immediately adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and therefore would expose people or structures to low risk related to sea level rise. Source: County GIS Maps				
8.f. Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
Discussion: The project site is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0119F, effective August 2, 2017. Source: County GIS Maps				
8.g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: See discussion in Section 8.f. Source: County GIS Maps				

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
9.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
Discussion: None of the listed routine uses are proposed. The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence. Source: Project plans				
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
Discussion: The construction of a single family residence includes some storage and use of hazardous materials. As required by the standard requirements of Mitigation Measure 7 above,				

the project is required to store, handle, and dispose of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater, and control and prevent the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses. As required by the State Municipal Regional Permit, the County is required to inspect the site for compliance with stormwater pollution prevention measures on a weekly basis during the wet season (April 1 – May 30) during project grading and construction. Source: Project plans				
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
Discussion: There are no existing or proposed schools located within one-quarter mile of the project site. No routine use involving the emission or handling of hazardous materials or waste is proposed. The project only involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence. Source: Project plans; County GIS Maps				
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
Discussion: The project site is not a listed hazardous materials site. Source: County GIS Maps				
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 400 feet west of the Half Moon Bay Airport, a public use airport. Upon review of the provisions of the Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (HMB-ALUCP) for the environs of Half Moon Bay Airport, as adopted by the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) on October 9, 2014, the project site is located in Zone 7 – Airport Influence Area (AIA) where the airport accident risk level is considered low. Within the AIA Zone, Airport Land Use Commission review is required for any proposed structure taller than 100 feet above ground level. The proposed structure is less than 30 feet in height.

Residential uses are considered conditionally compatible in areas exposed to noise levels between 60-64 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) only if the proposed use is on a lot of record and zoned exclusively for residential use as of the effective date of the ALUCP. Residential uses are not considered compatible above 65 CNEL. The project would be exposed to noise levels of less than 60 dB CNEL based on ALUC adopted craft noise exposure contours.

Source: Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; County GIS Maps

9.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

Discussion: The project site is located within a residential area, and, based on a review of aerial satellite imagery, is not within the immediate vicinity of a private airstrip.

Source: County GIS Maps

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

Discussion: The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence that provides sufficient, compliant on-site parking and public road access. The project would not permanently or significantly impede access on existing public roads. Furthermore, the project has been reviewed and approved with conditions by the County Public Works Department and the Coastside Fire Protection District.

Sources: Project plans, County GIS Maps

9.h.	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

Discussion: The project site is not located within a designated Local Responsibility Area (LRA) fire hazard zone and Wildland Urban Interface Zone. As proposed, the project meets requirements relating to fire-resistant exterior materials and fire sprinklers. The project has been conditionally approved by the Coastside Fire Protection District (CFPD). Additionally, the proposed residence would provide 2 covered parking spaces and one uncovered on-site parking space, which would adequately prevent overflow street parking which may impede fire access. Based on the foregoing, it is unlikely that the project would result in a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Source: County GIS Maps.

9.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
Discussion: The project site is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0119F, effective August 2, 2017. Source: County GIS Maps.					
9.j.	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
Discussion: See discussion in Section 9.i. Source: County GIS Maps.					
9.k.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: The project site is location within the area of minimum flood hazard as discussed in Section 9.i. Additionally, the project has been reviewed by the County Drainage Section for compliance with the County Drainage Manual. The County Drainage Section would further review the drainage aspect of the project at the building permit application stage. Source: County GIS Maps.					

10.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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-			X	

	demanding substances, and trash))?				
Discussion: Regarding the potential impact of construction-related erosion and sedimentation to water quality, please see discussion in Section 7.b, above. Regarding post-construction, the project involves the construction and operation of a new single-family residence and would unlikely result in the violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Source: Project plans					
10.b.	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
Discussion: The project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, as the applicant proposes to connect to the domestic water service, provided by the Montara Water and Sanitary District. Source: Project plans					
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:			X	
	i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
Discussion: The project site is undeveloped; however, there is an unauthorized drainage swale on the property, which appears to drain surface water from the adjoining property to the east. As shown in the project civil plans, project construction would result in the relocation of the swale to the left of the new house. The project would result in approximately 2,800 sq. ft. of new impervious surface and proposes energy dissipaters at the end of the new driveway in the public right-of-way, as well as a swale and a rock retention pit to handle drainage from the subject residence. The project would potentially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. Mitigation Measure 10, below, requires post-construction project run-off to be equal to or less than the pre-project run-off and comply other requirements of the County's Drainage Manual and Provision C.3.i. of the Municipal Regional Permit. Project compliance with these regulations would prevent the substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns of the site and area. The project does not involve alteration of the course of a stream or river. **Mitigation Measure 10:** At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan to the Building Inspection Section for review for compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Manual.					

Projects subject to Provision C.3.i (individual single-family home projects that create and/or replace 2,500 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface, and other projects that create and/or replace at least 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface but are not C.3 Regulated Projects) shall implement at least one (1) of the three (3) site design measures listed below: a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use. b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas. c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas. A site drainage plan is required that demonstrates how roof drainage and site runoff will be directed to an approved location. In compliance with the County's Drainage Manual, this plan must demonstrate that post-development flows and velocities to adjoining private property and the public right-of-way shall not exceed those that existed in the pre-developed state. Sources: Project C3C6 form, Project Plans					
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X		
Discussion: Please see Section 10.c for discussion. The project would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river. Sources: Project plans; Project C3C6 form					
iii. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X		
Discussion: Please see Section 10.c, above, for discussion. Sources: Project plans; Project C3C6 form					
10.d. Significantly degrade surface or groundwater water quality?			X		
Discussion: With the implementation of mitigation measures as discussed in Section 7.b, potential project impacts to surface water quality related to sedimentation would be reduced to a less than significant level. Sources: Project plans; Project C3C6 form					
10.e. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?			X		
Discussion: Please see Section 10.c for discussion. Sources: Project plans; Project C3C6 form					

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				**X**
Discussion: The project would not impede or redirect flood flows There is no work proposed within an existing drainage channel or creek. Sources: Project plans; Project C3C6 form				
10.f. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, create or contribute runoff water which would risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				**X**
Discussion: The site is located approximately 2,000 feet from the boundary of the tsunami inundation zone, according to the County GIS Maps. Sources: Project plans; County GIS Maps; Project C3C6 form				
10.g. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X
Discussion: The project proposes to connect to the domestic water service, provided by Montara Water and Sanitary District, and would therefore no conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Additionally, see Section 10.c for discussion regarding potential impact to stormwater quality. Sources: Project plans; Project C3C6 form				

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
11.a. Physically divide an established community?				X
Discussion: The proposed single-family residential development would not result in the physical division of an established community, as the undeveloped property is located within an established residential neighborhood. Sources: County GIS Maps				
11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
Discussion: The project complies with the zoning district requirements for the property and other local regulations and would not cause any significant environmental impact due to a conflict with				

any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, as described in this document. Source: County GIS Maps; County Zoning Regulations				
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 site is accessed from Cypress Avenue, an improved public road. The project would connect to the Montara Water and Sanitary District, which provides water and sewer service to this area.g The project involve the construction oof water and sewer laterals from existing water and sewer mains located within the Cypress Avenue road right-of-way. Sources: Project plans; County GIS Maps				

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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 project does not involve any mining or extraction of minerals. Sources: 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
Discussion: The project would not affect any nearby mineral resource recovery site, if such a site should exist nearby. Sources: Project plans; County GIS Maps				

13.	**NOISE**. Would the project result in:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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	
Discussion: The project would generate additional non-substantial, temporary noise associated with grading and construction. However, such noises will be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the County Ordinance Code. Sources: Project plans					
13.b.	Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				X
Discussion: The project residence would be built on a rigid mat slab foundation and would not involve a pile-driven foundation. Sources: Project plans					
13.c.	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: The project site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Please see discussion in Section 9.e, above. Sources: Project plans; Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan					

14.	**POPULATION AND HOUSING**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
14.a.	Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly				X

(for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
Discussion: The project involves the construction of a single-family residence on an undeveloped parcel, accessible from an improved public roadway. The project involve the construction of water and sewer laterals from existing water and sewer mains located within the Cypress Avenue road right-of-way. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in substantial population growth or create any additional infrastructure needs. Sources: Project plans				
14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
Discussion: The project site is an undeveloped, residential parcel. No housing would be displaced. The proposed construction support a single family residential use. The project would provide one additional housing unit to the neighborhood. Sources: Project plans				

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

	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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	
Discussion: The project involves the construction of one single-family residence within an existing residential neighborhood in the unincorporated Moss Beach/Seal Cove area in the San Mateo County. The project has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the Coastside Fire Protection District. The project site is located in an established residential neighborhood, where police, school and park services presently exist in this area. Sources: Project plans				

16. RECREATION. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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	
Discussion: The project involves the construction of a single-family residence that would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Sources: Project plans				
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 does not involve the construction of any recreational facilities. The project involves the construction of one single-family residence on a residentially-zoned property and would not require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities. Sources: Project plans				

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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: The project site can be assessed from Cypress Avenue, a public road that is improved to the front of the project site. The existing road is adequate to serve the project. Additionally, no road extension or widening is needed for this project. The County LCP (Policy 2.52) exempts the development of singular single-family dwellings from the development and implementation of a traffic impact analysis and mitigation plan. The project involves the construction of one single-family residence and associated improvements and would result in a temporary increase in traffic levels during construction and a negligible permanent increase in traffic levels after construction. The proposed use is a private single-family residential use and provides adequate on-site parking. Therefore, the project does not conflict with an				

applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Sources: Project plans, Local Coastal Program (LCP)				
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: CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) *Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts,* describes specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. It states that, generally, vehicle miles traveled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. “Vehicle miles traveled” refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. The project involves the construction of one single-family residence within an existing residential neighborhood. The project would only result in a temporary increase in traffic levels during construction and a negligible permanent increase in traffic levels after construction. Therefore, the project does not conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3. Sources: Project plans				
17.c. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
Discussion: The project site is assessed from Cypress Avenue, a public road that is improved to the front of the project site. The project has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the County Department of Public Works. Sources: Project plans				
17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
Discussion: The project has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the Coastside Fire Protection District and would not result in inadequate emergency access, for reasons stated in this Section. Sources: Project plans				

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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:				X
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)				X
Discussion: The project site is undeveloped. 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). Sources: Project Plans; County GIS Maps; Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Staff Dated March 20, 2024				
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. (In applying the criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)			X	
Discussion: Staff requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project vicinity, which was conducted by the Native American Heritage Council (NAHC). In a letter dated March 8, 2024, NAHC staff stated that the record search of the NAHC SLF was completed for the information submitted for the referenced project. The results were positive. NAHC staff recommended that the County contact the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista and The Ohlone Indian Tribe. Planning staff has consulted with the following tribes, as identified by the NAHC: • Amah MutsunTribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista				

- Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe
- Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
- Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area
- The Ohlone Indian Tribe
- Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band
- The Tamien Nation

On March 7, 2024, staff sent a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment by April 7, 2024, and to the Tamien Nation at their request for notification of all projects subject to CEQA. Andrew Galvan of The Ohlone Indian Tribe requested additional information on the project site location. No additional comments were received during the commenting period.

Sources: Project Plans; County GIS Maps; Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Staff Dated March 20, 2024; Letter from Native American Heritage Commission dated March, 2028.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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 project would connect to existing public utilities systems and would provide on-site drainage systems. For these reasons, the project would not 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.

Source: Project Plans

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 project includes proposes to connect to the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD) for domestic water services. MWSD has reviewed the project plans and the project will be subject to permitting requirements.

Source: Project Plans

19.c. Result in a determination by the waste-water treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
Discussion: Please see discussion in Section 19.a, above. Source: Project Plans				
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: The project involves the construction of one single-family residence with associated improvements and would result in a negligible increase in solid waste disposal needs. The site would be served by public solid waste services. Source: Project Plans				
19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
Discussion: The project involves the construction of one single-family residence with associated improvements would result in a negligible increase in solid waste disposal needs and would be served by public solid waste services. 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:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
20.a.	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located within a designated Local Responsibility Area (LRA) or State Responsibility Area (SRA) fire hazard zone and Wildland Urban Interface Zone. The project has been conditionally approved by The Coastside Fire Protection District (CFPD). Additionally, the proposed residence would provide 2 covered, on-site parking spaces, which would adequately prevent excessive street parking that could impair emergency access. Based on the foregoing, the project would not impair any emergency response or emergency evacuation plan.					

Source: County GIS Map; CALFIRE GIS Maps; CFPD Conditions					
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 site is relatively flat. The project has been conditionally approved by CFPD. CFPD will further review the project at the building permit application stage to ensure compliance with all applicable fire protection measures and requirements, including regulations requiring the use of fire-resistant exterior materials and fire sprinklers. Source: County GIS Map					
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: Please see discussion in Sections 20.a and 20.b. Source: County GIS Map.					
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: Please see discussion in Sections 20.a and 20.b. Source: County GIS Map; C3 C6 Form					

21.	**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**.	***Potentially Significant Impacts***	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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			X	

endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
Discussion: As discussed in this document, the project, as proposed and mitigated, has the potential to result in less than significant environmental impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures included in this document would adequately minimize project environmental impacts to a less-than-significant level. Source: Subject document.				
21.b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
Discussion: The project, as proposed and mitigated, would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The project includes the construction of one single-family residence. There may be concurrent construction in the area, such as for the Big Wave North Parcel Project (Big Wave Project) located at 380 Airport Street, whereby concurrent construction traffic may impact streets in the project vicinity. However, project conditions for the Big Wave Project, specifically Condition 36 and Mitigation Measure TRANS-8, prohibit the use of Cypress Street for project construction traffic, require project grading and construction traffic to be scheduled during non-commute hours (weekdays 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.) and require vehicles carrying extra wide and/or long loads to avoid residential streets. Therefore, cumulative impacts to area traffic are anticipated to be low. Source: Subject document.				
21.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
Discussion: As described in this document, the project, as proposed and mitigated, would not result in any substantial direct or indirect adverse impacts on human beings. Implementation of mitigation measures included in this document would adequately prevent any significant environmental impacts and minimize any environmental impacts to a less-than-significant level. Source: Subject document.				

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

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
CalTrans		X	
City		X	
Coastal Commission		X	Permit Appealable to CCC
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
Other: None			
National Marine Fisheries Service		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
Sewer/Water District: MWSD		X	
State Department of Fish and Wildlife		X	
State Department of Public Health		X	
State Water Resources Control Board		X	

MITIGATION MEASURES		
	Yes	No
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed.		X

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

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

a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.

b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

f. 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 California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

Mitigation Measure 2: The applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures to avoid direct impacts to California Red-legged Frog (CRLF), San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (SFDFW), protected nesting birds and raptors, if present during the course of activities on the site:

a. Pre-construction surveys for SFDFW houses shall be performed no less than 30 days prior construction (including ground disturbance work and/or demolition of existing structures). If stick houses are found and avoidance is not feasible, the houses shall be dismantled by hand under the supervision of a biologist. If young are encountered during the dismantling process, the material shall be placed back on the house and a buffer of 25 to 50 feet shall be established by the biologist for a minimum of 3 weeks to allow young time to mature and leave the nest. Nest material shall be moved to a suitable adjacent area for reuse. Pre-construction surveys shall be provided to the Project Planner for review and approval, prior to start of any work at the Project Site.

b. A pre-construction survey for CRLF shall be performed within 48 hours of ground disturbing activities. Non-listed species if found, may be relocated to suitable habitat outside the Project Site. If CRLF is found, work should be halted, and the USFWS will be contacted. If possible, CRLF should be allowed to leave the area on its own. If the animal does not leave on its own, all work shall remain halted until the USFWS provide authorization for work to resume. Pre-construction surveys shall be provided to the Project Planner for review and approval, prior to start of any work at the Project Site.

c. Tree and vegetation removal activities shall be initiated during the non-nesting season of from September 1 to January 31 of protected nesting birds and raptors when possible. If work cannot be initiated during this period, then nesting bird pre-construction surveys shall be performed in trees proposed for removal and suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of the project footprint. Pre-construction surveys shall be provided to the Project Planner for review and approval, prior to start of any work at the Project Site.

   If nests are found, a no-disturbance buffer shall be placed around the nest of protected nesting birds and raptors until young have fledged or the nest is determined to be no longer active by the biologist. The size of the buffer may be determined by the biologist

based on species and proximity to activities but should generally be between 50 to 100 feet for songbirds and up to 500 feet for nesting raptors.

Mitigation Measure 3: Prior to commencement of grading and construction activities, a field study by a qualified professional archaeologist shall be conducted to update the conditions of this possible site on Office of Historic Preservation's DPR 523 resource recordation forms, assess potential impacts of the proposed project activities on this site, and provide project-specific recommendations as warranted.

Mitigation Measure 4: In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archeological 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 archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archeologist and any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archeologist shall be required to submit to the Director of Planning and Building for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. 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).

Mitigation Measure 5: The applicants and contractors shall be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains, whether historic or prehistoric, during grading and construction. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately, and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend subsequent measures for disposition of the remains.

Mitigation Measure 6: Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the residence, the applicant shall revise the Erosion Control Plan to include the driveway area and proposed measures and additional measures as follows, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director.

Mitigation Measure 7: The applicant shall adhere to the San Mateo County-wide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including, but not limited to, the following:

a. Delineation with field markers clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses within the vicinity of areas to be disturbed by construction and/or grading.

b. Protection of adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.

c. Performing clearing and earth moving activities only during dry weather.

d. Stabilization of all denuded areas and maintenance of erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30. Stabilization shall include both proactive measures, such as the placement of hay bales or coir netting, and passive measures, such as re-vegetating disturbed areas with plants propagated from seed collected in the immediate area.

e. Storage, handling, and disposal of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.

f. Control and prevention of the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.

g. Use of sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering site and obtain all necessary permits.

h. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.

i. Limiting and timing applications of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.

j. Limiting construction access routes and stabilization of designated access points.

k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.

l. Training and providing instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding the Watershed Protection Maintenance Standards and construction Best Management Practices.

m. Additional Best Management Practices in addition to those shown on the plans may be required by the Building Inspector to maintain effective stormwater management during construction activities. Any water leaving site shall be clear and running slowly at all times.

Mitigation Measure 8: Once approved, erosion and sediment control measures of the revised Erosion Control Plan shall be installed prior to beginning any site work and maintained throughout the term of grading and construction, until all disturbed areas are stabilized. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time. Revisions to the approved erosion control plan shall be prepared and signed by the engineer and submitted to the Building Inspection Section.

Mitigation Measure 9: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the following measures as indicated on the applicant-completed Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form (Attachment D) or equivalent measures, to the extent feasible. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

a. Energy storage technology (e.g. solar or home battery storage system)
b. EV charging station(s)
c. Use of drought-resistant landscape design principles which include replacing lawns or installing new gardens with native and drought-resistant plants, utilizing mulch, installing a rain garden, and avoiding the use of invasive and/or water-intensive plant selections.

Mitigation Measure 10: At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan to the Building Inspection Section for review for compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Manual.

Projects subject to Provision C.3.i (individual single-family home projects that create and/or replace 2,500 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface, and other projects that create and/or replace at least 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface but are not C.3 Regulated Projects) shall implement at least one (1) of the three (3) site design measures listed below:

a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use.

b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas.

c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas.

A site drainage plan is required that demonstrates how roof drainage and site runoff will be directed to an approved location. In compliance with the County's Drainage Manual, this plan must demonstrate that post-development flows and velocities to adjoining private property and the public right-of-way shall not exceed those that existed in the pre-developed state.

DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared by the Planning Department.
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because of the mitigation measures in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

(Signature)

May 14, 2024 — Date

Camille Leung, Project Planner — (Title)

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Vicinity Map
B. Project Plans
C. Cultural Resource Documents
    1. Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Staff dated March 20, 2024
    2. Letter from Native American Heritage Commission, dated March 8, 2024
D. Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form
E. Geological Reports:
    1. Geotechnical Study, Mukaeda Property, Cypress Avenue, Moss Beach, California, prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated June 2020

2. Supplemental Engineering Geologic Peer Review, RE: Mukaeda; New Residence on a Vacant Lot, PLN2020-00070, APNs: 037-221-020, “0” Cypress Avenue, prepared by CSA, dated April 20, 2022.
3. Geologic Review Letter: Cypress Avenue, Moss Beach (APNs: 037-221-020, 030); PLN2020-00070, prepared by David W. Buckley, President of EcoGeoBuild, dated July 27, 2023