

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

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

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000, et seq.), that the following project: **After-the-Fact PAD and CDX to legalize a cargo container storage building**, when adopted and implemented, will not have a significant impact on the environment.

FILE NO.: PLN2023-00112

APPLICANT/ OWNER: Erik Markegard, 20080 Cabrillo Highway, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019.

CONTACT PERSON: Sonal Aggarwal, Project Planner, 650/363-1860, Saggarwal@smcgov.org

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 081-320-030, 25,253 sq. ft. (0.58 Acres)

LOCATION: 350 Madera Lane, San Gregorio, Unincorporated County of San Mateo

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project is an after-the-fact Planned Agricultural District (PAD) Permit to legalize a cargo container storage building used to support off-site agricultural operations, that was built without permits and associated with VIO2022-00089.

As currently built, the building is three stories on the northside (basement, first and second floor) and two stories on the southside (first and second floor). The second story of the building is proposed to be removed and relocated to a different site/location, making this building single-story facing La Honda Road.

The basement of the building would be used for storing agricultural supplies, tools, and equipment (346.69 sq. ft.). The first floor is used for storing frozen packed and labeled beef, lamb, pork, and chicken associated with the property owner's offsite cattle ranch operation, hay storage, tool, and maintenance shop (1,312.32 sq. ft.). The existing second-story containers contain an illegally constructed bedroom, bathroom, and kitchen which would be removed prior to the building final inspection of this project. The proposal also includes the legalization of a 5,000-gallon plastic water tank located in the front of this building, and an existing pond towards the south that was built by the owner. This pond is located 2 feet 6 inches south of the building and is proposed for watering on-site herbs and vegetable gardens. A new bee yard is also proposed. The project involved no tree removal and approximately 98 cu. yd of grading, which was required to build the pond. The site is located in La Honda Road County Scenic Corridor. The project qualifies for a Coastal Development Exemption as this building and pond are related to agricultural development.

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

1. The project, as mitigated, will not adversely affect water or air quality or increase noise levels substantially.
2. The project will not have adverse impacts on the flora or fauna of the area.
3. The project will not degrade the aesthetic quality of the area.
4. The project, as mitigated, will not have adverse impacts on traffic or land use.
5. In addition, the project, as mitigated, will not:
 - a. Create impacts which have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.
 - b. Create impacts which achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
 - c. Create impacts for a project which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
 - d. Create environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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

MITIGATION MEASURES: included in the project and identified by the Lead Agency to avoid potentially significant effects:

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

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

Mitigation Measures 1: The applicant shall remove the second story of the containers which shall be moved to a different site/location.

Mitigation Measure 2: The applicant shall plant at least four to five screening trees with a minimum stock size of 15-gallon or larger along La Honda Road to mitigate any potential view impacts from the neighboring properties and roads.

Mitigation Measure 3: In plans submitted for a building permit, the applicant shall show installation of a new roof on the single-story portion of the building, to be painted a green color to match the roof color of the existing barn.

Mitigation Measure 4: The number of exterior lighting fixtures for the container building shall be limited to the minimum required by the building code. Such light fixtures shall be warm-toned and downward-directed. Any other new lighting shall be subject to separate permitting.

Mitigation Measure 5: The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:

- a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 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.
- c. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- d. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible.
- e. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- g. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
- i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

Mitigation Measure 6: Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) or similar material shall not be used. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with this requirement in plans submitted at the time of building permit application.

Mitigation Measure 7: A pre-construction survey of protected species (e.g., dusky-footed woodrat, California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, migratory bird nesting) shall be conducted prior to any proposed grading-or-construction-related activities. If, for any reason, grading/construction activities do not commence within 10 days of completion of the survey, the survey shall be repeated, and results reported to the County. If active migratory bird nests or other evidence of other special species are discovered, no construction-related activities, including grading and tree removal, are allowed until the applicant has consulted a biologist, recommended measures to protect such species have been shared with County staff, and recommended measures have been fully implemented, to the satisfaction of the project biologist and Community Development Director.

Mitigation Measure 8: After a biologist conducts a pre-construction survey, the biologist shall monitor installation of permanent exclusion fencing around the property to avoid any wildlife entering the property. Applicant shall maintain exclusion fencing in working order for the life of the project.

Mitigation Measure 9: In the event that unanticipated cultural resources are exposed during

ground disturbance activities, work within 15 meters (50 feet) of the find must stop and a Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist, must be notified immediately. Work may not resume until a qualified archaeologists can evaluate the significance of the find. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or tribal consultation may be warranted.

Mitigation Measure 10: Although not anticipated, there remains the potential for the inadvertent discovery of human remains during ground-disturbing activities. State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The San Mateo County coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If concentrations of prehistoric or historic-era materials are encountered during project activities; all work in the immediate vicinity shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds and make recommendations.

Mitigation Measure 11: A construction verification report shall be submitted at the time of building permit application that provides the same level of construction verification required in a geotechnical final construction report. The report shall include affirmation that the geotechnical elements of the project were constructed according to the recommendations provided in the report along with the methods that were used by the Project Geotechnical Engineer for the verification. The elements include but are not limited to:

- a. A verification of the dimensions and reinforcement of the footings including depth and width.
- b. A verification of the dimensions and reinforcement in the piers including depth and logs.
- c. A verification of the dimensions, reinforcement and waterproofing of the slab on grade that connects the two structures.
- d. A verification of any site grading that has occurred as part of the original project. That includes verifying the compaction of any fill placed.

Furthermore, the Geotechnical Department recommends that the geotechnical and structural engineers provide the following supplemental letters:

- e. The Project Geotechnical Engineer shall submit a Plan Review Letter reviewing all pertinent aspects of the as-built plans and calculations. We recommend that special care be given to the proximity of the retention pond to the building foundation.
- f. The structural engineer provides revised calculations that include lateral loading on the foundation and retaining walls or as directed from the building department structural review.

Mitigation Measure 12: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall submit for review and approval, erosion and drainage control plans that show how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site will be minimized. The plans shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plans shall include measures that limit the application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

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

Mitigation Measure 13: An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" and/or building permit to ensure that the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure 14: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate removal of existing bathrooms and kitchen located in second story containers, and in the shed next to the barn, as well as associated containment and/or treatment facilities. The applicant shall complete the work prior to the Planning Final Inspection of the Building Permit.

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

Mitigation Measure 16: The plans submitted for the building permit shall show any existing fire hydrants in and around the site.

Mitigation Measure 17: The required fire hydrant shall be located no closer than 50 feet to any building, and no farther away from 150 feet from the proposed building and be located on the fire department access side of the building. Hydrants shall be placed on a concrete pad 4 inches deep, and 2 feet by 2 feet minimum at the case, and shall be positioned so the center of the discharge is 30 inches to 36 inches above grade and be within 5 feet of the fire department access road. A 3-foot (914 mm) clear space shall be maintained around the circumference of the fire hydrants, except as otherwise required or approved.

Mitigation Measure 18: The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from San Mateo County Environmental Health Services to legalize the existing well to an agricultural well. Any existing/proposed plumbing from the existing well i.e. irrigation, spigots, etc., shall be shown on the plans, and a note stating that is well shall be used for only non-portable well shall be added. The plans shall also show evidence of the well pad at the surface with an appropriate top plate.

Mitigation Measure 19: Install a screening wall in front of the freezer unit to mitigate any potential noise impacts and keep the noise under 55 dBA (daytime) to 50 dBA (nighttime) at all times.

Mitigation Measure 20: In plans submitted for a building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate that the emergency generator located in the front setback of the site will be moved elsewhere on the site, to comply with a minimum site setback of 3 feet from the side and rear property lines. If located 3 feet from the rear and side property lines, the generator should be housed in a cabinet or within a sound blanket to keep the noise level under 55 dBA (daytime) and 50 dBA (nighttime).

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: None

REVIEW PERIOD: **Wednesday, October 15, 2025 – Wednesday, November 5, 2025.**

All comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this Negative Declaration must be received by the contact person listed here, no later than **5:00 p.m., on Wednesday, November 5, 2025.**

SCHEDULED PUBLIC MEETING OR HEARING:

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

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

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

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** After-the-Fact PAD and CDX to legalize a cargo container storage building
2. **County File Number:** PLN2023-00112
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** San Mateo County, 455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Sonal Aggarwal, Project Planner, 650-363-1860
5. **Project Location:** 350 Madera Lane, San Gregorio, Unincorporated County of San Mateo
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 081-320-030, 25,253 sq. ft. (0.58 Acres)
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Erik Markegard, 20080 Cabrillo Highway, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019, erik@markegardfamily.com
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** N/A
9. **General Plan Designation:** Agriculture
10. **Zoning:** PAD/CD (Planned Agricultural District/Coastal Development District)
11. **Description of the Project:** The proposed project is an after-the-fact Planned Agricultural District (PAD) Permit to legalize a cargo container storage building used to support off-site agricultural operations, that was built without permits and associated with VIO2022-00089.

As currently built, the building is three stories on the northside (basement, first and second floor) and two stories on the southside (first and second floor). The second story of the building is proposed to be removed and relocated to a different site/location, making this building single-story facing La Honda Road.

The basement of the building would be used for storing agricultural supplies, tools, and equipment (346.69 sq. ft.). The first floor is used for storing frozen packed and labeled beef, lamb, pork, and chicken associated with the property owner's offsite cattle ranch operation, hay storage, tool, and maintenance shop (1,312.32 sq. ft.). The existing second-story containers contain an illegally constructed bedroom, bathroom, and kitchen which would be removed prior to the building final inspection of this project. The proposal also includes the legalization of a 5,000-gallon plastic water tank located in the front of this building, and an existing pond towards the south that was built by the owner. This pond is located 2 feet 6 inches south of the building and is proposed for watering on-site herbs and vegetable gardens. A new bee yard is also proposed. The project involved no tree removal and approximately 98 cu. yd of grading, which was required to build the pond. The site is located in La Honda Road County Scenic

Corridor. The project qualifies for a Coastal Development Exemption as this building and pond are related to agricultural development.

12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is a triangular-shaped 25,253 sq. ft. lot at the northeast intersection of Madera Lane and La Honda Road. It is surrounded by other agricultural lots on the left and rear sides of the site. Aside from the improvements that are proposed for legalization and described above, the site contains an existing barn (PLN2004-00647), one non-potable agricultural well, two water tanks (PLN2004-00647), one pump house (PLN2011-00192) and a shed (PLN2010-00117). The parcel is relatively flat and is elevated above Madera Lane and La Honda Road.
13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** N/A
14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?:**

The Tamien Nation has requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. In addition, Planning staff has consulted with the following eight tribes, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC): Amanh Mutsun Tribal Band; Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista; Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe; Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan; Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area; Tamien Nation; The Ohlone Indian Tribe; and Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band. On August 19, 2025, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comments. Only Tamien Nation requested for formal consultation on September 5, 2025. However, the consultation request was later canceled by Tamien Nation stating they had no comments on this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources. Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?		x		
Discussion: The project site is located in La Honda Road County Scenic Corridor. The project involves the legalization of a 2-story stacked cargo container building that was constructed without permits. As currently built, the building is three stories towards the north (basement, first and second floor) and two stories towards the south (first and second floor). The site is already developed with an agricultural barn and a 10,000-gallon water tank, which are visible from La Honda Road. The proposal also includes the legalization of a 5,000-gallon plastic water tank (located towards the west) and an existing pond (located towards the south) of this building, which are not visible from La Honda Road. The project involved no tree removal and approximately 98 cu. yd of grading, which was required to build the pond. As shown in photos included in Attachment F, the 2nd story and roof of the container storage building is visible from the La Honda Scenic Corridor, with the 1st story being minimally visible when intervening vegetation along the road shoulder is cut. The applicant has agreed to remove the second story containers to make this building into a single-story building facing La Honda Road. This would help mitigate view impacts from the adjacent roads and neighboring properties, as the single story building would blend in with the existing barn and views of other agricultural structures along La Honda Road. The applicant has also agreed to plant additional trees along La Honda Road and paint the roof green to blend with the surrounding, and match with the color pallet of the existing barn. Given these measures, any potential view impacts can be mitigated to less than significant impacts. Mitigation Measures 1: The applicant shall remove the second story of the containers which shall be moved to a different site/location. Mitigation Measure 2: The applicant shall plant at least four to five screening trees with a minimum stock size of 15-gallon or larger along La Honda Road to mitigate any potential view impacts from the neighboring properties and roads. Mitigation Measure 3: In plans submitted for a building permit, the applicant shall show installation of a new roof on the single-story portion of the building, to be painted a green color to match the roof color of the existing barn. Source: Plans and site visit, conducted November 22, 2024.				
1.b. Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			x	

Discussion: There are no historic resources, trees, or rock outcroppings that would be impacted. Any potential impact on the scenic resources would be mitigated through implementing mitigation measures 1 to 3 above.

Source: Plans and site visit, conducted November 22, 2024.

1.c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, such as significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

x

Discussion: The site is located in a non-urbanized area of San Gregorio and surrounded by rural properties. The project site is not located on a ridgeline. However, the site is at a higher slope than the adjacent roads, Madera Lane and La Honda Road. While the building is visible from both these roads, the applicant has agreed to implement Mitigation Measures 1 to 3 above, such as removing the second story and planting additional trees facing La Honda Road, to mitigate view impacts. With these measures, any potential view impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant impact.

Source: Plans and site visit, conducted November 22, 2024.

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

x

Discussion: The project does not involve any new light sources at this time, but the project will be undergoing building code compliance review during the building permit process. A mitigation measure has been added to limit the exterior lighting fixtures to the minimum required by the building code and require such fixtures to be warm-toned and downward-directed, to minimize dark sky light pollution onto La Honda Road.

Mitigation Measure 4: The number of exterior lighting fixtures for the container building shall be limited to the minimum required by the building code. Such light fixtures shall be warm-toned and downward-directed. Any other new lighting shall be subject to separate permitting.

Source: Plans and site visit, conducted November 22, 2024.

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

x

Discussion: The project site is located in La Honda Road County Scenic corridor.

Source: San Mateo County GIS Map Viewer (Accessed August 2025).

1.f.	If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				x
Discussion: The project is not located within the Design Review District. Source: Project Location, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.					
1.g.	Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?				
Discussion: See staff's responses in Sections 1.a – 1.d. above. Source: See sources in Sections 1.a. – 1.d.					

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a.	For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			x	
Discussion: The site is located in the Coastal Zone. It is zoned as PAD/CD (Planned Agricultural District/Coastal Development District) and is located in the categorical agricultural exclusion zone of the Coastal Zone. There is no prime soil on this site, but does contain land suitable for agriculture. The site is small for a commercially viable agricultural operation and already developed with an existing barn and accessory structures; therefore, the site is appropriate for the proposed accessory to agriculture uses, with some limited undeveloped areas that can still be used for small-scale farming activities. While the container building (1,390 sq. ft. footprint) permanently converts the soil such that it can no longer be farmed, other uses such as the pond, vegetable planter beds and water tanks would not convert the soil permanently, where these uses could be removed and farmed in the future. The container building would continue to be supportive of any future agricultural use of the property. Therefore, project impacts to the agricultural land would be less than significant.					

Source: Project Description, Project Plans, County of San Mateo GIS, and San Mateo County Zoning Regulations (Accessed August 2025), San Mateo County Local Coastal Program Policies.				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?			x	
Discussion: There is no easement on this site, and the site is not a Williamson Act contracted site. Hence, any impact created with this project would be less than significant. Source: San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, Memorandum for Eliza Milio, Agricultural Ombudsman regarding agricultural production, processing, and storage on multiple parcels, dated March 6, 2024.				
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: This project would not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of forested to non-forested use. There is no change in the proposed use of this land, and it would stay as an agricultural property. Hence, there would be no impact. Source: Project Plans and Project location.				
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: While the project is located within the Coastal Zone the project does not support soils identified as Class I, II or III rated good or very good for artichokes or brussels sprouts. Source: Project Plans and San Mateo County GIS Maps.				
2.e. Results in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?			x	
Discussion: Yes, see discussion in Section 2.a. Source: Project Location, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, San Mateo County Local Coastal Program, U.S. Department of Agriculture-Natural Resources Conservation Service's Web Soil Survey.				
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				x

Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? <i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i>				
Discussion: The site is zoned as PAD/CD (Planned Agricultural District/Coastal Development District). PAD zoning allows facilities for processing, storing, packaging and shipping of agricultural products subject to acquiring a PAD Permit and complying with Development Review Criteria, Chapter 20.A.2 of the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations. The project was referred to the Resource Conservation District (RCD) during the review process, who confirmed that packing, shipping and storing of agricultural products such as frozen meat, hay, herbs, honey and meat rubs is an agricultural accessory activity (See Appendix C). Therefore, the proposed use of storage building is compatible with the existing zoning of the site and there is no need for rezoning or change of land use. Hence, there is no impact. Source: Project plans and description, County of San Mateo Zoning Ordinance.				

3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
	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 Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan (CAP), developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), is the current regulating air quality plan for San Mateo County. The CAP was created to improve Bay Area air quality and to protect public health and the climate. During the construction of this container storage building, the project did not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the BAAQMD's 2017 Clean Air Plan. During project implementation, air emissions generated from site grading, equipment, and work vehicles; however, any such grading-related emissions were temporary and localized. The BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As defined in the BAAQMD's 2017 CEQA Guidelines, the BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction emissions due to the number of variables that can impact the calculation of construction emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of all feasible construction measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures that they have determined, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. These standard control measures have been included in Mitigation Measure 5 below for any future construction associated with permitting and completing this project:				

Mitigation Measure 5: The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:

- a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 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.
- c. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- d. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible.
- e. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- g. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
- i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

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

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

Discussion: As of December 2012, San Mateo County is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5. On January 9, 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to determine that the Bay Area attains the 24-hour PM-2.5 national standard. However, the Bay Area will continue to be designated as "non-attainment" for the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard until the BMQMD submits a "re-designation request" and a "maintenance plan" to EPA and the proposed redesignation is approved by the Environmental Protection Agency. A temporary increase in the project area is anticipated during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations reduces the potential effects to a less than significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5 in Section 3.a. would minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction to a less than significant level.

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

3.c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?			X	
Discussion: Any pollutant emissions generated from the proposed project would primarily be temporary in nature. The project site is in a rural agricultural land with few sensitive receptors (i.e., rural residential homes) located around the site. The implementation of Mitigation Measure 5 above would also help in minimizing any potentially significant exposure to nearby sensitive receptors to a less than significant level. Source: Project Plans, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.				
3.d. Results in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
Discussion: The proposed project did not create any objectionable odors during construction. 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: San Gregorio Creek is located approximately 817 feet south of the property and El Corte Madera Creek approximately 550 feet west of the project site. The existing pond on the property was created by the owner, involving minor grading. It does not meet the County Local Coast Program's definition of wetland or riparian corridor as it is man-made and has standing water during normal rainfall years (see policies below, underline added for emphasis). <i>LCP Policy 7.17 (Definition of Wetland) Define wetland as an area where the water table is at, near, or above the land surface long enough to bring about the formation of hydric soils or to support the growth of plants which normally are found to grow in water or wet ground. Such wetlands can include mudflats (barren of vegetation), marshes, and swamps. Such wetlands can be either fresh or saltwater, along streams (riparian), in tidally influenced areas (near the ocean and usually below extreme high water of spring tides), marginal to lakes, ponds, and man-made impoundments. Wetlands do not include areas which in normal rainfall years are permanently submerged (streams, lakes, ponds and impoundments), nor marine or estuarine areas below extreme low water of spring</i>				

tides, nor vernal wet areas where the soil is not hydric. In San Mateo County, wetlands typically contain the following plants: cordgrass, pickleweed, jaumea, frankenia, marsh mint, tule, bullrush, narrow-leaf cattail, broadleaf cattail, pacific silverweed, salt rush, and bog rush. To qualify, a wetland must contain at least a 50% cover of some combination of these plants, unless it is a mudflat.

No riparian or wetland setbacks are required for manmade impoundments. Hence, no setbacks are required between this agricultural pond and the building. Based on California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), there are no special status plant or animal species identified on this project site. No site-specific biological study was performed. Staff have added the following mitigation measures, which are standard protection measures to complete the next stages of this project (removing the second-story containers and moving the emergency generator elsewhere on the site).

Mitigation Measure 6: Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) or similar material shall not be used. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with this requirement in plans submitted at the time of building permit application.

Mitigation Measure 7: A pre-construction survey of protected species (e.g., dusky-footed woodrat, California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, migratory bird nesting) shall be conducted prior to any proposed grading-or-construction-related activities. If, for any reason, grading/construction activities do not commence within 10 days of completion of the survey, the survey shall be repeated, and results reported to the County. If active migratory bird nests or other evidence of other special species are discovered, no construction-related activities, including grading and tree removal, are allowed until the applicant has consulted a biologist, recommended measures to protect such species have been shared with County staff, and recommended measures have been fully implemented, to the satisfaction of the project biologist and Community Development Director.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, California Natural Diversity Database, Standard Biological Mitigation Measures.

4.b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Discussion: The project involves legalization of a man-made pond that was created without permits. This pond is filled with rainwater collected from the roof top gutters of the container storage building and could attract California red-legged frogs and other protected species, which may be impacted when the water is drawn from the pond. This pond is located approximately 2 feet 6 inches from this building. The following mitigation measure is added to avoid any potential future impacts associated with project operations.

Mitigation Measure 8: After a biologist conducts a pre-construction survey, the biologist shall monitor installation of permanent exclusion fencing around the property to avoid any wildlife entering the property. The applicant shall maintain exclusion fencing in working order for the life of the project.

Source: Project plan and description, San Mateo County GIS Maps and California Natural Diversity Database, Standard Biological Mitigation Measures.

4.c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
Discussion: The existing pond on the property was created by the owner and does not meet the County Local Coast Program's definition of wetland as it is man-made and has standing water during normal rainfall years. Source: Project Plans, Project site visit, conducted November 22, 2024.					
4.d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
Discussion: Project impact is anticipated to be minimal but could impact migratory nesting birds due to removal of the roof of the container building. See discussion in 4. a. to c. above. Source: Project Plans, Project Location. County GIS Maps					
4.e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Tree Protection Ordinances)?			X	
Discussion: No trees were removed for the construction of this storage building and pond and the project does not conflict with the Tree Protection Ordinance. Source: Project plans and proposal.					
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: The site is not located in an area with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved regional or state habitat conservation plan Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, San Mateo County General Plan, adopted 1986, California Natural Communities Conservation Plan Map, Accessed August 28, 2025.					
4.g.	Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve.					

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, National Wildlife Refuge System Locator.				
4.h.	Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?			X
Discussion: No oak woodlands or other timber woodlands were affected during the construction of the storage building and pond. Source: Project Plans, Project Location and Project Proposal.				

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 pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
Discussion: A project referral was sent to California Historical Resources Information System 12 (CHRIS), File No: NWIC 24-0802. The CHRIS response noted Study #5481 (Edwards 1983), including parts of the proposed project area in their maps. However, the report is unclear as to whether the researchers surveyed the proposed project area and whether the project area has the possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological sites. CHRIS recommended that a study by a qualified professional archaeologist is recommended prior to commencement of project activities. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 10 has been added to address this recommendation. CHRIS also recommended that the local Native American tribe(s) be contacted regarding traditional, cultural and religious heritage values that might be present on the site. Staff contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to complete a sacred lands request and obtain a list of the local Native American tribe(s). The NAHC provided a response noting that the results were negative. The NAHC also provided a list of eight (8) Native American tribes that may have knowledge of the site. Staff contacted these tribes on August 19, 2025, and received no comments. However, in the event cultural resources are encountered Mitigation Measure 10 has been added for any pending work yet to be completed. Mitigation Measure 9: In the event that unanticipated cultural resources are exposed during ground disturbance activities, work within 15 meters (50 feet) of the find must stop and a Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist, must be notified immediately. Work may not resume until a qualified archaeologists can evaluate the significance of the find. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or tribal consultation may be warranted. Source: Project Location; California Historical Resource Information System (File No.: 24-0802); State of California Native American Heritage Commission.				
5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?		X		

Discussion: See discussion under 5.b, above. Source: Project Location; California Historical Resources Information System (File No. 24-0802); State of California Native American Heritage Commission.				
5.c.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X	
Discussion: Per the applicant, no identified human remains found within the project area during the construction of the pond and storage building. Staff have included Mitigation Measure 11 below for any remaining work yet to be completed. Mitigation Measure 10: Although not anticipated, there remains the potential for the inadvertent discovery of human remains during ground-disturbing activities. State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The San Mateo County coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If concentrations of prehistoric or historic-era materials are encountered during project activities; all work in the immediate vicinity shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds and make recommendations. Source: Project Location; California Historical Resource Information System (File No.: 24-0802); State of California Native American Heritage Commission.				

6. ENERGY. Would the project:				
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>
6.a.	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X
Discussion: The project does not involve development which would consume or result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Source: Project Proposal, Project Plans				
6.b.	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.			X
Discussion: The project does not involve elements which would conflict or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Source: Project Proposal, Project Plans				

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:		X		
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>				
Discussion: The project site is located in San Gregorio, California. While there is a mapped landslide that touches the neighborhood parcel, no mapped geologic hazards appear on the property as per the County Geologist's review. Per the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Butano Geotechnical Engineering Inc., September 2022, the project has the potential to be affected by intensive seismic shaking and collateral seismic hazards. However, the hazard of intense seismic shaking is present throughout central California. The County of San Mateo has adopted the seismic provisions set forth in the 2022 California Building Code to address seismic shaking. The seismic provisions in the 2022 CBC are minimum load requirements for the seismic design of any structure. The provisions set forth in the 2022 CBC will not prevent structural and nonstructural damage from direct fault ground surface rupture, coseismic ground cracking, liquefaction and lateral spreading, seismic induced differential compaction, seismically induced landsliding, or seismically induced inundation. Given that the building has been constructed already, the Project Geotechnical Engineer will need to provide verification that the geotechnical elements of the building were constructed properly. This includes the construction of foundation elements as well as all completed site grading (such as backfill behind the retaining wall and around the pool). The applicant shall submit a revised Geotechnical Report at the building permit stage. The following mitigation measure has been added to satisfy this requirement before the issuance of a building permit. Mitigation Measure 11: A construction verification report shall be submitted at the time of building permit application that provides the same level of construction verification required in a geotechnical final construction report. The report shall include affirmation that the geotechnical elements of the project were constructed according to the recommendations provided in the report along with the methods that were used by the Project Geotechnical Engineer for the verification. The elements include but are not limited to: - A verification of the dimensions and reinforcement of the footings including depth and width. - A verification of the dimensions and reinforcement in the piers including depth and logs. - A verification of the dimensions, reinforcement and waterproofing of the slab on grade that connects the two structures. - A verification of any site grading that has occurred as part of the original project. That includes verifying the compaction of any fill placed. Furthermore, the Geotechnical Department recommends that the geotechnical and structural engineers provide the following supplemental letters:				

e. The Project Geotechnical Engineer shall submit a Plan Review Letter reviewing all pertinent aspects of the as-built plans and calculations. We recommend that special care be given to the proximity of the retention pond to the building foundation. f. The structural engineer provides revised calculations that include lateral loading on the foundation and retaining walls or as directed from the building department structural review. Source: San Mateo County Geotechnical Review Letter by Quinn Todzo, dated February 6, 2025, and Geotechnical Investigation Design Phase Report prepared by Butano Geotechnical Engineering, dated September 2022.				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?		X		
Discussion: See discussion under 7.a.i. above. Source: San Mateo County Geotechnical Review Letter by Quinn Todzo, dated February 6, 2025, and Geotechnical Investigation Design Phase Report prepared by Butano Geotechnical Engineering, dated September 2022.				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?		X		
Discussion: See discussion under 7.a.i. above. Source: San Mateo County Geotechnical Review Letter by Quinn Todzo, dated February 6, 2025, and Geotechnical Investigation Design Phase Report prepared by Butano Geotechnical Engineering, dated September 2022.				
iv. Landslides?		X		
Discussion: See discussion under 7.a.i. above. Source: San Mateo County Geotechnical Review Letter by Quinn Todzo, dated February 6, 2025, and Geotechnical Investigation Design Phase Report prepared by Butano Geotechnical Engineering, dated September 2022.				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion? <i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i>			X	
Discussion: The project site is not located on a coastal bluff Source: San Mateo County GIS Maps.				
7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
Discussion: The project involves approximately 85 cu. yd. of grading and no tree removal. The following mitigation measures could ensure that no further loss of topsoil or erosion occurs for completing the next stages of the project, such as removing the second story and placing it on or off-site.				

Mitigation Measure 12: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall submit for review and approval, erosion and drainage control plans that show how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site will be minimized. The plans shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plans shall include measures that limit the application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

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

Mitigation Measure 13: An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" and/or building permit to ensure that the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, Geotechnical Investigation Design Phase Report prepared by Butano Geotechnical Engineering, dated September 2022.

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: See discussion under 7.a. and b. above. Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, Geotechnical Investigation Design Phase Report prepared by Butano Geotechnical Engineering, dated September 2022.					
7.d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?		X		
Discussion: Per the Geotechnical Report submitted by Butano Geotechnical Engineering, dated September 2022, the building was built on in-situ sandstone which has a low potential for expansion. The report states that the southern container is supported by drilled piers that are 5 feet deep below the grade beam and embedded into the underlying bedrock of a minimum 18 inches. The northern container includes a below grade basement with the foundation embedded into the sandstone and supported by a mat slab foundation. The basement walls should be fully drained. Per the Project Geotechnical Engineer, the site is suitable for the existing building. Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, Geotechnical Investigation Design Phase Report prepared by Butano Geotechnical Engineering, dated September 2022.					
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: There is no septic or other wastewater disposal system proposed. In permitting the container building, the County requires, in addition to other required modifications, that the applicant to remove the existing bathrooms and kitchen located in second story containers and in the shed next to the barn, as well as associated containment and/or treatment facilities, before the final Planning inspection of the building permit. Any future sewage disposal system will need a separate permit from the County's Environmental Health Services Department. Mitigation Measure 14: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate removal of existing bathrooms and kitchen located in second story containers, and in the shed next to the barn, as well as associated containment and/or treatment facilities. The applicant shall complete the work prior to the Planning Final Inspection of the Building Permit. Source: Project Plans and Project Proposal					
7.f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

Discussion: Based on the project parcel's existing surrounding environment and topography, it is not likely that the project parcel would host any paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature. The applicant has also confirmed that no paleontological resource was found during the construction of the pond and storage building.

Source: Project Plans and Project Proposal.

8. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:

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

Discussion: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO₂) air emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. Project-related grading and construction of the proposed residence will result in the temporary generation of GHG emissions along travel routes and at the project site. In general, construction involves GHG emissions mainly from exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal vehicles of construction workers). Even assuming construction vehicles and workers are based in and traveling from urban areas, the potential project GHG emission levels from construction would be considered minimal. Although the project scope for the project is not likely to generate significant amounts of greenhouse gases, the mitigation measure provided in Section 3.a would ensure that any impacts are less than significant. Construction of the proposed storage building and pond included approximately 85 cu. yd. of grading. There is insufficient evidence to suggest that this activity will exceed the screening threshold for GHG emission established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The District's CEQA Threshold of Significance Guidance states that any stationary source that generates more than 10,000 Metric Tons of GHG emissions per year is considered a significant impact. The average U.S. Household is estimated to generate 7.5 tons of GHG emissions per year. To ensure new development projects are compliant with the County's Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP), the County provides the EECAP Development Checklist. The applicant-completed will be required to incorporate several EECAP measures, including use of "cool" exterior surfaces, providing trash, recycling and composting collection enclosures, compliance of construction equipment with BAAQMD guidance for idling. The project would be required to comply with the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). While the above described measures would reduce GHG emissions associated with project construction and operation, the BAAQMD encourages lead agencies to incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce GHG emissions during construction, including, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; using local building materials of at least 10 percent; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. These Best Management Practices have been included in Mitigation Measure 16 below in order to further reduce project related GHG emissions. Compliance with and/or consideration of EECAP and BAAQMD measures is required in order to reduce project related GHG emissions.

Compliance with and/or consideration of EECAP and BAAQMD measures is required in order to reduce project related GHG emissions.

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

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

8.b. Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

X

Discussion: As discussed above, the BAAQMD has determined that a project that generates GHG emissions above the 1,100 metric ton threshold would be in violation of the District's Clean Air Plan. The proposed use is allowed on PAD Zoning district through a PAD Permit. Therefore, the project does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or resolution.

Source: BAAQMD CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, 2017, Bay Area Clean Air Plan, Project Plans.

8.c. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?

X

Discussion: The project parcel and surrounding area is not considered as a forest land. Therefore, the project has no impact.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location and County GIS Maps.

8.d. Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?

X

Discussion: The project site is not located on a costal bluff.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location and 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 discussion under 8.d. above.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location and 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 not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project parcel is located in FEMA Flood Zone X, which is considered a minimal flood hazard (Panel No.06081C0380E, effective October 16, 2012). FEMA Flood Zone X areas have a 0.2 percent annual chance of flooding, with areas with one percent annual chance of flooding with average depths of less than 1-foot. Therefore, the proposed project poses no impact. Source: Project Location, County GIS Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0380E, effective October 16, 2012.					
8.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by FEMA. Therefore, the proposed project poses no impact. Source: Project Location, County GIS Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0380E, effective October 16, 2012.					

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9.a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
Discussion: The proposed project does not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project involves deep freezer for storing packaged meats and workshop. The employees of the applicant would come a couple of times during the week to pick up the packaged meats and ship them to the other sites in the County. Source: Project Proposal.					
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: No hazardous materials would be emitted from this building, hence there would be no impact. Source: Project Plans and Project Proposal.				
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: The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The emission or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste is not proposed with this project. Source: Project Plans and Project Proposal.				
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 included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and therefore would not result in the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Source: Project Location.				
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 not within 2 miles of a public airport or land use airport. Source: Project Location.				
9.f.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X
Discussion: The project site is accessible through Madera Lane and La Honda Road. There is no evidence that the project would interfere with any emergency response plan. Therefore, the project has no impact. Source: Project Plans, Project Location, and County GIS Maps.				

9.g.	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 located within a Very High Fire Risk State Responsibility Area. The project will be required to meet the fire safety standards and show compliance with the California Building Code. The project site contains two plastic water tanks, 5,000 gallons and 10,000 gallons. Per Coastside Fire Protection District, the applicant will need to dedicate the existing 5,000-gallon water tank and dedicate a fire hydrant for fire safety. As the project plans lack information about any existing fire hydrant, the following mitigation measures were added to show compliance with the fire safety standards. Mitigation Measure 16: The plans submitted for the building permit shall show any existing fire hydrants in and around the site. Mitigation Measure 17: The required fire hydrant shall be located no closer than 50 feet to any building, and no farther away from 150 feet from the proposed building and be located on the fire department access side of the building. Hydrants shall be placed on a concrete pad 4 inches deep, and 2 feet by 2 feet minimum at the case, and shall be positioned so the center of the discharge is 30 inches to 36 inches above grade and be within 5 feet of the fire department access road. A 3-foot (914 mm) clear space shall be maintained around the circumference of the fire hydrants, except as otherwise required or approved. Source: San Mateo County Fire Department's Review Letter, dated June 9, 2023, Project Plans, County GIS Maps.					
9.h.	Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located within such an area. Source: County GIS Maps.					
9.i.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: See discussion in 8.f. and 9. h. above. Source: Project Location, County GIS Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0380E, effective October 16, 2012.					
9.j.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
Discussion: As discussed in Section 8.f, 9.h. and i. above, the project site and immediately adjacent parcels are located in Flood Zone X, an area of minimal flood hazard. There is no levee or dam in the near vicinity of the site, hence, the proposed project will not expose people or structures					

to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

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

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

X

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

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

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

Discussion: The project site is located with the San Gregorio Watershed and is not located next to a creek. San Gregorio Creek is located approximately 520 feet northwest of the project site. The site contains a man-made pond that was created by the owner by grading less than 150 cu. yd. every year (threshold for not requiring a Grading Permit). Rainwater is harvested from roof top gutters and collected in the pond and into a 5,000-gallon plastic storage tank. The site also contains a well to be legalized as an Agricultural well and a pump house. As the well is non-conforming, and it can be continued to be used for agricultural purposes after acquiring the necessary permits from the San Mateo County Environmental Health Services. Staff reached out to the San Gregorio Water (Stetson Engineers) on January 14, 2025, to inquire about any potential water permits to harvest rainwater. Per the response received from Stetson Engineers, dated January 16, 2025, the owner of 350 Madera Lane does not need a water right for the rainwater capture system, and water rights are only required if water is diverted from a stream or a channel. Furthermore, if a well is pumping percolating groundwater, a water right is not required. Therefore, the project would have no impact on any existing watershed or water system of this region. See [Appendix E](#) for more details. The following mitigation measure is added to avoid any future deterioration of the pond and for legalizing the existing well.

Mitigation Measure 18: The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from San Mateo County Environmental Health Services to legalize the existing well to an agricultural well. Any existing/proposed plumbing from the existing well i.e. irrigation, spigots, etc., shall be shown on the

plans, and a note stating that is well shall be used for only non-portable well shall be added. The plans shall also show evidence of the well pad at the surface with an appropriate top plate. Source: Email communication with Julian Fulwiler from Stetson Engineers, San Gregorio Water Master, dated January 16, 2025, Plan check review comments of the Environmental Health, January 14, 2025.				
10.b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
Discussion: See discussion in 10. a. above. Source: Email communication with Julian Fulwiler from Stetson Engineers, San Gregorio Water Master, dated January 16, 2025.				
10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
Discussion: The project would be required to show compliance with the County's Drainage Manual at the building permit stage. The mitigation measures listed under Mitigation Measures 12 to 13 would reduce the impact to a less than significant impact. Source: Project plans, Project Location.				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	
Discussion: see discussion in 10.b. ii. above. Source: Project Plans, Project Location.				
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	

Discussion: Compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Permit is mandatory and would prevent the creation of Significant additional sources of polluted runoff. Source: Project Plans, Project Location.				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
Discussion: See discussion in 10. a. above Source: Project Plans, Project Location.				
10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located in tsunami or seiche zones. See discussion in 10. a. b. c. above. Source: Project Plans, Project Location.				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X
Discussion: The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) of 2015 requires local regions to create groundwater sustainability agencies (GSA's) and to adopt groundwater management plans for identified medium and high priority groundwater basins. San Mateo County has nine identified water basins. These basins have been identified as low priority, and are not subject to the SGMA, and there is no current groundwater management agency or plan that oversees these basins. Also, see discussion in Section 10.b. Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Office of Sustainability, Groundwater Website https://www.smcsustainability.org/energy-water/groundwater/.				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or ground water quality?			X	
Discussion: See discussions under 10.a. to e. above. Source: Project Plans, Project Location.				
10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?				
Discussion: The proposed project would increase impervious surfaces. Pursuant to the discussion in Section 10.a, the post-development runoff would be greater than the pre-development runoff. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 12 to 13, the proposed project impact would be less-than-significant. Source: Project Plans, Project Location.				

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 project does not involve dividing an established community. It involves legalizing an agricultural pond and a container storage building. Source: Project Location, Project Plans.				
11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
Discussion: The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed project use is consistent with the applicable Zoning Regulations and General Plan Policies. Source: Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County General Plan.				
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 site is already developed with a barn and a water tank. With the construction of this storage building the site would still be used for agricultural purposes. No newly expanded public utilities are required for this project. The site currently has an illegally constructed bathroom in the shed next to the barn, which it is proposed to be removed with this application. The site has no portable water or sanitation facilities; hence no person is allowed to stay overnight. Any future water or septic system would require obtaining permits from San Mateo County Environmental Health Services. Any potential impacts created would be mitigated by Mitigation Measure 18 above. Source: Project Plans, Project Proposal.				

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located in an area known for mineral resources nor does the project involve mineral extraction. Source: Project Location; San Mateo County General Plan; San Mateo County GIS Resource Map.				
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: See discussion under 12.a., above. Source: Project Location; San Mateo County General Plan; San Mateo County GIS Resource Map.				

13. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
Discussion: There is a mechanical equipment associated with the freezer unit located on the north side of this building. San Mateo County Environmental Health Services has conducted two site visits to confirm the noise level of this mechanical equipment and verified the noise levels between 42 dBA to 47 dBA (Noise Ordinance requirement is 55 dBA daytime, and 50 dBA nighttime). There is another emergency generator that is located in the front setback. The following mitigation measures can help reduce any potential noise impacts to a less than significant impact. Mitigation Measure 19: Install a screening wall in front of the freezer unit to mitigate any potential noise impacts and keep the noise under 55 dBA (daytime) to 50 dBA (nighttime) at all times. Mitigation Measure 20: In plans submitted for a building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate that the emergency generator located in the front setback of the site will be moved elsewhere on the site, to comply with a minimum site setback of 3 feet from the side and rear property lines. If located 3 feet from the rear and side property lines, the generator should be housed				

in a cabinet or within a sound blanket to keep the noise level under 55 dBA (daytime) and 50 dBA (nighttime).				
Source: Project Plans, Site visit, San Mateo County Municipal Ordinance				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				X
Discussion: The storage building is already constructed. Minor ground vibration or ground-borne noise created from the site would be typical to construction of any new building .				
Source: 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 parcel is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan.				
Source: Project Location.				

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
Discussion: No roads or infrastructure extension is required for this project. Hence, there will be no impact.				
Source: Project Plans, Project Location.				
14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
Discussion: The project involves legalizing an already constructed cargo container building and an agricultural pond that were constructed without permits. The site does not contain potable water or sanitation facilities. Hence, no housing can be developed at this site until it provides the required				

services. The site consists of an illegally constructed second-story living unit and a full bathroom located in the shed next to the barn that will be required to be removed as per Mitigation Measure 14 above. No replacement housing would be necessitated as these units were not permitted.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, Site inspection.

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

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?		X		
15.b. Police protection?				X
15.c. Schools?				X
15.d. Parks?				X
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				X

Discussion: See discussion under 9.g. above.

Source: San Mateo County Fire Department's Review Letter, dated June 9, 2023, Project Plans, County GIS Maps.

16. RECREATION. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X

Discussion: The proposed project includes legalizing an already built cargo container storage building, containing no dwelling units, which would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.

Source: Project Plans, Project Proposal.				
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: See discussion under 16.a. above. The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Source: Project Plans, Project Proposal.				

17. TRANSPORTATION. 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 would not conflict with any program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and parking Source: Project Plan, Project Proposal.				
17.b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts</i> ? <i>Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.</i>				X
Discussion: The project involves legalizing an already built container storage building, water tank and a pond. The site is accessible via La Honda Road and Madera Lane, which are public roads. The project does not involve altering any roadway and the development is limited to the project site. <i>Project operation-related traffic impacts</i> The owner and his workers make periodic trips to the site, mainly to access the freezer unit to drop off or pick up products. There is no retail use proposed or allowed. These trips would result in minimal to no impacts to area traffic. <i>Construction-related traffic impacts</i> The total grading required to complete this work was around 98 cu. yd. Most of the work is already completed with the exception of removing the second-story containers and moving it on-or-off-site. Any potential work required to be completed for this project like removing the second story, installing the screening walls in front of the generator, and installing roof could be completed in a couple of				

weeks to days. The proposed project (removing the second story, installing the screening walls in front of the generator, and installing roof) is not of a scope/scale that would exceed a threshold of significance and/or result in significant impacts.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

17.c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

X

Discussion: The project site is currently developed, and the project does not involve an increase in density, the introduction of new uses, or changes to the existing access roads which would result in increased hazards.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

X

Discussion: The project does not include any changes to the existing driveway that serves the site. The site is easily accessible from La Honda Road and Madera Lane. Hence, there would be no impact on the emergency access to the site.

Source: Project Plans.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				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)				

Discussion: The project site is not listed or is 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)

Source: Project Location.

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significantly 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 sent out certified mails to eight tribes provided by Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and heard back from Tamien Nation who asked for a formal consultation under AB52. However, no comments were provided by Tamien Nation and the meeting was canceled on the scheduled date.

Source: Project Plans.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	

Discussion: The project site does not have access to potable drinking water or sanitation facilities. The bathrooms that were illegally constructed would be removed through Mitigation Measure 14 above. The portion of the container storage building that would remain at the site would only contain a workshop/maintenance shop, deep freezer unit and hay storage. There is an existing non-conforming well on site that would be only allowed to be used for agricultural purposes. Any future development proposals would be subject to meeting Environmental Health's health and safety standards.

Source: Project Plans, Project Proposal.

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: See discussion under 19.a. above. Source: Project Plans, Project Proposal.				
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: See discussion under 19.a. above. Source: Project Plans, Project Proposal.				
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: See discussion under 19.a. above. Source: Project Plans, Project Proposal.				
19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
Discussion: See discussion under 19.a. above. Source: Project Plans, Project Proposal.				

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 is located with a state responsibility area identified as high fire severity zone. <u>Mitigation Measures 16 and 17</u> listed above under 9.g. above would help reduce any				

significant wildfire hazard to less than significant impact. The project would not impair any adopted emergency response plan or evaluation plan.

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

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: As discussed above, the site is already developed with a barn and is surrounded by low density residential and agricultural uses. The proposed project will be required to incorporate fire resistant materials, installation of fire sprinkler system, and the creation of defensible space around the developed areas as part of project construction. In the event there was a wildfire in the area the occupants would be likely be exposed to pollutant concentrations and/or uncontrolled spread as would the other surrounding development. However, the incorporation of the fire reduction methods described would aid in minimizing impacts.

Source: Project Location, Project Plans.

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

X

Discussion: The project includes legalization of a 5,000-gallon fire suppression water storage tank. There is another 10,000-gallon water tank available at the site. See discussions under 9.g. above.

Source: Project Location, Project Plans.

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

X

Discussion: While downslope landslides associated with post-fire instability are a possibility, the proposed project does not exacerbate this situation. As noted previously the majority of the adjacent parcels are developed and the proposed addition of storage building on the subject parcel will not increase or create additional risks associated with landslides.

Source: Project Location, Project Plans.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------

21.a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
Discussion: The project could have impacts on visual, cultural, geology and soils, noise, and other temporary impacts associated with a project construction. However, compliance with standard requirements of the California building and fire codes and mitigation measures included in this document will reduce those impacts to less than significant. 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 site is a developed parcel and introduction of this new container storage building would still keep the use to rural agricultural. Therefore, the project would not likely result in a cumulatively considerable impact when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. 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: See discussion of 21.a. and 21.b. 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	

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

<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in the 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: <u>Mitigation Measures 1:</u> The applicant shall remove the second story of the containers which shall be moved to a different site/location. <u>Mitigation Measure 2:</u> The applicant shall plant at least four to five screening trees with a minimum stock size of 15-gallon or larger along La Honda Road to mitigate any potential view impacts from the neighboring properties and roads.		

Mitigation Measure 3: In plans submitted for a building permit, the applicant shall show installation of a new roof on the single-story portion of the building, to be painted a green color to match the roof color of the existing barn.

Mitigation Measure 4: The number of exterior lighting fixtures for the container building shall be limited to the minimum required by the building code. Such light fixtures shall be warm-toned and downward-directed. Any other new lighting shall be subject to separate permitting.

Mitigation Measure 5: The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:

- a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 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.
- c. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- d. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible.
- e. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- g. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
- i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

Mitigation Measure 6: Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) or similar material shall not be used. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with this requirement in plans submitted at the time of building permit application.

Mitigation Measure 7: A pre-construction survey of protected species (e.g., dusky-footed woodrat, California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, migratory bird nesting) shall be conducted prior to any proposed grading-or-construction-related activities. If, for any reason, grading/construction activities do not commence within 10 days of completion of the survey, the survey shall be repeated, and results reported to the County. If active migratory bird nests or other evidence of other special species are discovered, no construction-related activities, including grading and tree removal, are allowed until the applicant has consulted a biologist, recommended measures to protect such species have been shared with County staff, and recommended measures have been fully implemented, to the satisfaction of the project biologist and Community Development Director.

Mitigation Measure 8: After a biologist conducts a pre-construction survey, the biologist shall monitor installation of permanent exclusion fencing around the property to avoid any wildlife entering the property. The applicant shall maintain exclusion fencing in working order for the life of the project.

Mitigation Measure 9: In the event that unanticipated cultural resources are exposed during ground disturbance activities, work within 15 meters (50 feet) of the find must stop and a Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist, must be notified immediately. Work may not resume until a qualified archaeologists can evaluate the significance of the find. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or tribal consultation may be warranted.

Mitigation Measure 10: Although not anticipated, there remains the potential for the inadvertent discovery of human remains during ground-disturbing activities. State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The San Mateo County coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If concentrations of prehistoric or historic-era materials are encountered during project activities; all work in the immediate vicinity shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds and make recommendations.

Mitigation Measure 11: A construction verification report shall be submitted at the time of building permit application that provides the same level of construction verification required in a geotechnical final construction report. The report shall include affirmation that the geotechnical elements of the project were constructed according to the recommendations provided in the report along with the methods that were used by the Project Geotechnical Engineer for the verification. The elements include but are not limited to:

- a. A verification of the dimensions and reinforcement of the footings including depth and width.
- b. A verification of the dimensions and reinforcement in the piers including depth and logs.
- c. A verification of the dimensions, reinforcement and waterproofing of the slab on grade that connects the two structures.
- d. A verification of any site grading that has occurred as part of the original project. That includes verifying the compaction of any fill placed.

Furthermore, the Geotechnical Department recommends that the geotechnical and structural engineers provide the following supplemental letters:

- e. The Project Geotechnical Engineer shall submit a Plan Review Letter reviewing all pertinent aspects of the as-built plans and calculations. We recommend that special care be given to the proximity of the retention pond to the building foundation.
- f. The structural engineer provides revised calculations that include lateral loading on the foundation and retaining walls or as directed from the building department structural review.

Mitigation Measure 12: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall submit for review and approval, erosion and drainage control plans that show how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site will be minimized. The plans shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plans shall include measures that limit the application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to

surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

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

Mitigation Measure 13: An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" and/or building permit to ensure that the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure 14: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate removal of existing bathrooms and kitchen located in second story containers, and in the shed next to the barn, as well as associated containment and/or treatment facilities. The applicant shall complete the work prior to the Planning Final Inspection of the Building Permit.

Mitigation Measure 15: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the measures indicated on the applicant-completed EECAP Development Checklist or equivalent measures, as well as Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce GHG emissions during construction, to the extent feasible, including, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; using local building materials of at least 10 percent; and recycling or reusing at least

50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. Such measures should be shown on building plans.

Mitigation Measure 16: The plans submitted for the building permit shall show any existing fire hydrants in and around the site.

Mitigation Measure 17: The required fire hydrant shall be located no closer than 50 feet to any building, and no farther away from 150 feet from the proposed building and be located on the fire department access side of the building. Hydrants shall be placed on a concrete pad 4 inches deep, and 2 feet by 2 feet minimum at the case, and shall be positioned so the center of the discharge is 30 inches to 36 inches above grade and be within 5 feet of the fire department access road. A 3-foot (914 mm) clear space shall be maintained around the circumference of the fire hydrants, except as otherwise required or approved.

Mitigation Measure 18: The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from San Mateo County Environmental Health Services to legalize the existing well to an agricultural well. Any existing/proposed plumbing from the existing well i.e. irrigation, spigots, etc., shall be shown on the plans, and a note stating that is well shall be used for only non-portable well shall be added. The plans shall also show evidence of the well pad at the surface with an appropriate top plate.

Mitigation Measure 19: Install a screening wall in front of the freezer unit to mitigate any potential noise impacts and keep the noise under 55 dBA (daytime) to 50 dBA (nighttime) at all times.

Mitigation Measure 20: In plans submitted for a building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate that the emergency generator located in the front setback of the site will be moved elsewhere on the site, to comply with a minimum site setback of 3 feet from the side and rear property lines. If located 3 feet from the rear and side property lines, the generator should be housed in a cabinet or within a sound blanket to keep the noise level under 55 dBA (daytime) and 50 dBA (nighttime).

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)

Project Planner

10/10/25

Date

(Title)

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Project Plans
- C. Memorandum regarding Agricultural Production, Processing, and Storage on Multiple
Parcels from Resource Conservation District (RCD) dated March 6, 2024.
- D. Affidavit of No Archeological Resources Found by the applicant, dated September 27, 2024
- E. Response Letter from San Gregorio Water Master (Stetson Engineers).
- F. Photos of project taken from La Honda Road, site visit conducted on November 22, 2024