

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Cordilleras Road Major Subdivision
2. **County File Number:** PLN2025-00350
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** San Mateo County Planning and Building Department
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Samuel Becker, Project Planner
650/382-4493
5. **Project Location:** 1815 Cordilleras Road, Emerald Lake Hills, CA. 94062
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 057-070-090 and 057-063-010.
79,890 sq. ft. or 1.834 acres.
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Edenbridge, Inc. (Attn: Eric Zweig), P.O. Box 1825,
Los Altos, CA. 94023
8. **Owner:** Jefferson 10 Investors, LP
9. **General Plan Designation:** Low Density Residential
10. **Zoning:** Residential Hillside/Design Review Districts (RH/DR)
11. **Description of the Project:** General Plan Amendment, Major Subdivision, Grading Permit, and a Protected Tree Removal permit to subdivide 1.8 -net-acre parcel into 5 parcels (Lots 1-5). The proposed subdivision requires an amendment to the General Plan designated density. Therefore, the project proposes to amend the General Plan Designation from Low Density Residential (0.3-2.3 du/net acre) to Medium-Low Density Residential (2.4-6.0 du/net acre). Site improvements, including installation of utilities and creation of a new private road required for the subdivision result in 580 cubic yards of cut and 5 cubic yards of fill, and the removal of two protected trees. The existing single-family development and accessory structures are proposed to be demolished.
12. **Surrounding Land Use and Setting:** The project site is made up of two non-contiguous lots of record (with two assessor's parcel numbers) which constitute one legal parcel. The parcel is bisected by lands owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The larger portion of the parcel (APN 057-070-090) is 75,380 sq ft. in size and the smaller triangular shaped portion (APN 057-063-010) is approximately 4,510 sq. ft. in size. The property is currently developed with single-family residential development including a single-family residence and multiple accessory buildings. The project parcel is zoned RH/DR (Residential Hillside/Design Review Districts) and is an interior lot with frontage to Cordilleras Road along the north side of the property. Cordilleras Road is a County-maintained road that is 40' wide, where sidewalks are not present along the road and residents often park their vehicles along the street and within the County Right of Way (ROW). The parcel is surrounded by residential

development and land use in all directions, with the exception of the one, vacant parcel to the South. Given the larger parcel sizes and low density residential development the area has maintained a significant amount of natural vegetation and trees, which give this area a more rural appearance despite being an urbanized area.

13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:**

None

14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?:** Notification to affiliated tribes was sent and no official requests for consultation were received from any California Native American tribes which are traditionally and/or culturally affiliated with the project area.

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” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Energy		Public Services
	Agricultural and Forest Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Recreation
X	Air Quality	X	Hydrology/Water Quality		Transportation/Traffic
X	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning	X	Tribal Cultural Resources
X	Climate Change		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
X	Cultural Resources		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 EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA

process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

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

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a. Have a significant adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within a scenic vista or scenic corridor area. The project site is approximately 1.834 acres and located along Cordilleras Road in the developed Emerald Lake Hills residential community. The proposed major subdivision consisting of 5 lots zoned for single family residential development would not create an adverse effect on existing residential areas, as this use is consistent with and already prominent around the project site. The surrounding area is urbanized, with many single-family residences, more frequently with Accessory Dwelling Units, as well as other accessory structures and major landscaping. The immediately adjacent parcels are mostly developed, although the parcel to South, Southwest is heavily wooded and not developed, and the SFPUC ROW directly abutting site to east is not developed. Along Cordilleras Road, a public road, there are residential uses visible in proximity to the project, including a large, single-family subdivision in incorporated Redwood City less than one-half miles away, there are varying land use types further along Cordilleras Road that includes institutional developments like churches, public utilities, and medical centers. This proposed development would not create an adverse impact on view from existing residential areas or along Cordilleras, Canyon Roads, especially since there are not scenic vistas or protected resources near the site, nor other public</p>				

water bodies or lands to consider this project impacting views. Existing trees on site already present a visual buffer to the site, and only two trees are proposed for removal as part of the subdivision. Any future development of the proposed 5 lots would be required to comply with both the San Mateo County Tree Ordinance and the findings for development, which require at least 7 findings to be made in order to remove a protected tree of at least 6 inches in diameter in a design review district. As well as the Emerald Lake Hills Design Review standards that are intended to manage development intensity, protect scenic views and community aesthetic. Given the site and surrounding setting, future redevelopment of the property would not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location.

b. Significantly damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project parcels are not located within a state scenic highway. In addition, there are no buildings of historical significance or rock outcroppings located on the property.

Source: Project Location.

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

Discussion: The project parcel is located within an urbanized area.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location.

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

Discussion: The proposed subdivision does not involve the introduction of significant light sources that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Future development is subject to the design review guidelines for the Emerald Lake Hills community which includes the review of exterior materials and lighting to ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

Source Project Plans; Project Location.

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

Discussion: The project site is not located within or in proximity to the boundaries of a State or County Scenic Corridor.

Source: County GIS; Project Location.

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

Discussion: The project site is located within a Design Review District. The proposed subdivision includes creating 5 lots ranging in size from approximately 13,000 to 17,000 in net sq. ft. The resulting parcel sizes are consistent with minimum parcel size, lot width, and design requirements set by both the Residential Hillside (RH) zoning district and the County Subdivision Regulations. However, the creation of these parcels results in a land use density which is incompatible with the existing low density residential General Plan designation. Therefore, the project also includes a General Plan Amendment to amend the land use designation from low density residential to medium low density residential. However, there are other instances of medium low density residential throughout the Emerald Lake Hills community. Therefore, the applicant is proposing to amend the general plan designation from low density residential (0.3-2.3 du/net acre) to medium-low density residential (2.4-6.0) du/net acre), which would accommodate the proposed density.

Source: San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County General Plan.

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

Discussion: The Emerald Lake Hills community includes many natural scenic qualities as the applicable development standards place particular importance on the preservation of trees and minimization of earthwork activities in order to preserve the natural qualities of the community. According to the Arborist Report prepared by Mayne Tree Expert Company, dated November 16, 2024, the project proposes to remove two protected Oak trees to provide access to the proposed subdivision. Pursuant to County Tree Ordinance, those trees are required to be replaced by 5 new trees of a native species of at least 24-inch box size. The applicant has proposed replacement trees be of the same native species for the trees removed, Coast Live and Valley Oaks. All other protected trees in proximity to the construction would be protected with tree protection fencing during construction activities. Additionally, the project provides an additional 5 feet of dedication of public right of way space from Cordilleras Road, in conjunction with RH zoning district 20' front setback

requirement, positions future development at least 25' from the road, to conform with both ROW dedication and setback standards for the underlying zoning district. Other than trees designated as protected under the County Tree Ordinance, those that are 6 inches in diameter (19 inches circumference) or larger when measured 4.5 feet, there are no other natural scenic qualities to consider as part of this proposed subdivision.

Source: County GIS; Site Visit; Project Plans.

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forestland, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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: According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the project parcels are designated as "Urban and Built-up Land", and therefore do not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. There is no agricultural land on or adjacent to the project site.

Source: California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map (2022); Project Plans; County GIS.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project parcel is not subject to an Open Space Easement nor is it under the Williamson Act contract.

Source: County GIS.

c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcels are located in an urbanized area. The project does not include any proposal that could result in the conversion of Farmland into a non-agricultural use, or conversion of forestland to non-forest use.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
d. For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not within the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>Source: County GIS; Project Location.</p>				
e. Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?				X
<p>Discussion: See discussion under Questions 2(a).</p> <p>Source: Project Location; County GIS.</p>				
f. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				X
<p>Discussion: See discussion under Questions 2(c).</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				

<p>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:</p>				
	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.

The project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the BAAQMD's 2017 Clean Air Plan. During project implementation, air emissions would be generated from site grading, equipment, and work vehicles; however, any such grading-related emissions would be temporary and localized. Once constructed, use of the development as a single-family residence would have minimal impacts to the air quality standards set forth for the region by the BAAQMD. The BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As defined in the BAAQMD's 2017 CEQA Guidelines, the BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction emissions due to the number of variables that can impact the calculation of construction emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of all feasible construction measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures that they have determined, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. These standard control measures have been included in Mitigation Measure 1 below:

Mitigation Measure 1: Basic Construction Air Quality Measures

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

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

with applicable regulations.

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

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

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

Discussion: As of December 2012, San Mateo County is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5. On January 9, 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to determine that the Bay Area attains the 24-hour PM-2.5 national standard. However, the Bay Area will continue to be designated as "non-attainment" for the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard until the BAAQMD submits a "re-designation request" and a "maintenance plan" to EPA and the proposed redesignation is approved by the Environmental Protection Agency. A temporary increase in the project area is anticipated during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations reduce the potential effects to a less than significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 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, limited to the construction phase, and would not result in long-term operational emissions beyond those typical of single-family residential use. Sensitive receptors are defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) as locations or populations that are particularly susceptible to the adverse effects of air pollution, including children, the elderly, and individuals with pre-existing illnesses. Common sensitive receptor locations include residences, schools, daycare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and parks. The project site is situated within a low-density residential neighborhood in the Emerald Lake Hills community. The nearest sensitive receptors include single-family residences adjacent to the project site. Other sensitive receptor types, nursing homes, churches, and pre schools, are located within the immediate project vicinity, less than a mile both east and west of the project site along Cordilleras Road. However, with the temporary nature of construction-related emissions, the distance separation from institutional sensitive receptors, and the existing mature tree canopy and vegetation providing a natural buffer from adjacent residences, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 would further minimize any potentially significant exposure to nearby sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location.

3.d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
<p>Discussion: The proposed project includes subdivision of a RH/DR (Residential Hillside/Design Review) zoned parcel. The proposed project has the potential to generate odors associated with construction activities. However, any such odors would be temporary and are expected to be minimal.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				

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 (USFWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service?		X		
<p>Discussion: A Biological Resources Assessment was prepared for the project by MIG, dated August 19, 2025. The assessment included a background review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), California Native Plant Inventory, and USFWS database, and other relevant databases, as well as a reconnaissance-level field survey conducted on September 19, 2024. Cordilleras Creek, a perennial watercourse supporting riparian habitat with the potential to support special-status aquatic species, is located approximately 100 feet north of the project site on the opposite side of Cordilleras Road. No direct impacts to Cordilleras Creek would result from the proposed project, as all development activity is confined to the project site.</p> <p>The assessment identified two habitat types on the project site: developed/landscaped areas and California Bay Forest. The developed portions of the site contain mature native and ornamental trees that provide moderate-quality habitat for nesting birds, roosting bats, and dusky-footed woodrat. Two tree crevices with potential bat roosting habitat were observed, and a remnant mud structure consistent with a black phoebe nest was noted under the eaves of an existing structure. No special-status wildlife was directly observed during the field survey. MIG evaluated the potential for 50 special-status animal species and 10 special-status plant species documented in the project region. No special-status plant species were determined to have a moderate or high potential to occur on site given the developed and landscaped condition of the property. For wildlife, MIG concluded that potential habitat exists for dusky-footed woodrat (<i>Neotoma fuscipes</i>), nesting raptors</p>				

and migratory birds protected under the California Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and special-status bat species including pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*) and western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*). It was further determined that the project site does not provide suitable habitat for Mission blue butterfly, monarch butterfly, Crotch's bumble bee, California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, or western pond turtle due to the absence of required host plants, aquatic breeding habitat, or grassland foraging areas.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures 2 through 8, the project's potential impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 2: Pre-Construction Dusky-Footed Woodrat Survey.

A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for dusky-footed woodrat nests within the project disturbance area and a 100-foot buffer no more than 14 days prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal. The survey results shall be documented and submitted to the County. If woodrat nests are identified within the survey area, the avoidance and relocation measures specified in Mitigation Measure 5 shall be implemented prior to construction.

Mitigation Measure 3: Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey.

If construction or tree removal activities are scheduled during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of the project site and surrounding area (250-foot buffer for raptors, 100-foot buffer for passerines) no more than 14 days prior to the start of construction. If active nests are identified, the avoidance measures specified in Mitigation Measure 6 shall be implemented.

Mitigation Measure 4: Pre-Construction Bat Roost Survey.

A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey of trees proposed for removal and structures proposed for demolition to assess bat roosting potential no more than 14 days prior to tree removal or demolition. The survey shall focus on tree cavities, crevices, and exfoliating bark. If active bat roosting is confirmed, the avoidance and exclusion measures specified in Mitigation Measure 7 shall be implemented.

Mitigation Measure 5: Dusky-Footed Woodrat Avoidance.

If active woodrat nests are found during the pre-construction survey required by Mitigation Measure 2, a no-disturbance buffer of no less than 25 feet shall be established around each nest and maintained throughout construction. If avoidance is infeasible, a qualified biologist shall prepare and implement a woodrat relocation plan, including passive relocation techniques, subject to review and approval by CDFW.

Mitigation Measure 6: Avoidance of Migratory Bird Species.

If active nests are found during the pre-construction survey required by Mitigation Measure 3, the qualified biologist shall establish species-appropriate no-disturbance buffers (typically 250 feet for raptors and 50–100 feet for passerines). Buffers shall remain in place until the biologist determines that young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. Buffer distances may be adjusted at the discretion of the biologist based on site conditions and species tolerance.

Mitigation Measure 7: Roosting Bat Avoidance.

If active bat roosts are found during the pre-construction survey required by Mitigation Measure 4, tree removal or demolition of the occupied structure shall be postponed until bats have vacated the roost. If a maternity roost is present (April 15 through August 31), a no-disturbance buffer shall be maintained until juveniles are volant, as determined by a qualified biologist. Passive exclusion measures may be implemented outside of the maternity season under the direction of a qualified biologist.

Mitigation Measure 8: Environmental Awareness Training.

Prior to the commencement of construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct an environmental awareness training for all construction personnel. The training shall include identification of special-status species and sensitive habitats potentially present on the project site, required avoidance and minimization measures, permit conditions, and the procedure for encountering protected species during construction.

Source: Project Location; Biological Resources Assessment conducted by MIG, dated August 19, 2025, CNDBB Layer on County GIS Map viewer.

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 biological resource assessment concluded no riparian habitat was observed within the project area that possessed the field characteristics used by the federal and state resource/regulatory agencies in defining their jurisdiction (i.e., waters of the U.S., under the Clean Water Act, or waters of the state, under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act). Therefore, no jurisdictional or regulated waters or aquatic habitats were found in the project area. However, one sensitive vegetation alliance (natural community), California Bay Forest and Woodland Alliance, is present in the southwestern corner of the project area. The development plan for the project area has not been finalized, nor is required since the subject project is for subdivision, but this habitat patch is not currently proposed for development. Thus, there will be no impact on the California Bay Forest and Woodland Alliance. Future development of Lot 3, southwest corner lot of the proposed subdivision, will be required to comply with County’s Tree Protection Ordinance for any removals and/or protection of protected trees, but no trees in this area are proposed for removal as part of this proposal. Additionally, the CNDDDB identified five sensitive habitats as occurring within this nine-

quadrangle area: northern coastal salt marsh, northern maritime chaparral, serpentine bunchgrass, valley needlegrass grassland, and valley oak woodland. Based on the site visit, these five habitats were determined to be absent from the project area, and none were mapped on the project site using the CNDDDB layer for County GIS map viewer.

Since the project avoids all riparian areas, does not remove or disturb any sensitive natural community, and incorporates required stormwater and erosion control measures, it would not result in a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFW, USFWS, or NMF

Source: Project Location; Biological Resources Assessment conducted by MIG, dated August 19, 2025. County GIS Map viewer.

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: As discussed under 4.b., no riparian habitat or other wetlands were found at the site. Cordilleras Creek is a waterway with potential of riparian habitats but its located approximately 70 feet north of the project's northern property line, and the creek is physically separated from the project site by a paved roadway (Cordilleras Road) and related roadside drainage infrastructure. No activity proposed under this project is to take place within the creek, or in proximity to its banks. With any potential indirect impacts already mitigated pursuant to on-site stormwater treatments and erosion and sediment control requirements, this project would not result in any effect by means of fill, degradation, or loss of wetlands or other protected waters.

Source: Project Location; Biological Resources Assessment conducted by MIG, dated August 19, 2025.

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: As discussed under 4.a. and 4.b., the project site and surrounding area were investigated for the presence of wildlife movement corridors, migratory pathways, and wildlife nursery sites. The assessment concluded that the project site does not function as a movement corridor or nursery for local wildlife. Due to the project area already being developed with single family residential structures and uses, and proximity of residential development to the north, northwest, and east, this level and intensity of urbanization shows the site does not serve as a regional movement pathway for any native wildlife. While wildlife could occasionally traverse the upland slopes South of the site, undeveloped, wooded area, the developed portion of the project area doesn't serve as a movement pathway between larger habitat areas, as concluded by the assessment. The assessment also found no evidence of wildlife nursey sites (e.g. rookeries, denning areas, bat maternity roosts) within the project site. The vegetation on site, like lawn and common residential landscaping, wouldn't serve as a habitat for nursey or breeding, and while native trees on site could provide nesting habitat for bird species, although none were observed, the project

shall comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), including pre-construction nesting bird surveys if vegetation removal occurs during the nesting season—in order avoid potential impact. See Mitigation Measure 2-8 in discussion 4.a. for this item.

Therefore, the project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridor, and does not create a substantial adverse effect

Source: Project Location; Biological Resources Assessment conducted by MIG, dated August 19, 2025.

4.e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinance but does require compliance with the County Tree Ordinance, specifically Section 8.400.150 Required Findings for Protected Tree Permit Approval. Based on review of applicant submitted arborist report, the proposal to remove two oak trees in connection with access road for proposed subdivision, meets the necessary findings for removal, with those removals to be mitigated by the replanting of 5- 24” box native, oak trees. Additionally, the report and project plans outline industry-standard tree protection measures for the protected trees on site where site improvements have the potential to take place within their proximity. Compliance with this relevant regulation, supplemented by replacement plantings, ensures impacts remain less than significant.

Source: San Mateo County Protected Tree Ordinance; Arborist Report by Mayne Tree Expert Company, Inc. dated November 16, 2024.

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; San Mateo County General Plan; California Natural Communities Conservation Plan Map, Accessed December 17, 2025.

4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The site is not located within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location; County GIS; National Wildlife Refuge System Locator, Accessed December 17, 2025.

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

Discussion: There are no oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands are proposed for removal as part of this permit. As discussed in 4.e., two individual Oak trees are proposed for removal. These oaks are located at least 50' away from one another in the center area of the already developed property along the existing driveway. They are proposed for removal as they are in conflict with the location of the future road and accompanying utilities necessary to serve the site. These two trees are not part of a woodlands, and all other individual oak and other protected trees, will remain onsite and will be protected for the duration of site improvements necessary to complete the subdivision.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location.

5. 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>
5.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		

Discussion: A records request was sent to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). In a letter dated November 6, 2025, CHRIS identified that the proposed project area contains or is adjacent to the archeological site that was identified in a reconnaissance level survey or in an area that has not been evaluated. Additionally, the project area has the potential to contain unrecorded archeological sites. While the project site was included in a previous study area, it was recommended that prior to commencement of project activities, a qualified professional familiar with the architecture and history of San Mateo County conduct a formal CEQA evaluation to further investigate the entirety of the project to confirm if there are any unrecorded resources.

A cultural resources study, including archeological evaluation, was conducted by Basin Research Associates, dated July 7, 2025, that evaluated the project site in its entirety for historical resources. Firstly, the study confirmed that none of the site's current development (a single-family residence and appurtenant structures) meet the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or any other local historical resource listing. None of these buildings have been moved from their original locations, and none of the owners/occupants associated with property historically have been identified as significant figures in local history. The Basin study also included full records search, pedestrian survey, and targeted subsurface auger testing to address the CHRIS records search that confirmed that a single prehistoric archaeological resource located adjacent to the project site. This resource is historically associated as a tribal resource from historical occupation area along Cordilleras Creek, but the portions of the site within and near the project area have been subject to extensive disturbance from decades of residential development, grading, and utility installation. The report specifically cites the 1990 Stanford University re-recording, which noted that cultural materials were sparse and lacked integrity in the vicinity of the project area. To verify the current condition within the project boundaries, Basin conducted a pedestrian archaeological survey on December 16, 2024, followed by a systematic auger testing program on January 2, 2025. Auger probes were placed in areas of highest sensitivity based on the mapped site boundary and prior studies. As documented in the Basin report, the auger tests encountered no intact midden deposits, no concentrations of cultural material, and no features that would indicate the presence of a subsurface archaeological deposit with integrity. This finding is consistent with the 2008 William Self Associates testing program conducted immediately east of the site within the

SFPUC-owned lands, which similarly concluded that this area lacked integrity and contained only “minor amounts of fragmentary shell and baked clay/fire-cracked rock.”. Overall, the evaluation was done in recognition of CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 and determined that the portion of cited resource within the project site does not appear to retain the physical characteristics necessary to qualify as a historical resource. The available evidence, including the 1990 Stanford recordation, the 2008 WSA testing, and Basin’s 2024–2025 fieldwork and report, demonstrates the remaining cultural traces are too sparse, discontinuous, and disturbed to yield information to history of location, and association. Therefore, the report concluded that no additional archaeological testing is warranted, because the remaining cultural traces are too sparse, discontinuous, and disturbed to yield information important to prehistory or history. The conclusion does not dismiss the cultural importance of the broader Cordilleras Creek corridor, which is recognized as an area of prehistoric occupation. Rather, the conclusion is specific to the physical integrity of the archaeological deposit within the project footprint, which CEQA requires for a resource to be considered historically significant. The Basin report also notes that the NAHC Sacred Lands File returned positive results, and the County is in charge of conducting AB 52 consultation, which resulted in no formal consultations.

Based on the Basin study, the NWIC records search, and the results of the auger testing, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, because no intact or significant archaeological deposits are present within the project area. An archaeological inadvertent discovery condition and other relevant mitigation measures will be implemented to ensure that any unanticipated finds are appropriately evaluated and treated. With these measures in place, impacts to historical resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 9: Worker Awareness Training

Prior to the start of work, awareness training shall be provided to all construction crew. Training will include a description of all cultural resources that may be found on or near the Project Study Area, the laws and regulations that protect those resources, the consequences of non-compliance with those laws and regulations, instructions for inspecting equipment each morning prior to activities, and a contact person if protected biological resources are discovered at the site.

Mitigation Measure 10: Statement on Plans

The project proponent shall note on any plans that require ground disturbing excavation that there is a potential for exposing buried cultural resources including prehistoric Native American burials.

Mitigation Measure 11: On-Call Archaeologist

The project proponent shall retain a Professional Archaeologist on an “on-call” basis during ground disturbing construction for the project to review, identify and evaluate cultural resources that may be inadvertently exposed during construction. The archaeologist shall review and evaluate any discoveries to determine if they are historical resource(s) and/or unique archaeological resources under CEQA. If the Professional Archaeologist determines that any cultural resources exposed during construction constitute a historical resource and/or unique archaeological resource under CEQA, he/she shall notify the project proponent and other appropriate parties of the evaluation and recommend mitigation measures to mitigate to a less-than significant impact in accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 15064.5. Mitigation measures may include avoidance,

preservation in-place, recordation, additional archaeological testing and data recovery among other options. The completion of a formal Archaeological Monitoring Plan (AMP) and/or Archaeological Treatment Plan (ATP) that may include data recovery may be recommended by the Professional Archaeologist.

Mitigation Measure 12: Monitoring Closure Report

A Monitoring Closure Report shall be filed with the project proponent at the conclusion of ground disturbing construction if archaeological and Native American monitoring of excavation was undertaken.

Mitigation Measure 13: Unanticipated Discoveries

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 archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or tribal consultation may be warranted.

Source: Project Location; County GIS; California Register of Historic Resources; California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter, dated November 6, 2025; Cultural Resources Report, (Basin Research Associates), July 7, 2025.

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

Discussion: Refer to section 5.a. for discussion.

Source: Project Location; County GIS; California Register of Historic Resources; California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter, dated November 6, 2025; Cultural Resources Report, (Basin Research Associates), July 7, 2025.

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

Discussion: No known human remains or burial sites have been identified within or adjacent to the project site. The Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by Basin Research Associates, dated July 7, 2025, did not identify evidence of human interments on the property. However, because the project involves ground-disturbing activities in an area with a cited cultural resource(s), a mitigation measure for any inadvertent encounter is required. In the event that human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the discovery shall cease immediately and the San Mateo County Coroner shall be notified in accordance with California

Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. See Mitigation Measure 14.

Mitigation Measure 14: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains

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

Source: Project Location; County GIS; California Register of Historic Resources; California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter, dated November 6, 2025; Cultural Resources Report, (Basin Research Associates), July 7, 2025.

6. ENERGY. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
<p>Discussion:</p> <p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>The subdivision related physical improvements of the project include demolition, grading, clearing, tree removal and construction of ingress/egress road. These actions would require the consumption of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (e.g., fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles (transportation) and construction equipment. Transportation energy use during construction would come from the transport and use of construction equipment, delivery vehicles and haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would fluctuate according to the phase of construction and would be temporary and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure. Most construction equipment during demolition and grading would be gas-powered or diesel powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered equipment.</p> <p><u>Operation</u></p> <p>The project is for residential subdivision project served by existing road infrastructure. Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) provides electricity to the project area. Due to the proposed construction of a</p>				

single-family residence, project implementation would result in a permanent increase in electricity over existing conditions. However, such an increase to serve a single-family residence would represent an insignificant percentage increase compared to overall demand in PG&E's service area. The nominal increased demand is expected to be adequately served by the existing PG&E electrical facilities and the projected electrical demand would not significantly impact PG&E's level of service. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during operation and construction of the project given the financial implication of the inefficient use of such resources. As such, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Source: Project Proposal; Project Plans.

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

Discussion: The proposed subdivision does not conflict with or obstruct any state or local renewable energy plans, and would not have a significant impact. Furthermore, any future development on the newly created lots would be required to comply with State Building Energy Efficiency Standards, appliance efficiency regulations, and green building standards in order to prevent inefficient and wasteful energy consumption.

Source: Project Proposal; Project Plans.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>				X
Discussion: According to the Earthquake Fault Zones Map of the Woodside Quadrangle, the property is not located in an earthquake fault zone as designated by the state of California, therefore the potential for ground surface rupture to a fault crossing the site is low, according to Geotechnical				

Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey (SFB) Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024. This conclusion is consistent with regional mapping for the Woodside Quadrangle and with the County’s geotechnical review, who conducted three review cycles for this project and identified liquefaction and seismic landslide as the only state-mapped geo-hazards affecting the site. Fault rupture was not identified as a geo-hazard in any review cycle. No evidence of surface fault rupture or fault-related ground deformation was observed during geotechnical field investigation, which included six exploratory borings and multiple site reconnaissance visits. Although strong seismic shaking has potential to occur in the region, the absence of mapped faults on the site and the lack of any observed fault-related geomorphic features during SFB’s engineering geologic reconnaissance support the conclusion that fault rupture risk is less than significant.

Source: Project Location; County GIS; Geotechnical Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024, and Supplemental Study, dated February 5, 2026.

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

Discussion: Per the geotechnical study prepared by SFB, as the site is located in an active seismic area. Moderate to large earthquakes are probable along with several active faults in the greater Bay Area over a 30-to-50-year design life. Strong ground shaking should therefore be expected several times during the design life of the structure, as is typical for sites throughout the Bay Area. All future homes will be required to comply with the California Building Code, which provides prescriptive and performance-based seismic design standards intended to reduce the risk of structural failure during strong shaking. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary as the project will be required to incorporate CBC-compliant structural design and a geotechnical engineer will prepare design-level reports for each lot prior to building permit issuance. ~~compliance.~~

Source: Project Location; Geotechnical Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024 and Supplemental Study, dated February 5, 2026.

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

Discussion: The project site is located within a State-mapped liquefaction hazard zone. As such, there were multiple geotechnical investigations performed for the project: original December 18, 2024 Geotechnical Investigation, December 4, 2025 response letter, February 5, 2026 Supplemental Geotechnical Investigation, which all together demonstrate that the potential for liquefaction to create substantial risks to life or property is low with implementation of standard engineering design measures. Across six exploratory borings advanced to depths of 21.5 to 40 feet, the subsurface profile was found to consist primarily of firm to hard clays underlain by very dense clayey gravels and, ultimately, moderately hard sandstone bedrock encountered at depths of approximately 33–40 feet. Subsurface exploration did also identify thin, discontinuous sand and gravel lenses were identified between roughly 10 and 28 feet below ground surface; these lenses represent the only materials with any liquefaction susceptibility. As documented in both the 2024 and 2026 reports, these lenses occur as isolated pockets only 2–4 feet thick, rather than as continuous stratigraphic layers that typically display damaging liquefaction settlement. Stevens, Ferrone & Bailey (SFB) performed liquefaction triggering and post-liquefaction deformation analyses in accordance with standard industry procedures. The supplemental 2026 study expanded the investigation to 40 feet and evaluated three groundwater scenarios: (1) groundwater at the depth observed during drilling (~15–27 feet), (2) groundwater at 10 feet, and (3) groundwater at the ground surface (0 feet), which is the most conservative assumption. Even under the most conservative groundwater scenario, calculated liquefaction-induced settlements ranged from 0 to approximately 2 inches, depending on

boring location. These results are consistent with the December 4, 2025 technical explanation that thin, isolated liquefiable pockets at depth contribute minimally to surface deformation. Additionally, the report notes that the project site and surrounding Woodside Quadrangle have no recorded instances of liquefaction-related ground failure, even during the 1906 San Francisco (Mw 7.7–7.9) and 1989 Loma Prieta (Mw 7.0) earthquakes. This historical performance aligns with the subsurface conditions documented at the site.

The County's request for deeper investigation was fully addressed in the supplemental study, dated February 5, 2026, which advanced borings to refusal in bedrock at ~40 feet and provided complete liquefaction calculations for all borings. The County Geotechnical Reviewer subsequently issued a conditional approval, confirming that the supplemental investigation satisfied all County requirements and that the project may proceed to building permit level design. In order to mitigate any potential significant impact to a less than significant level, Mitigation Measure 15 was added. This mitigation measure will ensure that the proposed project will adhere to all recommendations and conditions, including re-compaction near surface soils, engineered fill placement, site wide drainage controls, and future residences on post-tension slab foundations. Therefore, the potential for liquefaction to result in substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 15: Implement All Recommendations of the Geotechnical Reports

All grading, drainage, foundation, and construction activities shall comply with the recommendations in SFB Geotechnical Studies and all conditions as outlined by the County Geotechnical Section.

Mitigation Measure 16: Full Erosion Control and Drainage Plans

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

- a) Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b) Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c) Clear only areas essential for construction.
- d) Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.
- e) Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and to control dust.
- f) Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales

and/or sprinkling.

- g) Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 ft., or to the extent feasible, from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h) Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i) Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j) Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow.
- k) The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acres or less per 100 ft. of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly, and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 of fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion resistant species.
- l) Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.
- m) Environmentally sensitive areas shall be delineated and protected to prevent construction impacts.
- n) Control fuels and other hazardous materials, spills, and litter during construction.
- o) Preserve existing vegetation whenever feasible.

Mitigation Measure 17: Wet Season Grading

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

Mitigation Measure 18: Erosion Control and Tree Protection

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 Location; Geotechnical Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024 and Supplemental Study, dated February 5, 2026. County Geotechnical Conditional Approval Letter, dated February 25, 2026.

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

Discussion: County GIS Maps and mapping by the California Geological Survey identifies some portions of the project site, the southwestern hillside area, as being within a State-mapped earthquake-induced landslide hazard zone. However, geotechnical investigations conducted for the

proposed subdivision demonstrate that the project site is not subject to substantial landslide hazards, and that with implementation of standard engineering measures, the potential for landslides is low. The site-specific investigations consistently showed that no active landslide features are present on or immediately upslope of the development area, only minor soil creep, which is a common and expected condition on natural hillsides in the Emerald Lake Hills area. This conclusion was reaffirmed in supplemental geotechnical reporting which included additional field reconnaissance by a Certified Engineering Geologist and confirmed the absence of active or incipient slope failures. Additionally, supplemental reporting provided evidence that the on-site slopes themselves are supported by well-performing stone retaining walls and exhibit no cracking, bulging, scarps, or drainage patterns indicative of active instability, by performing subsurface borings (B-1 through B-6) to confirm soil type and density. The report notes that they encountered firm to hard clays, dense gravels, and ultimately moderately hard sandstone bedrock at depths of 33–40 feet, confirming that the site is underlain by competent materials not prone to deep-seated failure. While minor soil creep is present, which is typical on north-facing slopes in the surrounding area, this condition can be mitigated through a combination of industry standard practice as well as the proposed project components that include installation of surface and subsurface drainage improvements along the southern boundary to intercept hillside runoff and prevent saturation of near-surface soils.

Lastly, the supplemental reporting that further investigated this sloped area concluded that the proposed 10-foot lateral setback from the existing stone retaining wall at the future Lot 3, southwest corner of project site, is geotechnically appropriate, and that the planned development footprint lies entirely outside any zone of potential slope deformation. Based on staffs final review and conditional approval, the County Geotechnical Section has no objection to the subdivision project as proposed. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measures 15-18 that ensure drainage standards are met, all recommendations and conditions are followed, and the subsequent lots have design level reports when proposed for future development, the impact of is less-than-significant under CEQA.

Source: County GIS; Project Plans; Project Location; Geotechnical Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024 and Supplemental Study, dated February 5, 2026

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

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

Source: Project Location; County GIS.

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

Discussion: The construction of the project involves approximately 585 cubic yards (cy.) of grading for the private road and biotreatment areas. Including 580 cy. of cut and 5 cy. of fill. Mitigation Measures 16-18 are included to control erosion and tree protection during construction of proposed project. The subdivision project requires a grading permit, which requires compliance with Grading Ordinance and other related grading conditions of approval. Any future permits for developing the subsequent divided lots would require their own respective permits for grading if on-site grading, not including grading for the building pad, exceeds 250 cy. In total volume. With those standards

<p>conditions and the additional mitigation measures, the potential impact would be less-than-significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; Geotechnical Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024 and Supplemental Study, dated February 5, 2026.</p>					
7.c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
<p>Discussion: Pursuant to the discussions in Sections 7.a and 7.b, the associated Mitigation Measures would minimize the potential for an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse. Therefore, the mitigation measures would minimize impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; Geotechnical Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024 and Supplemental Study, dated February 5, 2026.</p>					
7.d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
<p>Discussion: Pursuant to the discussions in Sections 7.a and 7.b, the associated Mitigation Measures would minimize the potential for an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse as part of the required work for the subdivision. And as recommended in the applicants geotechnical study, buildings shall not be underlain in area with both expansive soils or fills and non-expansive soils or fills. The proposed grading will be performed so subsequent lots of development will be supported on fills with proper expansion potential. Therefore, the mitigation measures would minimize impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; Geotechnical Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024 and Supplemental Study, dated February 5, 2026.</p>					
7.e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose to utilize septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The project proposes to connect to the existing County Sewer District which serves this community.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					
7.f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		

Discussion: Per the Cultural Resources Report completed by Basin, and staff review of potential impacts, staff has included Mitigation Measures 9-14 to mitigate any potential, unanticipated future discoveries during execution of the project. See full discussion in Section 5.a.

Source: Project Location; Cultural Resources Report, (Basin Research Associates), July 7, 2025.

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 for the private road, Kulchin Court, and construction of any future single family development on the proposed 5 lots 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. Under the BAAQMD May 2017 CEQA Guidelines, a 5-lot subdivision is typically considered a small project that falls well below the operational criteria air pollutant thresholds. Although the project scope for the project is not likely to generate significant amounts of greenhouse gases, Mitigation Measure #1 requiring project to conform to all BAAQMD best practices, would ensure that any impacts are less than significant. As part of the subdivision, construction of the proposed ingress/egress would include approximately 585 c.y. of grading. Any subsequent development from the resulting lots would be required to comply with all Erosion and Sediment Control requirements, BAAQMD standards, and all other guidelines for development in the building code. There is insufficient evidence to suggest that these activities will exceed the screening threshold for GHG emission established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The District’s CEQA Threshold of Significance Guidance states that any stationary source that generates more than 10,000 Metric Tons of GHG emissions per year is considered a significant impact. The average U.S. Household is estimated to generate 7.5 tons of GHG emissions per year. To ensure new development projects are compliant with the County’s General Plan Climate Element, the County provides the Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form (Form). According to the applicant-completed Form, the project incorporates several measures, such as water-efficient landscaping with native plants exceeding the 1:1 tree replacement per removal ratio, proposing five 24” box trees in replacement of two trees for removal. Additionally, the proposed subdivision tentative map includes drainage plans that incorporate Green Infrastructure (GI) stormwater treatment measures with bioretention basins that exceed local and state regulations in compliance. Future development permits will be required to incorporate Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) compliant landscaping that includes installation of climate adapted plants, and other best practices. Future construction would also 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 further reduce GHG emissions during construction, including, but not limited to: dust control, use of alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment; utilizing local building materials; and recycling or reuse of construction waste or demolition materials. These Best Management Practices have been included in Mitigation Measure 19 below in order to further reduce project related GHG emissions. Compliance with and/or consideration of the Climate Element and BAAQMD measures is required in order to reduce project related GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measure 19: At the time of any building permit application associated with this project, including but not limited to the construction of access road, and future development of the lots, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the measures indicated on the applicant-completed Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form or equivalent measures, as well as Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce GHG emissions during construction, to the extent feasible, including, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; using local building materials of at least 10 percent; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

Source: Project Plans; BAAQMD CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, 2017, Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form.

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

Discussion: The project does not conflict with the San Mateo County General Plan Climate Element or BAAQMD regulations, provided that Mitigation Measure 19, above, is implemented to ensure items from Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form and BAAQMD Best Management Practices (BMPs) are followed throughout course of project.

Source: BAAQMD CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, 2017; Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form.

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

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

Source: Project Location; BAAQMD CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, 2017.

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

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

Source: Project Plans; County GIS.

8.e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

<p>Discussion: The project is not located on or adjacent to San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean. Therefore, this project will not place structures in proximity to the sea or bay which would be susceptible to sea level rise.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; County GIS.</p>					
8.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) or other flood hazard delineation map?			X	
<p>Discussion: The subject parcel, and specifically the land to be subdivided, is located in Flood Zone X (Area of Minimal Flood Hazard), usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level, per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0282E, effective October 16, 2012.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; County GIS.</p>					
8.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
<p>Discussion: See discussion in 8.g.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; County GIS.</p>					

<p>9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</p>					
		Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9.a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					
9.b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: See discussion in 9. a. above.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					

9.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
<p>Discussion: The emission or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste is not proposed for this project. Additionally, there are no existing or proposed schools within .25 miles of the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				
9.d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
<p>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.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; California Department of Toxic Substances Control.</p>				
9.e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p>Discussion: The nearest airport to the project site is the San Carlos airport, which is approximately 4.5 miles to the northeast of the project site. The project site is not within the boundaries of any existing or planned airport land use plan.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; County GIS.</p>				
9.f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed subdivision would be located on privately-owned parcels. These parcels would be accessed via Cordilleras Road and there is no evidence to suggest that the project would interfere with any emergency response plan. Additionally, all work in the public right-of-way will be reviewed and approved by the County Department of Public Works through their requirement for an encroachment permit prior to the start of work. Therefore, the project has no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; County GIS.</p>				
9.g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk			X	

of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				
<p>Discussion: The project site is located within a State Responsibility Area identified as having a Moderate Fire Risk. The project was reviewed by San Mateo County Fire Department (SMCFD) and received conditional approval. No further mitigation, beyond compliance with the standards and requirements of SMCFD, is necessary.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; California State Fire Severity Zones Maps; SMCFD Review letter, dated October 29, 2025.</p>				
9.h. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; County GIS; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0282E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
9.i. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not within the boundaries of a mapped flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; County GIS.</p>				
9.j. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
<p>Discussion: While the project site does not appear to be downstream of it, there is a dam in the vicinity. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; County GIS; California Department of Water Resources-Division of Safety of Dams, California Dam Breach Inundation Maps.</p>				
9.k. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within a San Mateo County General Plan mapped tsunami and seiche inundation area.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; County GIS; MTC/ABAG Hazard Viewer Maps.</p>				

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		
<p>Discussion: The project is subject to compliance with both the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (MRP) requirements for treating stormwater runoff and the County of San Mateo Drainage Requirements for retaining and detaining stormwater runoff. A Preliminary Drainage Analysis was prepared for the project by Macleod and Associates, Inc., dated January 29, 2026, and Drainage Conditions of Approval were issued by the County Drainage Section on March 4, 2026. During construction, the project is required to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and associated erosion and sediment control measures, including Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs), to prevent the discharge of pollutants to waters. As proposed and conditioned, each lot will be served by its own on-site stormwater drainage and treatment facility in accordance with Drainage Conditions 18 and 19. Stormwater treatment measures will be designed consistent with MRP Provision C.3 and the technical guidance in Chapter 6 of the C.3 Regulated Projects Guide. Each lot will also be subject to an individual Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Agreement to ensure long-term maintenance of treatment facilities. A separate maintenance agreement will govern the tie-in connection to allow a gravity connection to the project's shared detention system. Based on the adherence to relevant regulations and conditions, a drainage analysis demonstrating that project does not increase stormwater runoff from the site or add flow to the existing storm drain after onsite detention and metering, and Mitigation Measures 16-18, and 20-21, the potential impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 20: Each lot shall have its own stormwater management facility and each of the drainage/stormwater facilities must meet the County's Peak Flow and Volume Requirement of collecting stormwater runoff from a 10-year, 1 hour storm event.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 21: Implement All Recommendations of the Drainage Reports and Conditions of Approval</p> <p>All grading, drainage, foundation, and construction activities shall comply with the recommendations in applicant Drainage Analyses and all conditions as outlined by the County Drainage Section.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Storm Drain Study prepared by Macleod and Associates, Inc. dated January 29, 2026. County Drainage Section Conditional Approval Letter, dated March 4, 2026.</p>				
10.b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with			X	

groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				
<p>Discussion: The proposed project is not expected to deplete any groundwater supplies or interfere with the groundwater recharge. Stormwater will be treated and detained on-site, not infiltrated, consistent with County C.3 requirements. Although impervious surfaces will increase with future development of resulting lots, the project mitigates that impact by including bioretention areas that provide limited infiltration and water quality treatment. Additionally, the site does not rely on groundwater from the municipal water connection that serves surrounding area, since its relying on private connection. Therefore, the project will not substantially reduce groundwater recharge or deplete groundwater supplies in the area and is a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Storm Drain Study prepared by Macleod and Associates, Inc. dated January 29, 2026.</p>				
10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;		X		
<p>Discussion: The project on-site involves approximately 29,296 sq. ft. of existing impervious surface with 4,028 sq. ft. of new impervious surface to be created, associated with the construction of the access road for the proposed subdivision, for a total of 33,324 sq. ft. of post project impervious surface. Off-site area is minimal, 173 sq. f.t exists pre project and will increase by 70 sq. ft. for a post project total of 243 sq. ft. Additionally, the project involves approximately 580 cubic yards of cut and 5 cubic yards of fill for site grading, utility installation, and private road construction. These ground-disturbing activities have the potential to result in short-term erosion and sedimentation during the construction phase Compliance with the project's erosion and sediment control plan and drainage requirements to maintain the site post-construction with permanent drainage infrastructure, pursuant to Mitigation Measures 16-18, 20-21, will ensure the project does not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the site or result in substantial erosion or siltation. Upon mitigation, the project will have a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Storm Drain Study prepared by Macleod and Associates, Inc. dated January 29, 2026. Project C.3 and C.6. Development Review Checklist, dated January 29, 2026.</p>				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site;		X		

<p>Discussion: The Drainage Analysis prepared by applicant demonstrates that the project's detention system is designed to attenuate post-development runoff at or below pre-development flow rates. The treatment of storm water with the proposed detention system (bioretention areas, rock storage, outflow metering) allows for the discharge from the detention system to not exceed the pre-development flow rate. The project would not result in on- or off-site flooding. Mitigation measures 20-21 that came from Drainage Section review of the proposed, will ensure each lot has a stormwater management facility and that flooding will not be increased by this subdivision and subsequent development(s).</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Storm Drain Study prepared by Macleod and Associates, Inc. dated January 29, 2026.</p>				
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	
<p>Discussion: As demonstrated in the drainage analysis, the project's detention and biotreatment system is designed to meter post-development discharge at or below pre-development flow rates. The project would not add flow to the existing storm drain system beyond what currently exists. Each lot will be equipped with its own on-site stormwater treatment facility designed in compliance with MRP Provision C.3 to treat runoff and remove pollutants prior to discharge. Multi-parcel stormwater facilities that collect runoff from more than one lot are designed to detain and retain stormwater from a 100-year, 1-hour storm event per County Drainage Section requirements. The existing downstream drainage infrastructure has adequate capacity to convey the metered project flows. The project would not exceed the capacity of existing stormwater systems or generate substantial sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, with Mitigation Measures 20-21 in place, the project will be compliant with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Permit would prevent the creation of significant, additional sources of polluted runoff.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Storm Drain Study prepared by Macleod and Associates, Inc. dated January 29, 2026.</p>				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?		X		
<p>Discussion: The project would not impede or redirect flood flows with implementation of Mitigation Measures 20-21, see discussion in 10.a.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Storm Drain Study prepared by Macleod and Associates, Inc. dated January 29, 2026.</p>				
10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in an area mapped for flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; County GIS Maps.</p>				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or		X		

sustainable groundwater management plan?				
<p>Discussion: The project includes stormwater treatment facility for each resulting lot to facilitate on-site drainage and two biotreatment areas with detention basins to temporarily store water but is designed to remain dry between rain events. No permanent holding of water via groundwater basin is proposed. The project is a C3 Regulated project and both the subdivision and subsequent development of the lots are subject to the provisions. Additionally, the project will be required to enter into an Operation and Maintenance Agreement (O&M Agreement) with the County (executed by the Director of Planning and Building) and the property owner to ensure long-term maintenance and servicing of stormwater site design and treatment control and measures according to the approved maintenance plan(s), for the life of the project. To conclude, no substantial increase in polluted runoff will occur because all the stormwater will be treated onsite prior to any discharge. Mitigation Measures 20-21 are put in place to ensure stormwater treatment on site and that each lot has its own treatment facility.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Drainage Conditions of Approval Letter, dated March 4, 2026.</p>				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?		X		
<p>Discussion: The project adherence to require compliance with C.3 treatment requirements, erosion control, and construction BMPs will ensure no degradation of surface or groundwater quality. Any discharge or run-off from the project would be allowable and would be mitigated with the implementation of erosion control measures under Mitigation Measure 16.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?		X		
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would increase both the on-site and off-site impervious surfaces, 4,028 sq. ft. newly created on-site and 70 sq. ft. newly created off-site. Pursuant to the discussion(s) in Section(s) 7.a. and 10. a. and implementation of Mitigation Measures 16, and 20-21, the proposed project impact would be less-than-significant</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project C.3 and C.6. Development Review Checklist, dated January 29, 2026.</p>				

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?				X
<p>Discussion: The project proposes a major subdivision of an existing 1.834-net-acre parcel into five residential lots. The project also proposes a General Plan Amendment to increase the allowable density from Low Density Residential (0.3–2.3 du/net acre) to Medium-Low Density Residential (2.4–6.0 du/net acre). The site is located within the unincorporated Emerald Lake Hills community, a built-out residential neighborhood characterized by single-family homes on hillside lots. The subdivision would occur entirely within an already developed residential area and would not introduce new barriers, road closures, or infrastructure that would physically divide the community. The proposed internal access road is intended solely to serve the new lots and does not alter existing neighborhood circulation patterns. The project would be compliant with all zoning district regulations for minimum lot size, lot width, etc. Therefore, the project does not physically divide an established community and has no impact that requires mitigation.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County General Plan.</p>				
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project requires a General Plan Amendment because the existing Low Density Residential designation does not allow the density implied by a five-lot subdivision. Five dwelling units on approximately 1.834 acres result in a density of approximately 2.73 du/ac, which is just above the maximum allowed under existing Low Density Residential designation of .3 – 2.3 du/ac. However, the proposed project would be on the low end of the range with a General Plan Amendment to Medium Low Density Residential designation of 2.4 – 6 du/ac. However, there are other instances of Medium Low Density Residential designations throughout the Emerald Lake Hills community. Further, there are nearby, incorporated Emerald Lake Hills parcels within the City of Redwood City that are designated for low density and dwelling units per acre of upwards of 7.0 du/ac, so the overall environmental impact of the proposed subdivision would not be inconsistent with similar development in the immediate project vicinity.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County General Plan; Zoning Regulations.</p>				
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 proposal would increase the development intensity of the subject parcel. All required public service infrastructure from utility providers has been confirmed to have capacity to serve the future development of the site. All new parcels can be serviced through standard connections, as outlined in the Cal Water and DPW Sewers letters, and no system upgrades or expansions are required. The project is strictly for residential development and does not introduce any commercial, industrial, or recreational components that would induce further growth, and all improvements, for example a private road, are contained within the project boundaries. Although, the Department of Public Works (DPW) will not require off-site improvements, like sidewalks, as part of the project. The project will be conditioned upon approval that a dedication of 5' along the property/Cordilleras for road ROW be required. This will allow this area to be used in future, if necessary, for the purpose of public roadway improvements or sidewalk construction. DPW also conditioned approval relative to the dedication requirement that if sidewalks are to be built in future through an assessment district, or similar instrument, the property owners in the development will be required to participate and may be required to pay for the improvements adjacent to project road frontage.

Source: Project Plans; County GIS.

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

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	
<p>Discussion: The residential nature of the project would not produce any long-term significant noise source. However, the project would generate short-term noise associated with grading and construction activities. The short-term noise during grading and construction activities would be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code for Noise Control and County of San Mateo Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 would ensure that the impact during construction is reduced to less than significant</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County Ordinance Code.</p>				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?		X		
<p>Discussion: See discussion 13.a., temporary, minor noise may take place related to construction activities, however, such noises will be temporary, where the volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the County Ordinance Code and County of San Mateo Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). Additionally, based on the geotechnical information provided, the project will not include any pile driving or other high-vibration construction methods, rather project will involve standard low to moderate vibration activities like grading, trenching, foundation excavation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 would ensure that the impact during construction is reduced to less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Geotechnical Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024 and Supplemental Study, dated February 5, 2026.</p>				
13.c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for			X	

example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
--	--	--	--	--

Discussion: The proposed subdivision does result in a net increase of four homes. All resulting development would be required to comply with local zoning and Design Review regulations that would ensure the development is compatible with the character of the area in both its design and placement on the lots. The proposed increase in housing would comply with all local regulations as stated, notwithstanding the necessary General Plan Amendment to increase du/ac to accommodate for the proposed development. This modest increase from Low, to Medium Low Density Residential is not uncommon in the unincorporated Emerald Lake Hills Community, or within vicinity of this project within incorporated Redwood City that includes even higher du/ac allowance. Also, the relevant utility service providers have reviewed the project and provided “will serve” letters indicating that there is capacity to accommodate the future developed spurred by the major subdivision within their existing service infrastructures. Because the project is located in an established residential area and does not introduce new employment centers, commercial uses, or infrastructure extensions, it would not induce substantial unplanned population growth.

Source: Project Plans.

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

Discussion: The subject project site contains an existing single-family residence with appurtenant structures (office/workshop, storage, garage). As indicated on vesting tentative parcel map and on application forms, the existing 1950s residence will be demolished along with all existing structures and driveways. Overall, this proposal creates a net increase in housing supply, and no residents are being displaced in a manner that would require replacement housing stock elsewhere.

Source: Project Plans.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?			X	
15.b. Police protection?			X	
15.c. Schools?			X	
15.d. Parks?			X	

15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed major subdivision and subsequent single-family residences by way of a General Plan Amendment, would exist in an area already developed with other single-family homes in the surrounding vicinity. No new fire stations, police stations, schools or parks would be required for the proposed lot split or any future developments on site, and all other public utilities such as water and sewage systems would be provided at site, as confirmed by utility service providers. Also, the payment of development fees, such as school fees, user fees, and additional property taxes generated, will allow the maintenance of the existing service levels. Hence, the project will have less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				

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	
<p>Discussion: The project may result in a nominal increase to usage of nearby recreational facilities due to the increase in residents. In proximity and in every direction from subject parcels, there are examples of parks/recreational facilities like local, neighborhood parks, nature and open space preserves, and community center(s). Overall, the increase of single-family developments in this already urbanized area results in a nominal change and will not create such an impact that significant physical deterioration of any public recreation facility would occur or be accelerated.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				
16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not include any recreational facilities nor does it require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans. Project Location.</p>				

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	
<p>Discussion: The traffic trips (comprised of both owners of and guests/visitors) generated for the subject property and subdivision proposal were calculated as part of the traffic analysis report conducted by Hexagon Transportation Consultants Inc., dated December 16, 2024. This report noted that one single family home being replaced with five, new single-family homes would result in a net increase of four homes and a very low level of trip operation. Per the report, “according to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition, a single-family detached home generates an average of 9.43 trips per day. Based on this data, the proposed project, consisting of five homes, is expected to generate approximately 47 vehicle trips per day.” This increase of 9.43 to 47 daily vehicle trips does not reach the threshold for a transportation impact to be considered significant, 110 or more vehicle trips per day according to California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) guidelines. To summarize, an estimated 47 trips per day will have a less than significant impact on local transportation, and the projections fail to reach 50% of the minimum threshold that would be considered significant impact. Furthermore, the SMCFD provided review of this project and granted conditional approval related to fire department access for the proposed private road, and that the proposal does not conflict with any fire related requirement for proper circulation, ingress and egress.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; Traffic Study, (Hexagon Transportation Consultants), December 16, 2024; County Fire Review Letter, dated October 29, 2025.</p>				
17.b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts</i> ? <i>Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.</i>			X	
<p>Discussion: Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines provides specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. A project's effect on automobile delay does not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA. Per Section 15064.3, an analysis of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) attributable to a project is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. Regarding VMT, as discussed in 17.a., 47 daily trips is well below the 110 vehicle trips threshold from California Governors Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI), does not warrant further VMT analysis. Also, there are not County maintained, non-motorized facilities along Cordilleras Road, nor are there public transit routes that require considerations.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; Traffic Study, (Hexagon Transportation Consultants), December 16, 2024; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (c) Applicability, Screening Thresholds for Land Use Projects Section of the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA.</p>				

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	
<p>Discussion: The project would create a private road accessed via Cordilleras Road, a County DPW maintained road, which was reviewed and approved with conditions by San Mateo County Fire Department and Department of Public Works. The proposed ingress/egress and emergency vehicle access meet the required dimensions and design considerations. Therefore, the project provides adequate access which shall be required to be maintained in conformance with all Fire Code standards at the building permit stage for future development. Additionally, a 5-foot right-of-way dedication along Cordilleras Road is required by DPW, which is a standard improvement, and also doesn't substantially increase hazards due to design features, the ROW requirement will create further separation from road to future development. Also, see discussion in Section 17.a. above.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; County Fire Review Letter, dated October 29, 2025.</p>				
17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
<p>Discussion: See 17.c. discussion, SMCFD has provided conditional approval, confirm that the proposal meets their standards for adequate emergency access.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; County Fire Review Letter, dated October 29, 2025.</p>				

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>
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)		X		

Discussion: Staff submitted a Sacred Lands File Search request to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the project area. A response was received on October 17, 2025, stating that the search results were positive, recommending that the tribes on the included list be contacted, as they may have knowledge about the cultural resources within the project area. Staff contacted the following tribes on November 12, 2025:

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

Based on this referral to identified tribes, staff did hold an informal meeting with a representative of the Ramaytush Tribe on November 19, 2025. There was a general discussion of the project and its location in proximity to Cordilleras Creek, approximately 100 feet north of the project's northern boundary and across Cordilleras Road. Although this meeting took place and project information was shared with the tribal representative, no formal consultation or monitoring were subsequently requested.

Relevant mitigation measures for proper training for any groundwork and outlining of steps to take should any resources be inadvertently discovered are listed in Section 5, Mitigation Measures 9-14.

Source: Project Plans; Cultural Resources Report, (Basin Research Associates), July 7, 2025.

<p>ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. (In applying the criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)</p>		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Discussion: See discussion under question 5.a. and 18.a. above.

Source: Project Plans; Cultural Resources Report, (Basin Research Associates), July 7, 2025.

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		
<p>Discussion: The existing single family residential use is currently serviced by San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) for drinking water. However, SFPUC is working with the California Water Service Company (Cal Water) to transfer service to the subject property and the proposed future lots, which would result in a net increase of four single-family residences. According to Cal Water Conditional Will Serve Letter, dated January 10, 2025, the lots within APNs 057-070-090, 057-063-010 are outside of California Water Service Company service area, but California Water Service can provide water service to the two lots once they have been officially released by SFPUC. Cal Water has confirmed that water is available to serve the subject subdivision with potable water. In order for Cal Water to provide adequate water for domestic use and fire protection service, developer-funded facilities may be required in addition to cost of mains and service. These improvements, if required by Cal Water, would occur within the project site and would not require an expansion of regional water infrastructure where the construction or relocation could cause significant environmental impacts.</p> <p>For wastewater, the newly created parcels will connect to the existing sanitary sewer system, the Emerald Lake Hills Sewer Maintenance District (ELHSMD), governed by the County of Department of Public Works (DPW)-Sewers. In a letter dated November 4, 2025, ELHSMD confirmed that it is able to provide sewer service to the proposed subdivision. No request for an additional wastewater treatment facility was required but each resulting parcel must obtain individual sewer lateral per the conditions outlined.</p> <p>For stormwater and drainage infrastructure, the project is required to demonstrate compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Permit, which require the construction of new site design measures to reduce stormwater runoff and associated negative environmental impacts. As proposed, each lot will have its own stormwater facility to facilitate on-site drainage, which will discharge to the proposed new private road. There is no proposed cross drainage among the lots, and no impact of flooding of neighboring parcels due to the elevation of the proposed biotreatment/detention areas and of the proposed lots of the subdivision, which are directed to flow into proposed drainage facilities, and if needed, existing storm drains along frontage of Cordilleras Road. Additionally, the provided drainage analysis demonstrates that the project does not increase stormwater runoff from the site or add flow to the existing storm drain after onsite detention and metering, pursuant to a gravity storm drain connection. See discussion in Section 10a. and Mitigation Measure 21, the project will be required to confirm that each lot, and the stormwater facility for the subdivision, meet the County's Peak Flow and Volume Requirement of collecting stormwater runoff from a 10-year, 1 hour storm event. Therefore, the project would comply with San Mateo County C.3 Regulated Projects Guide for requirements and Site Design Measures as well as the San Mateo County Drainage Manual, and a less than significant impact if mitigated is anticipated.</p>				

<p>Overall, all new utility distributions (electric, communication, cable) are generally required to be placed underground for new residential subdivisions, and none of these new, or upgraded utility distributions are shown to have a significant or adverse impact that would result in environmental impacts if they abide by the regulations and conditions outlined by utility providers.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County Drainage Division; Department of Public Works (DPW)-Sewers; California Water Service (Cal Water).</p>					
19.b.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
<p>Discussion: See discussion for Question 19.a. for the discussion about sufficient water supplies service to the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County Drainage Division; Department of Public Works (DPW)-Sewers; California Water Service (Cal Water).</p>					
19.c.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
<p>Discussion: See discussion for Question 19.a for the discussion about sufficient wastewater service to the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County Drainage Division; Department of Public Works (DPW)-Sewers; California Water Service (Cal Water).</p>					
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	
<p>Discussion: The construction of the proposed project would generate some solid waste, both during construction and after completion (on an ongoing basis typical waste generated by residential uses). Similar to all other properties in the area, the residence would receive municipal trash and recycling pick-up service from Recology. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in a significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County Drainage Division; Department of Public Works (DPW)-Sewers; California Water Service (Cal Water).</p>					
19.e.	Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
<p>Discussion: Solid waste generated by a new single-family residence(s) is expected to be minimal and comply with all relevant standards. The project site would receive solid waste service by Recology.</p>					

Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County Drainage Division; Department of Public Works (DPW)-Sewers; California Water Service (Cal Water).

<p>20. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</p>					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
20.a.	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project site is located within a Moderate Fire Hazard State Responsibility Area as identified by the County's GIS maps. However, the project was reviewed by the responsible fire agency for the area, San Mateo County Fire Department (SMCFD), and in their review of the project did not cite impacts to an adopted emergency response plan. The project was conditionally approved by SMCFD.</p> <p>Source: Google Maps, Project Plans, County GIS Maps.</p>					
20.b.	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X	
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not introduce a change in slope, winds, or any other factors that would exacerbate wildfire risks or the spread of wildfire. The subdivision of these lots was conditionally approved by SMCFD with standard conditions of approval, none specific to this topic were necessary or requested. Therefore, by following conditions of approval from the reviewing fire agency, this project will not exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Fire Hazard Severity Maps; County Slope Analysis for Subdivision.</p>					
20.c.	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X	
<p>Discussion: In order to access the proposed subdivision, a private road is proposed for construction, this road would provide routine and emergency access to serve future development. The grade of the road meets the slope requirements, as reviewed the responsible agencies, and is designed to allow for proper vehicle and emergency personnel access. This road would serve as the purpose of emergency</p>					

access and does not introduce an exacerbated fire risk that has temporary or lasting impact to wildfire risk in this area of moderate wildfire risk. While new utilities are proposed, they are required to be installed underground. In review by the responsible fire agency, no request for fuel breaks were required. Any construction on the resulting lots would be required to comply with all building and fire code requirements, including the installation of fire sprinklers. As a result, and with compliance to all relevant conditions, the project will provide a less than significant impact.

Source: Google Maps; Project Plans; County GIS.

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: See discussion in Section 10.a. and 19.a. that the project is reviewed for proper drainage and stormwater maintenance and controls. Based on the findings of those sections there is no reason to expect significant impacts

Source: Project Location; Project Plans; San Mateo County Drainage Section.

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>
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, significantly reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		

Discussion: The project as proposed with all the recommended mitigation measures discussed in the previous sections minimize the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Source: All applicable sources previously cited in this document.

<p>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</p>		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Discussion: As defined by the CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts reflect “the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355[b]). To the best of Staff’s knowledge, there are no other construction projects currently under way or proposed near the project site.

As discussed in previous sections, there are cumulative projects impacts related to the future projects that will be required in order to develop each of the subsequent five lots proposed for subdivision. Each of those lots would be required to adhere to all relevant County regulations and standards, and due to location within a Design Review district, development would be required to be considered at a public hearing. These projects would be properly reviewed and vetted at time of their individual submittal.

For the reasons presented above, the proposed project is not expected to result in adverse cumulative impacts to human beings, either directly or indirectly. All impacts identified in this document are less than significant, or reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of mitigation measures, and the project’s incremental contribution to potential cumulative impacts will not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project’s impact is considered significant unless mitigated.

Source: All applicable sources previously cited in this document

<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Discussion: As discussed in this document, the project could result in environmental impacts that could both directly and indirectly cause impacts on human beings. However, implementation of mitigation measures included in this document would adequately reduce project impacts to less than significant levels.

Source: All Applicable Sources Previously Cited in This Document.

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

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
Caltrans		X	

City		X	
California Coastal Commission (CCC)		X	
California Department of Food and Agriculture		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
Other: NA		X	
National Marine Fisheries Service		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board	X	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 project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed.	X	
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> Basic Construction Air Quality Measures</p> <p>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:</p> <p>a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved</p>		

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

Mitigation Measure 2: Pre-Construction Dusky-Footed Woodrat Survey. A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for dusky-footed woodrat nests within the project disturbance area and a 100-foot buffer no more than 14 days prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal. The survey results shall be documented and submitted to the County. If woodrat nests are identified within the survey area, the avoidance and relocation measures specified in Mitigation Measure 5 shall be implemented prior to construction.

Mitigation Measure 3: Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey. If construction or tree removal activities are scheduled during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of the project site and surrounding area (250-foot buffer for raptors, 100-foot buffer for passerines) no more than 14 days prior to the start of construction. If active nests are identified, the avoidance measures specified in Mitigation Measure 6 shall be implemented.

Mitigation Measure 4: Pre-Construction Bat Roost Survey. A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey of trees proposed for removal and structures proposed for demolition to assess bat roosting potential no more than 14 days prior to tree removal or demolition. The survey shall focus on tree cavities, crevices, and exfoliating bark. If active bat roosting is confirmed, the avoidance and exclusion measures specified in Mitigation Measure 7 shall be implemented.

Mitigation Measure 5: Dusky-Footed Woodrat Avoidance. If active woodrat nests are found during the pre-construction survey required by Mitigation Measure 2, a no-disturbance buffer of no less than 25 feet shall be established around each nest and maintained throughout construction. If avoidance is infeasible, a qualified biologist shall prepare and implement a woodrat relocation plan, including passive relocation techniques, subject to review and approval by CDFW.

Mitigation Measure 6: Avoidance of Migratory Bird Species. If active nests are found during the pre-construction survey required by Mitigation Measure 3, the qualified biologist shall establish species-appropriate no-disturbance buffers (typically 250 feet for raptors and 50–100 feet for passerines). Buffers shall remain in place until the biologist determines that young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. Buffer distances may be adjusted at the discretion of the biologist based on site

conditions and species tolerance.

Mitigation Measure 7: Roosting Bat Avoidance. If active bat roosts are found during the pre-construction survey required by Mitigation Measure 4, tree removal or demolition of the occupied structure shall be postponed until bats have vacated the roost. If a maternity roost is present (April 15 through August 31), a no-disturbance buffer shall be maintained until juveniles are volant, as determined by a qualified biologist. Passive exclusion measures may be implemented outside of the maternity season under the direction of a qualified biologist.

Mitigation Measure 8: Environmental Awareness Training. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct an environmental awareness training for all construction personnel. The training shall include identification of special-status species and sensitive habitats potentially present on the project site, required avoidance and minimization measures, permit conditions, and the procedure for encountering protected species during construction.

Mitigation Measure 9: Worker Awareness Training

Prior to the start of work, awareness training shall be provided to all construction crew. Training will include a description of all cultural resources that may be found on or near the Project Study Area, the laws and regulations that protect those resources, the consequences of non-compliance with those laws and regulations, instructions for inspecting equipment each morning prior to activities, and a contact person if protected biological resources are discovered at the site.

Mitigation Measure 10: Statement on Plans

The project proponent shall note on any plans that require ground disturbing excavation that there is a potential for exposing buried cultural resources including prehistoric Native American burials.

Mitigation Measure 11: On-Call Archaeologist

The project proponent shall retain a Professional Archaeologist on an "on-call" basis during ground disturbing construction for the project to review, identify and evaluate cultural resources that may be inadvertently exposed during construction. The archaeologist shall review and evaluate any discoveries to determine if they are historical resource(s) and/or unique archaeological resources under CEQA. If the Professional Archaeologist determines that any cultural resources exposed during construction constitute a historical resource and/or unique archaeological resource under CEQA, he/she shall notify the project proponent and other appropriate parties of the evaluation and recommend mitigation measures to mitigate to a less-than significant impact in accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 15064.5. Mitigation measures may include avoidance, preservation in-place, recordation, additional archaeological testing and data recovery among other options. The completion of a formal Archaeological Monitoring Plan (AMP) and/or Archaeological Treatment Plan (ATP) that may include data recovery may be recommended by the Professional Archaeologist.

Mitigation Measure 12: Monitoring Closure Report

A Monitoring Closure Report shall be filed with the project proponent at the conclusion of ground disturbing construction if archaeological and Native American monitoring of excavation was undertaken.

Mitigation Measure 13: Unanticipated Discoveries

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 archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or tribal consultation may be warranted.

Mitigation Measure 14: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains

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 15: Implement All Recommendations of the Geotechnical Reports

All grading, drainage, foundation, and construction activities shall comply with the recommendations in SFB Geotechnical Studies and all conditions as outlined by the County Geotechnical Section.

Mitigation Measure 16: Full Erosion Control and Drainage Plans

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

- a) Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b) Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c) Clear only areas essential for construction.
- d) Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.
- e) Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and to control dust.
- f) Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.

- g) Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 ft., or to the extent feasible, from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h) Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i) Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j) Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow.
- k) The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acres or less per 100 ft. of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly, and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 of fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion resistant species.
- l) Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.
- m) Environmentally sensitive areas shall be delineated and protected to prevent construction impacts.
- n) Control fuels and other hazardous materials, spills, and litter during construction.
- o) Preserve existing vegetation whenever feasible.

Mitigation Measure 17: Wet Season Grading

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

Mitigation Measure 18: Erosion Control and Tree Protection

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

Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

Mitigation Measure 20: Each lot shall have its own stormwater management facility and each of the drainage/stormwater facilities must meet the County's Peak Flow and Volume Requirement of collecting stormwater runoff from a 10-year, 1 hour storm event.

Mitigation Measure 21: Implement All Recommendations of the Drainage Reports and Conditions of Approval

All grading, drainage, foundation, and construction activities shall comply with the recommendations in applicant Drainage Analyses and all conditions as outlined by the County Drainage Section.

DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared by the Planning Department.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X

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

Samuel Becker

(Signature)

May 11, 2026

Samuel Becker

Date

(Project Planner, San Mateo County)

ATTACHMENTS

(Available at: https://www.smcgov.org/planning/mitigated-negative-declaration-edenbridge-inc-1815-cordilleras-road-emerald-lake-hills-ca?auHash=6LmsQk-AV56U7iflov_WakuB-oyuk7hnQOD0NUbNQHo)

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Project Narrative
- C. Project Plans
- D. Biological Resources Assessment, (MIG), August 19, 2025
- E. Geotechnical Study prepared by Stevens, Ferrone, and Bailey Engineering Company, Inc. dated December 18, 2024 and Supplemental Study, dated February 5, 2026.
- F. Arborist Report, (Mayne Tree Expert Company), November 16, 2024
- G. Storm Drain Study, (Macleod and Associates, Inc.), January 29, 2026.
- H. Traffic Study, (Hexagon Transportation Consultants), December 16, 2024