

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** *Pie Ranch Master Plan*
2. **County File Number:** PLN2015-00208
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo, Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Camille Leung, Project Planner, 650/363-1826, cleung@smcgov.org
5. **Project Location:** Property located at 2080 Cabrillo Highway, north of Green Oaks Way, at the Southern Border of the County, unincorporated Pescadero area of San Mateo County.
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** APN 089-230-210; Approximately 13 acres
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Jered Lawson, P.O. Box 444, Pescadero, CA 94060-0444
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** Pie Ranch, c/o Jered Lawson, P.O. Box 444, Pescadero, CA 94060-0444
9. **General Plan Designation:** Agriculture
10. **Zoning:** Planned Agricultural District/ Coastal Development District (PAD/CD)
11. **Description of the Project:** *(Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)*

PIE RANCH MASTER PLAN: Coastal Development Permit (CDP) & Planned Agricultural Development Permit (PAD) to: 1) Legalize a 820 sq. ft. Outdoor Commercial Kitchen and Signage at Highway 1; 2) Farmstand building reinforcement/repairs including a new commercial kitchen, new 605 sf covered deck, 2 new restrooms, new cupola, new signage, ADA and drainage improvements; 3) New 1,500 sq. ft. Bunkhouse (Farm Labor housing) to house 8 workers (to replace 3 unpermitted yurts); 4) New 300 sq. ft. Restroom Building; 5) Septic and Water Storage System Expansion; and 5) associated traffic improvements per the recommendations of the traffic reports. The project involves only minor grading and no tree removal.

The western portion of the project site along Green Oaks Creek is located in Flood Zone A, a special flood hazard area designation, with a 1 percent annual chance of flooding. The projects involves these buildings located in Zone A:

- Farmstand renovation and deck addition
- Legalization of Outdoor Kitchen (unenclosed)
- Proposed Restroom Building near the re-built Steele Family Farmhouse

The remaining area of the project site is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0470E, effective October 16, 2012). The proposed Bunkhouse is located in Zone X.

This permit would legalize special events which have already been in operation for many years, including:

- Agriculture related events include 13 barn dances and potluck dinners annually, farm tours, corporate/organizational group-building events, youth and adult education, and associated parking.
- Public Events include an annual 300 person fundraiser and private events/weddings (13 events/yr).

Proposed work under separate Coastal Development Permit Exemption (CDX): New 1520 sf Agricultural Shed with loft (to replace existing cargo containers); New 800 sf Greenhouse; Renovation of Harvest Shed (formerly creamery) with 400 sf porch addition.

This project is appealable to the Coastal Commission.

12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The parcel is located in a rural area located on southern limit of the County, on Cabrillo Highway. Green Oaks Creek adjoins the site along its northern border and Green Oaks Way along its southern border. The parcel is located within the Cabrillo Highway State Scenic Corridor.
13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** Caltrans
14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?:** No, consultation has not begun. Planning staff has notified the following tribes, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC): Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band, The Ohlone Indian Tribe (2 contacts provided), Tamien Nation, Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area, Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan (2 contacts provided), Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe, and Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista. On June 14, 2023, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment by July 14, 2023. On February 4, 2026, a letter was sent to the contact person for the Ramaytush Tribe regarding the subject project requesting comment by March 4, 2026. Please see Sections 5 and 18 for further discussion.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

- c. **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. **Supporting Information Sources.** Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?				X
Discussion: The project site is not visible from residential areas or the Pacific Ocean, and is not located in a scenic vista. The project site is visible from public lands, as it is located to the east and across Highway 1 from the Ano Nuevo State Park. However, the project would have no impact on the park and would only be minimally visible from the eastern portion of the park, where views would remain largely the same. Please refer to Section 1.b for a discussion of potential project impacts due to the site location within the Cabrillo Highway State Scenic Corridor. Source: County GIS map.				
1.b. Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
Discussion: The project site is located completely within the Cabrillo Highway State Scenic Corridor. The proposed improvements to the farmstand would be visible from Cabrillo Highway. The farmstand building is 2,201 square feet. It is located at the front of the site in the small area bound by the western bank of Green Oaks Creek as it crosses the site and Cabrillo Hwy (See Site Plan, 1/A0.1). Parking is provided along the front of the building facing Highway 1 and along the south side of the building adjacent to the private road serving this property and properties beyond. The Farmstand walls consist of open framing, with one layer of board and batten sheathing over the open framing. Corrugated metal roofing lies directly on the exposed trusses which span from wall to				

wall. The trusses do not have mechanical fasteners to the walls nor do the walls themselves have any significant shear capacity to resist lateral movement. Sliding barn doors leave significant gaps which rodents use to obtain access to the barn. Floors also have small gaps. The walls rest on a combination of old and new unconnected pier foundations that are settling independently. Because the structure is so loosely built, this has not yet caused any significant issues for the building to date.

Proposed Changes: The Farmstand is located at the lowest elevation of the site and adjacent to Green Oaks Creek, placing it within the setbacks of the creek's associated riparian zone as well as the flood zone as defined by the San Mateo County Planning Department. However, since the barn is pre-existing in this location, the applicant proposes to repair it in place. This work will consist of 1) insulating the structure 2) providing additional lateral support 3) adding clips that secure the roof and roof trusses to the walls they rest upon 4) new perimeter foundation to anchor added lateral support 5) new fire resistant perimeter skirt around the base 6) plugging small gaps in the floor/doors (where possible). 7) New commercial kitchen for on-site pie baking, 8) new seismic restraint systems, 9) new electrical upgrade, 10) a new ADA ramp, 11) a new 675 square foot deck with a 590 square foot cover, and 12) two new accessible restrooms 13) new cupola for light and natural ventilation (Please see Farmstand Renovation Drawing Set).

The proposed changes to the Farmstand would reinforce the building for greater permanence, where roofing, lighting, and decking changes would only be minimally visible from the highway and would not substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

As discussed in detail in Section 5, the Farmstand is not associated with the Green Oaks Dairy and is not a historic resource meeting the criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources. Buildings or structures that are not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources are not historic resources as defined by CEQA.

The report concludes that the Pie Ranch property contains no buildings or structures meeting the criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources. Proposed changes do not create an adverse impact and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Source: Project application; Evaluation of Modifications to Pie Ranch, 2080 Highway 1-CA, San Mateo County, CA, dated April 28, 2025.

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

Discussion: The project only involves minor grading and does not involve grading or construction that would significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project involves only minor grading (approximately 25 cubic yards), associated with farmstand improvements and construction of a bunkhouse (Farm labor housing) and a restroom building, and does not involve development on a ridgeline. Proposed structures and uses are consistent with development on surrounding farmlands.

Source:

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

Discussion: Proposed new buildings and legalization of existing structures may introduce new sources of exterior lighting. Staff has added Mitigation Measure 1 to minimize light spillover to Highway 1 and light pollution of the night sky by requiring that all exterior lighting be task-oriented, downward-directed, and have a maximum color rating of 2200 kelvin. No new light posts will be allowed. As proposed and mitigated, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Mitigation Measure 1: Minimize new exterior lighting. All new exterior lighting shall be task-oriented with rays confined to the site, downward-directed, and have a maximum color rating of 2200 kelvin. No new light posts will be allowed. Exterior light fixtures shall be shown on plans submitted for a building permit application.

Source: Plans.

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

Discussion: The site is located within the Cabrillo Highway State Scenic Corridor. Please refer to Section 1.b for a discussion of potential project impacts due to the site location within the Cabrillo Highway State Scenic Corridor.

Source: County GIS map.

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

Discussion: The site is not located in a Design Review District.

Source: Zoning maps.

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

Discussion: The proposed uses and structures are consistent with the surrounding farmland environment. Please refer to questions above for discussion of potential project impacts due to the site location within the Cabrillo Highway State Scenic Corridor.

Source: Plans; Zoning maps

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a. For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
Discussion: The property is located within the Coastal Zone. Source: County GIS map.				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	
Discussion: The project involves the construction of new buildings and legalization of existing buildings for agricultural and accessory to agricultural use, consistent with development on surrounding farmlands. Farm Labor Housing and agricultural structures are permitted in the PAD/CD, with the issuance of the requested Coastal Development Permit (CDP), Planned Agricultural Development (PAD) and Farm Labor Housing (FLH) permit. An Agricultural Conservation Easement and Trail Easement, granted by Pie Ranch to Peninsula Open Space Trust in 2015, restricts uses within 2 areas of the parcel, a Center Agricultural/ Education Center at the center of the property and a Highway 1 Agricultural/ Education Center in the area of the Farmstand. All proposed structures are located these easement areas but are consistent with the allowed uses of the easement. The property is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Source: County GIS Map; Agricultural Conservation Easement and Trail Easement, 2015; Project Plans.				
2.c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?		X		

Discussion: The project involves the conversion of Farmland to uses that are accessory to agricultural use. The subject property contains large areas of prime soil, including Class II soils (Lockwood loam, gently sloping) over a northern portion of the parcel, as shown in Attachment D. Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils are rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts. The project would convert approximately 1,500 sq. ft. (including outdoor kitchen and Farmstand) of Class II soils for permanent structures. These structures already exist, but the outdoor kitchen is not permitted and the Farmstand work includes a 605 sq. ft. deck addition.

The 300 sq. ft. Bathroom building would also be located on prime soils but would be built in the footprint of an existing shed used as a pantry. The Bunkhouse would not be located on prime soils. The Bunkhouse would replace housing provided by 3 yurts that are located on prime soils, which the applicant states will be removed once the Bunkhouse is complete. A mitigation measure has been added to require the removal of the 3 yurts at the time of the final approval of the building permit application for the Bunkhouse.

There are also two unpermitted shipping containers located to the north of the Farmstand located on prime soils. The applicant states that these will be removed once construction of the Harvest Shed (BLD2023-03339) is complete. A mitigation measure has been added to require the removal of the two containers once construction of the Harvest Shed (BLD2023-03339) is complete.

As proposed, the area of farmland converted for permanent structures has been minimized through replacement of existing structures, use of disturbed areas containing existing structures, placement of new buildings along property boundaries, and removal of some buildings located on prime soil. Therefore, the project minimizes the division of farmland. The project will maintain the existing agricultural use of the property and proposed structures are supportive and necessary to the existing agricultural operation.

Mitigation Measure 2: The applicant shall obtain a demolition permit to remove the 3 yurts and complete the demolition process prior to the final approval of the building permit application for the Bunkhouse. The demolition plan shall include a plan to restore the former area of the yurts to open space or farmland uses. Removal of one of the unpermitted shipping containers located to the north of the Farmstand is required once construction of the Harvest Shed (BLD2023-03339) is complete. The second container shall be removed once the Farmstand is complete.

Source: County GIS Map; Project Plans.

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

Discussion: Please see discussion in Section 2.c.

Source: County GIS Map; Project Plans.

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

Discussion: Please see discussion in Section 2.c.

Source: County GIS Map; Project Plans.

2.f.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in				X
------	--	--	--	--	---

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))? <i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i>				
Discussion: The project site does not contain forestland or timberland and lands which are specifically zoned for timber harvesting. Source: County GIS Map.				

3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
Discussion: Regarding potential air quality impacts related to project traffic, based on the traffic counts, a daily trip generation was determined by Hexagon for Pie Ranch on weekends (excludes special events). The counts showed that the ranch generates 372 total trips including 187 inbound and 185 outbound between 10:00 AM and 5:00 PM (see Table 1 of Attachment F). The count distribution shows that a large majority of the trips (approximately 95 percent) are traveling northbound on Highway 1 and continue northbound or are traveling southbound and continue southbound. These can be considered pass-by trips. These are vehicles that stop in at Pie Ranch while already driving on Highway 1 to and from other destinations. The counts show that very few vehicles make a special trip just to go to Pie Ranch. Based on the counts, Pie Ranch is only generating approximately nine inbound and nine outbound trips that would not have occurred had the ranch not been in operation. Regarding special events, no trip analysis is needed, as these do not occur regularly or frequently (13 events/year) and do not occur during peak traffic times. Regarding potential air quality impacts related to project grading and construction, the project involves grading and construction activities associated with the construction of residential and agricultural buildings. No other adverse emissions would be generated by the project. The site is rural and remote, where standard farming uses may also generate dust, and is not located within close proximity to off-site sensitive receptors. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As described in the BAAQMD's 2017 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction emissions due to the number of variables that can impact the calculation of construction emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of all				

control measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures, *All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures*, and other criteria, that, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. Relevant BAAQMD measures have been incorporated into mitigation measure provided below.

Mitigation Measure 3: Upon the start of excavation activities and through to the completion of the project, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that the following dust control guidelines are implemented:

- a. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- b. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- c. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- d. 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.

Source: Traffic reports prepared by Hexagon, dated November 16, 2022, and September 23, 2016; Project Plans; Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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: Please refer to discussion in Section 3.a.				
3.c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?			X	
Discussion: The area is rural with residential buildings located on adjoining agricultural and rural parcels. There are no residential buildings located in close proximity except for the dwelling units on the subject parcel. Please refer to discussion in Section 3.a. Source: Traffic reports prepared by Hexagon, dated November 16, 2022, and September 23, 2016; Project Plans; Bay Area Air Quality Management District.				
3.d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
Discussion: Please refer to discussion in Section 3.a.				

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
4.a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service?		X		
Discussion: The initial 2016 Biological Impact Form and subsequent March 2019 addendum (Attachment E) were prepared for activities on the property requiring a coastal development permit (CDP) in accordance with the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP). Activities addressed in the reports included: an annual farm dinner in September, monthly open farm day potluck and barn dance, and day vehicle use on Green Oaks Way for farm and educational opportunities. Project scope also includes removal of an existing, unpermitted produce washing system at back of Farmstand, which borders Green Oaks Creek, once Harvest Shed renovation is complete. This has been added as a mitigation measure to require its completion and restoration. A 2019 Addendum (Attachment E) provided further analysis to address the 2017 Pie Ranch Master Plan for building and renovation projects; no formal construction plans had been prepared. The CZU Lightening Complex Fire in September 2020 altered site conditions. An addendum letter, dated November 9, 2022 (Attachment E), was prepared to provide a second addendum and biological update on site conditions on the Pie Ranch property in Pescadero, California (project site; APN 089-230-210) following the CZU Lightening Complex Fire in the September 2020. Figure 1 of the 2022 report shows the current extent of sensitive communities on the property including Green Oaks Creek and its associated riparian habitat, one tributary on the west side of the property, eucalyptus grove on the south side of the property (which provides documented roost habitat for federal candidate species the monarch butterfly), and a single pond with associated riparian habitat and emergent wetland vegetation (which provides habitat for federal listed California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake). Attachment B provides photographs of the site at the time of the 2022 assessment. No proposed work is within 100 feet of the pond (creamery building and agricultural shed work are under separate permits). The biologist identified some intact riparian woodland vegetation along Green Oaks Creek (primarily below top of bank) west and east of the house consisting of primarily <i>Alnus rubra</i> Forest Alliance. This habitat was dominated by red alder and willow, interspersed with a few Douglas fir, coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>), Eucalyptus, and two palm trees. Much of the understory was dominated by California blackberry (<i>Rubus ursinus</i>). Adjacent to the creek much of the willow riparian habitat had not returned and the setback area was dominated by annual grassland habitat. Based on a review of aerial imagery it appears primarily willows were destroyed in this area, whereas larger oaks and ornamental species make up those areas that remain vegetated. As a consequence of the fire, an updated map is provided to show the limits of riparian vegetation presently and the prescribed 30-foot setback (Attachment A, Figure 1 of the 2022 report). Despite				

the effects of the fire on vegetation, all of the special status plants and animals identified in the 2019 report may still potentially be present on the property. Regrowth of vegetation and planned habitat restoration will provide suitable habitat for these species in the future. Two species were potentially be affected by the fire – monarch butterfly and San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat. None of the woodrat nests documented in the 2019 report were found during the 2022 site visit; however, suitable habitat remains in areas with intact riparian woodland habitat and/or coyote brush scrub located south of the site. Also, much of the eucalyptus stand that provided habitat for monarch butterfly was burned in the fire and consequently debris was removed from the site. A small number of trees remain along the roadway that may provide overwintering habitat.

All of the potential impacts described in the 2019 report related to the Master Plan building have not changed despite the effects of the fire. However, the riparian setback has been slightly reduced as shown in Figure 1 (Attachment A). Additional avoidance and minimization measures are prescribed below to ensure adequate protection of these fragile habitats during planned build out of the property in addition to the measures prescribed in the 2019 report.

Lastly, two special status species listings have been upgraded since the 2019 report. These include monarch butterfly and northwestern pond turtle. Monarch butterfly is now a federal candidate for listing under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Northwestern pond turtle (NWPT) is expected to be listed in January 2023. Monarch butterfly was documented on the property in Monterey pine and Douglas fir along the creek and in eucalyptus trees along the Green Oaks driveway¹. Much of this habitat was destroyed in the 2020 fire. Additional avoidance measures are prescribed below based on these changed listings to ensure incidental take of both species is completely avoided

It should be noted that a traffic mitigation measure requires trimming of riparian vegetation along Green Oaks Road. This vegetation has been regularly trimmed to maintain vehicle clearance and visibility and poses limited risk to wildlife species of concern, per an April 10, 2026 letter from biologist Josh Fodor at Ecological Concerns Inc.

Mitigation Measure 4: The applicant shall submit a Coastal Permit Exemption form to remove the existing, outdoor, unpermitted produce washing system at back of Farmstand, which borders Green Oaks Creek, and complete the demolition process prior to the final approval of the building permit application for the Harvest Shed. Mitigation Measure 5 shall apply.

Mitigation Measure 5: Based on the close proximity of project activities to sensitive habitat and species that may be present in or near to Green Oaks Creek, the following Additional Mitigation Measures (AMMs) are recommended to ensure adequate protection of these species in addition to their habitats. [Reference to tree removal or clearing has been removed as that is not in the scope of this project].

AMM BIO-1: All buffer zones (including wetland and riparian, as well as streamline buffer zones) shall be clearly demarcated in the field during construction-related activities using orange construction fencing and/or silt fencing and signage to prevent incidental trespass by construction personnel into these areas. No project activities including staging of materials, loitering, eating, drinking, smoking, refueling, placement of hazardous materials, parking of vehicles, nor any other construction-related activity is permitted in these areas. Further vegetation clearing and/or removal of topsoil in this area is strictly prohibited; mowing may be performed prior to construction for fire control and/or access. Furthermore, placement of spoils will be restricted to areas outside any buffer zones (including any buffer zones established for sensitive species).

AMM BIO-2: Water quality best management practices shall be developed using Best Management Practices to prevent any accidental discharge of materials or equipment into nearby sensitive habitats and buffer zones, particularly during construction activities within the current 30-foot buffer zone. At a minimum, refueling and/or maintenance of equipment or vehicles shall be

performed outside any of the delineated setback zones. Adequate spill protection kits shall be placed immediately adjacent to refueling/maintenance locations.

AMM BIO-3: A worker awareness environmental training program (program) is required to be presented by a qualified biologist to construction personnel prior to the start of construction activities. The program shall include information on the location of sensitive habitats in the vicinity of the Project along with a map showing their respective “no-disturbance” buffer zones. Buffer zones shall be clearly demarcated in the field as stated above and the program shall include a list of restricted activities within these areas as described in AMM BIO-1. The worker environmental training program (program) provided under AMM BIO-3 (2019 report) shall also include information on the known or potential use of the site by any sensitive species, 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 protocols to follow as well as a contact person if protected biological resources are discovered on the project site during activities.

AMM BIO-4: All outdoor lighting shall be downcast and no outdoor lighting within the 30-foot buffer shall be allowed.

AMM BIO-5: Landscaping within buffer zones shall be appropriate to the surrounding habitat including Green Oaks Creek and its associated riparian habitat. The biologist shall review final landscaping plans to ensure the planting plan is appropriate to the existing landscape. Within the current buffer zone, any invasive species listed as moderate or high on the Cal-IPC website <https://www.cal-ipc.org/plants/inventory/> that are present shall be removed prior to planting. The presence of non-porous pavement of similar material is prohibited within the 30-foot buffer zone, with the exception of underground water or irrigation lines as needed.

AMM BIO-6: Permanent fencing (including either existing fencing or similar structural deterrent including boulders or split rail fencing) shall be maintained between the subject property and Green Oaks Creek to prevent humans and pets from trampling vegetation and/or accessing sensitive aquatic habitats where sensitive species may be present.

AMM BIO-7: Pre-construction surveys for CRLF, SFGS, and NWPT shall be performed no less than 48 hours prior to the start of project activities (including construction, vegetation clearing, staging, and/or any other project-related activity). The survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist with familiarity identifying both species. All areas of the project site and adjacent buffer areas (up to 300 feet) shall be searched. If either species is found, work shall be halted, and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) contacted. If possible, the animal should be allowed to leave the area on its own. If it does not leave on its own, all work shall remain halted until the USFWS provides authorization for work to resume.

AMM BIO-8: Pre-construction surveys for San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat houses shall be performed no less than 30 days prior to construction. If stick houses are found and avoidance is not feasible, the houses shall be dismantled by hand under the supervision of a biologist. If young are encountered during the dismantling process, the material shall be placed back on the house and a buffer of 25 feet shall be established for a minimum of 3 weeks to allow young time to mature and leave the nest. Nest material shall be moved to a suitable adjacent area for reuse.

AMM BIO-9: Pre-construction nesting bird and raptor surveys shall be performed on and in all accessible areas adjacent to the project site (up to 300 feet for songbirds and up to 500 feet for raptors) if activities are proposed to occur during the nesting bird season (February 1 to August 31) including any tree removal and/or noise or visual disturbance; areas where prior nests have been found shall be monitored by the biologist to determine status of the nest and whether occupied or not. Surveys shall be performed no less than 10 days prior to the start of activities by a qualified biologist. If an occupied or active nest is found, a no-disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest site in accordance with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) guidance on the

establishment of nest buffers. Nest buffers shall remain in place until all young have fledged and left the nest or are no longer dependent on parents for feeding, or if the nest fails due to natural causes (e.g., storm event or natural predation).

AMM BIO-10: All outdoor work shall be performed during daylight hours; no work shall be performed within 30 minutes of sunrise or sunset.

AMM BIO-11: Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) rolled erosion control products, or similar material should not be used. Acceptable substitutes include coconut coir matting or tackified hydroseeding compounds.

AMM BIO-12: Trenches and holes should be covered and inspected daily for stranded animals. Trenches and holes deeper than one foot should contain escape ramps at a maximum slope of 2:1 to allow trapped animals to escape.

AMM BIO-13. A pre-construction winter roost survey for Monarch butterfly shall be performed in remaining intact stands of eucalyptus, Monterey pine, and/or Douglas fir between November 1 and January 15 to assess the status of roost habitat post fire.

AMM BIO-14. If monarch butterfly winter roost habitat is observed, a 100-foot no disturbance buffer shall be established around the roost until the end of the roost season

Source: Sol Ecology Biological Reports for the project, including 2016 Biological Impact Form; March 2019; Addendum letter, dated November 9, 2022; letter from biologist Josh Fodor at Ecological Concerns Inc., dated April 10, 2026.

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: Please see discussion in Section 4.a.					
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: Please see discussion in Section 4.a.					
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: Please see discussion in Section 4.a.					

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 involve any tree removal.					
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 an operating farm and is not located within an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Source: County GIS.					
4.g.	Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?			X	
Discussion: The project site is visible from public lands, as it is located to the east and across Highway 1 from the Ano Nuevo State Park. However, the project would have no impact on the park and would only be minimally visible from the eastern portion of the park. Source: County GIS.					
4.h.	Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
Discussion: The site does not contain oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands. Source: Aerial map					

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: The applicant submitted a historical resource evaluation, Evaluation of Modifications to Pie Ranch, 2080 Highway 1-CA, San Mateo County, CA, dated April 28, 2025 (Attachment H). The following analysis is from that evaluation. <i>Background</i>				

After California became a state in 1850, Maria Antonia Pico de Castro sold Rancho Punta del Año Nuevo to Issac Graham and petitioned the US Land Commission for title to the rancho that was granted to her husband and successors in 1857. Graham sold the Rancho to a San Francisco investment group, I Clark & Coburn in 1862. The investors (Cobrin eventually bought out Clark) and leased much of Rancho Butano and Rancho Punta del Año Nuevo land to the Steele Brothers for their dairy operations.

The Steel family, who originally settled along the east coast, were living in Ohio when the brothers, Edgar and Rensselaer, immigrated to California 1852; Isac Chapman Steel, wife Huldah Emeline Steele and his family came in 1857. The couple married in 1845 and had two children. This is the same year that the brothers, George, Rensselaer Edgar Willis and Isac C., leased land in Point Reyes and began their work in the dairy industry making cheese that sold in San Francisco. By 1862, they identified suitable coastal land and leased Rancho Punta de Año Nuevo in Santa Cruz County (later it became San Mateo County) and Rancho San Antonio Pescadero. The lease allowed for the purchase of a portion of the land.

The brothers began construction on five dairies - Green Oaks that Isac C. would operate, Pocket Dairy at Pebble Beach, Hill Dairy in Whitehouse Canyon; Cascade operated by Rensselaer; and Cloverdale run by E.W. In 1861, the Steel Brothers produced 45 tons of cheese, making them the largest producers in California. When the original leases ran out in 1866, the lease holders did not renew and retained Pocket Dairy and Cloverdale Dairy.

However, the brothers were able to purchase 7,000-acres along the coast and began purchasing land in San Louis Obispo County. With the operations of the five dairies, the Steele Brothers are credited with establishing the first large-scale cheese manufacturing operations in California. As the brothers separated, Isac C. Steele remained with the Green Oaks Dairy which was renamed Faiely Dairy before closing and the land returned to raising wheat and other crops. Isac C. Steele passed away in 1903 (1820-1903).

Description of the property

The 14-acre wedge-shaped property extends from the Cabrillo Highway toward the foothills and is a portion of the Green Oaks Dairy Ranch owned and operated by Isac Chapman Steele. The main building on the property is a two-story house constructed in 2002 and the 1860s barn and ancillary structures, including a former packing shed, as well as several small sheds, yurts and other small structures of various ages and uses. The owners have used natural materials for the new sheds and other structures built on the farm, maintaining a rustic and rural feeling to the complex.

Marketstand (Farmstand)

Adjacent to Highway 1 and separated from other structures on the Pie Ranch, the Market Stand occupies a single-story c.1933 wood-frame shed that was not part of the Steele Dairy operation and was constructed when the land was leased to grow crops, likely Brussels sprouts and artichokes, crops still grown in the area. The structure has been rehabilitated, retaining much of the open design and was repaired with similar materials. Broad steps lead to the front and side entry to the market with space for community gatherings. The wood building does not exhibit unusual design or craftsmanship. Similar structures are found within the agricultural areas of the San Mateo Coast.

Evaluation of Significance

For purposes of this study, the criteria used to evaluate the significance of potential historic resources is that of the California Register of Historical Resources and the San Mateo County Criteria for the Designation of County Historic Landmarks and Historic Districts (Section 7732). The National Register of Historic Places is more stringent than the California Register and both contain similar criteria. The National Register listing for Green Oaks Ranch House has not been removed

although it is invalid because the primary building, the 1862 Steele ranch house, was destroyed by fire in 2020 and is no longer extant.

The San Mateo County Historic Preservation Ordinance does not contain a threshold age for a historic resource. The National Register of Historic Places and the California register of Historical Resources establish the threshold for historic resources as 50 years. Buildings less than 50 years old may be historic resources listed in the National Register of Historic Places if they meet Criteria Condition G, exhibiting exemplary architecture or have direct association with a very significant historical event. The new house at Pie Ranch does not meet this criteria and is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

The San Mateo County Criteria contains five categories:

7732.1 It exemplifies or reflects elements of the County's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, or architectural history; or

7732.2 It has special aesthetic or artistic interests or values; or

7732.3 It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history; or

7732.4 It embodies distinctive architectural characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship; or

7732.5 It is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, or architect.

While the categories do not specifically address the integrity of a historic resource, it is necessary to first consider integrity to evaluate potential resources. The National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources defines integrity to be the majority of seven aspects - location, design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association. A resource must be able to communicate the reason for its significance.

Section 7732.1. The property at Pie Ranch has a historical association with the development of the dairy industry in California. However, no significant buildings or improvements remain from the period when the dairy ranch operated. A barn to house horses does not convey the association with the dairy industry. As stated elsewhere, the main building, the significant dairy barn is preserved across Highway 1 in the Anno Nueva State Reserve not on the Pie Ranch property. The property has lost physical integrity of the Green Oaks Dairy.

The Pie Ranch continues the broad category of agricultural use. However, the primary building (house) and structures are contemporary for farming, and although agricultural use continues, it does not represent significant elements of the County's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, or architectural history.

Section 7732.2. The Pie Ranch complex does not have special artistic value. The house and assorted sheds are different in design and utilitarian in function. Work areas do not exhibit artistic value.

Section 7732.3. The main house and most structures on the property are associated with the Pie Ranch, an educational farm. The barn constructed in the 1860s is a structure associated with the I.C. Steele family who were significant in the history of San Mateo County. The 1860s barn appears to individually qualify for the association with the Steele family. The rest of the improvements are not identified with the Steele family or the Green Oaks Dairy. The working farm is not identified as individually contributing to the history of San Mateo County in a significant way.

Section 7732.4. The main building is the farmhouse constructed in 2002, and ancillary structures associated with crop farming, structures that have been rehabilitated for farm uses or are recent construction. The materials used are often from the land or recycled to maintain the sense of earlier hands-on farming. Most small sheds are of rough construction and collectively these elements do not qualify under the San Mateo County criteria. The Pie Ranch is not a historic resource exhibiting

architectural characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, and is not a valuable example of the historic use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

Section 7732.5. The house and structures were not designed by a master architect.

In summary, the land at Pie Ranch has a history associated with the former owners, Isac C. Steele and family, who were important in the development of commercial cheese-making and the dairy industry in California. However, the main house is not associated with the Steele family nor is the Market Stand. The horse barn that may have been used by the Steele family does not represent the use as a dairy ranch or part of the dairy operations. The property is best described as the site of the Green Oaks Dairy Ranch and identified with signage and documentation. Additionally, the 1860s horse barn appears to be individually significant for its association with the I.C. Steele family and the common barn form of the period.

California Register of Historical Resources:

The criteria for listing historical resources in the California Register of Historical Resources are consistent with those for listing resources in the National Register of Historic Places but have been modified for state use in order to include a range of historical resources which better reflect the history of California. The threshold age for a resource to be considered is 50 years without extraordinary conditions. The California Register eligibility or listing is the threshold for CEQA to consider a significant resource. A historical resource must retain integrity and be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following four criteria;

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history;
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values; or
4. It has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

In addition, the resource must retain enough of its historic character or appearance to be recognizable as a historic property and to convey the reason for its significance.

The Farn Stand – Packing Shed was compared to the California Register of Historical Resources Criteria.

Criterion 1 The Farm Shed was constructed as a collection point for crops to be picked up for delivery elsewhere. It is not associated with a significant event.

Criterion 2 The Farm Stand was used by families leasing land and growing crops. They were not found to be significant in the history of San Mateo County or California. The property does not meet Criteria 2

Criterion 3 The Farm Stand is a rectangular wood-frame structure with vertical board siding and a metal roof. The structure has openings on one side and has been rehabilitated to include a porch and contemporary designed steps. The shed does not have a loading dock or other connection to its past. The simple structure does not meet Criteria 3.

Criterion 4 The parcel has been disturbed by various agricultural uses and construction of structures and buildings. A section of the parcel was surveyed for the potential of having significant archeological material and found to have a low probability. The property does not meet criteria 4

The Pie Ranch complex has several structures constructed for agricultural use; all appear to be less than 50 years old or have been altered for non-original uses. In the case of the structure known as the 1860s Horse Barn, the structure has been remodeled and reconstructed. In evaluating the

importance of these structures, the criteria of the CRH was applied and no structures were found to meet the criteria. Most of the structures are common in agricultural use and found on farms along the San Mateo County coast. Some structures are modified from older versions and often use recycled wood. No structures were found to be unusual in design, materials or workmanship. Typical of continued agricultural use, the structures have been modified and adopted as the needs dictated. None of the structures were associated with individuals of significance or as part of a broad pattern; they are not individually or collectively significant. The Pie Ranch is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, except as a locally designated site of the Green Oaks Dairy and is not a historic resource as defined by CEQA.

Plans proposed for the Pie Ranch

The Pie Ranch contains no buildings or structures meeting the criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources. Proposed changes do not create an adverse impact.

There are two proposed changes for Pie Ranch listed below.

A new bunkhouse is proposed for a vacant area east of the main house. The site proposed has been surveyed and found to have a low potential for important archeological discovery, therefore, the site appears appropriate for the proposed new bunkhouse.

The Farm Stand, a former vegetable packing shed, is located adjacent to Highway 1. The Stand is not associated with the Green Oaks Dairy and is not a historic resource meeting the criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources. Buildings or structures that are not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources are not historic resources as defined by CEQA. A proposal has been submitted to add a monitor-window band to the ridge of the roof.

CONCLUSIONS

Plans submitted for modifications to the Pie Ranch, a new Bunkhouse building and alterations to the Farm Stand, do not create an adverse change to any structure meeting the criteria of the California Register of Historic Resources.

Source: Evaluation of Modifications to Pie Ranch, 2080 Highway 1-CA, San Mateo County, CA, dated April 28, 2025.

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

Discussion: Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search indicated that the office has no record of any previous cultural resource studies for the proposed project area (NWIC letter dated April 17, 2026). The letter identified that the proposed project area has the possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological site(s). A field study by a qualified professional archaeologist is recommended prior to commencement of project activities, including a good faith effort to identify archaeological deposits that may show no indications on the surface.

NWIC also recommended the lead agency contact the local Native American tribe(s) regarding traditional, cultural, and religious heritage values. For a complete listing of tribes in the vicinity of the project, please contact the Native American Heritage Commission at 916/373-3710.

The NWIC letter identified that the proposed project area contains a complex of recorded buildings and structures, Green Oaks Ranch, (P-41-000167; OITS ID: 408323). This resource has the status codes of 1CL, 1S, and 7K. In 1976 this resource was listed in the National Register (NPS-76000526-0000) and the California Register (1S), in 1977 it was listed as a State Historical Landmark SHL-

0906-9999 (1CL), and in 1991 it was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation as part of a local government survey (4060-0001-0000), but was not reevaluated (7K).

Cultural Resource Evaluation

The applicant submitted a cultural resource evaluation, Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Proposed Bunkhouse Replacement Project at Pie Ranch in the County of San Mateo for Attn: Bonnie Bamburg, Urban Programmers by Archaeological Resource Management Dr. Robert Cartier, Principal Investigator, January 14, 2025. The report findings are included below.

The archival research revealed that the proposed project area is located within the boundaries of a previously recorded historic resource, P-41-167 (CA-SMA-167H), known as Green Oaks Ranch. However, no significant cultural materials, prehistoric or historic, were noted during surface reconnaissance of the project area. In addition, the proposed project area is located outside the immediate vicinity of any of the historic structures within the subject property. Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed project will have no impact on cultural resources. In the event, however, that prehistoric traces (human remains, artifacts, concentrations of shell/bone/rock/ash) are encountered, all construction within a fifty-meter radius of the find should be stopped, the Planning Department notified, and an archaeologist retained to examine the find and make appropriate recommendations.

Planning staff has consulted with the following tribes, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC): Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band, The Ohlone Indian Tribe (2 contacts provided), Tamien Nation, Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area, Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan (2 contacts provided), Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe, and Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista. On June 14, 2023, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment by July 14, 2023. On February 4, 2026, a letter was sent to the contact person for the Ramaytush Tribe regarding the subject project requesting comment by March 4, 2026. No comments were received.

Mitigation Measure 6 requires compliance with this standard recommendation.

Mitigation Measure 6: In the event that prehistoric traces (human remains, artifacts, concentrations of shell/bone/rock/ash) are encountered, all construction within a fifty-meter radius of the find should be stopped, the Planning Department notified, and an archaeologist retained to examine the find and make appropriate recommendations.

Source: Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Proposed Bunkhouse Replacement Project at Pie Ranch in the County of San Mateo for Attn: Binnie Bamburg, Urban Programmers by Archaeological Resource Management Dr. Robert Cartier, Principal Investigator, January 14, 2025.

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

Discussion: The project involves land disturbance of 0.3-acres of the project site and approximately 25 cubic yards of grading. Due to the earthwork associated with project construction, the project has the potential to disturb any interred human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Mitigation Measure 7, below, requires the property owner, applicant, and contractors to comply with the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric. The implementation of this standard mitigation measure would mitigate any potential impact to interred human remains to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure 7: The property owner, applicant, and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend subsequent measures for disposition of the remains.

Source: Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Proposed Bunkhouse Replacement Project at Pie Ranch in the County of San Mateo for Attn: Bonnie Bamberg, Urban Programmers by Archaeological Resource Management Dr. Robert Cartier, Principal Investigator, January 14, 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	

Discussion: Electrical service is provided to the property by Pacific Gas and Electric. Power to the site is provided via a transmission line located on the east side of Highway One which feeds power poles located on the property as shown on the Site Plan (1/A0.1) and Electrical Site Plan (1/E1.1).

Proposed Changes: Upgrade the service as shown on the Electrical Legend on the Electrical Site Plan (E1.1) to provide adequate power on the site for all existing and proposed structures and uses, as well as adding (4) sub-panels and activating (1) inactive meter as shown on the Electrical Legend and Electrical Site Plan (E1.1).

Energy conservation standards for non-residential buildings were adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the California Energy Commission) in June 1977 and are updated every 3 years (Title 24, Part 18.6, of the California Code of Regulations). Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow for consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. Building permit applications are subject to the most current standards. It is expected that energy resources would be used efficiently during construction and operation of the project given the financial implications of the inefficient use of such resources.

The applicant plans to apply for grant funding to install 40 kw photovoltaic system on the roofs of the Agricultural Shed and Farmstand, and potentially an addition 10-20 kw system on the roof of the Harvest Shed, including an EV charging station at Farmstand. As such, the project parcel would generate energy onsite, offsetting some of the site's operational energy demand. As such, the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, either during project construction or operation.

Source: Project plans; California Building Standards Code; California Energy Commission.

6.b.	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.				X
Discussion: Based on discussion in Section 6.a, the project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.					

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:					
		Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7.a.	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
	i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>		X		
Discussion: While a project-specific geotechnical study was not submitted to the County, the applicant submitted a geotechnical study for the re-construction of the Steele House at the property, titled Geotechnical Study, <i>Proposed Steele House Residential Development</i>, 2080 Cabrillo Highway, Pescadero, California, dated March 22, 2021, prepared by Atlas technical consultants LLC. The following is site analysis is from that report: The site occupies the easterly side of the San Gregorio Fault Zone, approximately 120 feet from an inferred fault and within a zone of sympathetic, northwest trending linear features. The linear faceted ridge aligned with a linear depression to the west (lineament) are sufficient geomorphic features to support inference of tectonic origin and for siting exploratory trenching to confirm potential fault ground rupture during a nearby major earthquake with the San Gregorio Fault Zone. The recency of fault movement in this area of southern San Mateo County is poorly understood. However, on the basis of considerable geologic characterization of deformed and offset marine terraces and ancient sea cliffs (shoreline angles), Weber and others (1995) report an average late Quaternary slip rate of 0.2-0.4 inches per year. While there has been only sparse historic microseismicity associated with the San Gregorio Fault as a whole, a paleoseismic study across the northern reach at Seal Cove, north of Half Moon Bay, indicates strong earthquakes with right-lateral offsets on the order of 9 feet have occurred in the past 1400 years (Thompson and others, 1995). Thornburg and Weber (1998) report two magnitude 6 earthquakes in 1926 were attributable to crustal movement in Monterey Bay coincident with the southeasterly trend of the San Gregorio Fault.					

The active San Andreas Fault is mapped approximately 12 miles to the northeast. The active Hayward Fault zone is mapped approximately 30 miles to the northeast, and the active Calaveras Fault is mapped approximately 32 miles to the northeast.

[Atlas] judge[s] the risk of liquefaction occurring beneath the site during a nearby major earthquake to be low, given the shallow depth to consolidated bedrock and the unsaturated, cohesive, semi-consolidated nature of the Pleistocene alluvial deposits.

Within the next 23 years the Working Group (2015) predicts a 63 percent chance of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake on one of the active Bay Area faults. For this same period and magnitude earthquake, they predict a 21 percent chance of a significant earthquake on the San Andreas Fault. Very strong to violent ground shaking is expected in the site area during a nearby major earthquake (Petersen and others, 1999).

The Geotechnical Section has reviewed the project and added the requirements under Mitigation Measure 8, including prohibiting habitable structures on this site unless the proposed building area has been investigated and cleared by a geologic study that confirms a minimum 50-foot setback (or more) from identified fault traces and requiring, at the time of building permit application, submittal of geotechnical and geologic reports for project investigation and foundation design for all habitable structures.

Mitigation Measure 8: No habitable structures shall be permitted on this site unless the proposed building area has been investigated and cleared by a geologic study that confirms a minimum 50-foot setback (or more) from identified fault traces. At the time of building permit application, geotechnical and geologic reports shall be provided for project investigation and foundation design for all habitable structures. For all proposed non-habitable structures, a consent letter shall be provided at the time of building permit application, provided by the current owner, that:

- a. The parcel is located within Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, San Gregorio Fault Zone. Without full trenching at the site, it is unknown if the current project is located on or within 50' of an active fault trace.
- b. It is unknown whether or what damage would be made to the proposed structure without detailed study, so total damage should be expected in case of a major earthquake event.
- c. When and if the current proposed project is going to be converted to a habitable structure, a detailed study shall be provided per county zoning code SECTION 6326.3, and California Geological Survey SP117A.

Source: Geotechnical Study, *Proposed Steele House Residential Development*, 2080 Cabrillo Highway, Pescadero, California, dated March 22, 2021, prepared by Atlas technical consultants LLC

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?		X		
Discussion: As discussed in Section 7.A.i, very strong to violent ground shaking is expected in the site area during a nearby major earthquake (Petersen and others, 1999). Mitigation Measure 8 requires geotechnical and geologic reports shall be provided, at the time of building permit application, for project investigation and foundation design for all habitable structures.				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?		X		
Discussion: As discussed in Section 7.A.i, [Atlas] judge[s] the risk of liquefaction occurring beneath the site during a nearby major earthquake to be low, given the shallow depth to consolidated bedrock and the unsaturated, cohesive, semiconsolidated nature of the Pleistocene alluvial deposits.				

Mitigation Measure 8 requires geotechnical and geologic reports shall be provided, at the time of building permit application, for project investigation and foundation design for all habitable structures.				
iv. Landslides?		X		
Discussion: Per Geotechnical Study, <i>Proposed Steele House Residential Development</i>, 2080 Cabrillo Highway, Pescadero, California, dated March 22, 2021, prepared by Atlas technical consultants LLC, there was no observed evidence of erosion or landslide activity constraining the proposed building area [of the Steel House]. A large, ancient landslide mapped 200 feet of the development area is judged stable given its position on the on the fan. The proposed building site is bounded up- and downstream from back failures at an outside bend of Oak Creek (Plate 4). While outside bend position is generally considered optimal, during periods of heavy rainfall the serrated channel upstream would tend to produce a source of sediment and vegetation to be translated downstream during storms. There is potential for channel blockage that, if breached, could produce flood flow toward site. There has been no historic occurrence of catastrophic flooding or debris flow into the site. [Atlas] judge[s] the risk of impact to the site low to moderate given its outside bend position. Mitigation Measure 8 requires geotechnical and geologic reports shall be provided, at the time of building permit application, for project investigation and foundation design for all habitable structures. Source: Geotechnical Study, <i>Proposed Steele House Residential Development</i>, 2080 Cabrillo Highway, Pescadero, California, dated March 22, 2021, prepared by Atlas technical consultants LLC				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion? <i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i>				X
Discussion: The site is not located in proximity to the coastal bluff, being located on the east side of Cabrillo Highway approximately 6,800 feet from the coast. Source: County GIS Map.				
7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
Discussion: As discussed in Sections 4 and 7 (above), should there be any precipitation during project grading or construction, there is the potential for sedimentation in areas downslope from the project area, including run-off to Green Oaks Creek. With the implementation of standard measures included in Mitigation Measures 3 and 5, potential project impacts related to sedimentation would be reduced to a less than significant level.				
7.c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse?		X		

Discussion: As discussed in Section 7.A.i, [Atlas] judge[s] the risk of liquefaction occurring beneath the site during a nearby major earthquake to be low, given the shallow depth to consolidated bedrock and the unsaturated, cohesive, semi-consolidated nature of the Pleistocene alluvial deposits. Mitigation Measure 8 requires geotechnical and geologic reports shall be provided, at the time of building permit application, for project investigation and foundation design for all habitable structures.				
7.d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?		X	
Discussion: Geotechnical Study, <i>Proposed Steele House Residential Development</i>, 2080 Cabrillo Highway, Pescadero, California, dated March 22, 2021, prepared by Atlas technical consultants LLC identified the presence of expansive soils at the site. Mitigation Measure 8 requires geotechnical and geologic reports shall be provided, at the time of building permit application, for project investigation and foundation design for all habitable structures.				
7.e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			X
Discussion: The project involves the expansion of an existing septic system. The expansion is subject to County Environmental Health Division regulations and permit requirements, including percolation testing. See discussion in Section 19.d. which states that mapping of the leachfield area shows there is sufficient disposal area to install leachfields that will match the required capacity. Source: Project plans; "Engineering Letter Report for Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Pie Ranch, 2080 Highway 1, Pescadero, San Mateo County, California APN 089230210", dated March 31, 2022,				
7.f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X
Discussion: Albion Environmental, Inc. (Albion) conducted a cultural resource assessment for proposed construction of a new residence at the adjoining project site to the northeast (APN 089-230-280), as described in the report titled "Pie Ranch, Cultural Resources Assessment for the Proposed Construction at 2080 Cabrillo Highway, Pescadero, California", dated August 2015. Albion conducted a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search which indicated that five cultural resource surveys have been conducted within ¼ mile of the project area, yet no previously recorded archaeological sites are located within the records search area. Albion also conducted intensive visual inspection of the parcel's surface, focusing on the areas proposed for surface disturbance and failed to identify prehistoric or historic cultural material on the surface. The archaeologist also excavated four shovel test pits in the vicinity of the proposed construction and failed to recover anything beyond modern materials. Based on these findings, no further action regarding cultural resources was recommended by Albion. Mitigation Measure 6 (above) requires compliance with the standard recommendation that, in the event that prehistoric traces are encountered, all construction within a fifty-meter radius of the find				

should be stopped, the Planning Department notified, and an archaeologist retained to examine the find and make appropriate recommendations.

The site is flat near Cabrillo Highway and gradually slopes upward to the east. There are no unique geological features that would be impacted by this project.

Source: Project Plans; County GIS Map; "Pie Ranch, Cultural Resources Assessment for the Proposed Construction at 2080 Cabrillo Highway, Pescadero, California", Albion Environmental, Inc., dated August 2015.

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: Relevant project elements for climate change impact analysis include the proposed on-site housing and traffic impacts of the project. The project includes a Bunkhouse that would provide farm labor housing for 8 workers, allowing workers to reside on-site and reducing vehicle commute trips (replacing 3 unpermitted yurts used as worker housing). The project also involves agriculture-related events including 13 barn dances and potluck dinners annually, farm tours, corporate/organizational group-building events, youth and adult education, and associated parking. Public Events include an annual 300 person fundraiser and private events/weddings (13 events/yr). These are events that have occurred for many years. Based on the traffic analysis described in Section 17.a, a daily trip generation was determined for Pie Ranch on weekends without special events. The counts showed that the ranch generates 372 total trips including 187 inbound and 185 outbound between 10:00 AM and 5:00 PM (see Table 1 of Attachment F).

The count distribution shows that a large majority of the trips (approximately 95 percent) are traveling northbound on Highway 1 and continue northbound or are traveling southbound and continue southbound. These can be considered pass-by trips. These are vehicles that stop in at Pie Ranch while already driving on Highway 1 to and from other destinations. The counts show that very few vehicles make a special trip just to go to Pie Ranch. Based on the counts, Pie Ranch is only generating approximately nine inbound and nine outbound trips that would not have occurred had the ranch not been in operation.

Regarding trips associated with special events, most special events occur on Saturdays and/or with attendees travelling to the site by bus or van. These events help to support the farm operations at Pie Ranch, supporting local sourcing of produce and farm products to the Bay Area, which reduces the climate impacts in the region.

Additionally, the applicant plans to apply for grant funding to install 40 kw photovoltaic system on the roofs of the Agricultural Shed and Farmstand, and potentially an addition 10-20 kw system on the roof of the Harvest Shed, including an EV charging station at Farmstand. As such, the project parcel would generate energy onsite, offsetting some of the site's operational energy demand. As such, the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, either during project construction or operation.

Source: Project Plans; Traffic reports prepared by Hexagon, dated November 16, 2022, and September 23, 2016.

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: See Sections 3.a and 8.a. above.					
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 would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use.					

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: As discussed in Section 7.a.v, the site is not located near a coastal cliff or bluff.					
8.e.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
Discussion: As discussed in Section 7.a.v, the site is not located near a coastal cliff or bluff and would not be affected by sea level rise in the near future.					
8.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?		X		
Discussion: The western portion of the project site along Green Oaks Creek is located in Flood Zone A, per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0470E, effective October 16, 2012. Zone A is a special flood hazard area designation, with a 1 percent annual chance of flooding. This flood zone is also called the 100-year flood. The projects involves buildings located in Zone A: • Farmstand renovation and deck addition • Legalization of Outdoor Kitchen (unenclosed) • Proposed Restroom Building near the re-built Steele Family Farmhouse The remaining area of the project site is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0470E, effective October 16, 2012. The proposed Bunkhouse is located in Zone X. Therefore, the project would not place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area. Sherwood Design Engineers, Inc. (Sherwood) has completed a base flood elevation (BFE) study (Attachment I) for the farmhouse (the farmhouse was destroyed in the 2020 CZU fire (now rebuilt) and the building pad refers to the ground at the remaining foundation), offices, and the Farmstand at Pie Ranch in Pescadero, California, dated March 17, 2021. The base flood elevation study was conducted in compliance with San Mateo County requirements to determine the 100-year 24-hour flood stage elevation in the creek adjacent to the subject buildings. Analysis here focuses on the Farmstand, which is an element of this project (not the farmhouse). The ground elevation of the southeast corner of the Farmstand is at 156.32' and the calculated BFE in this section of the stream was calculated to be 155.55'. the ground elevation of the northwest corner of the Farmstand is 154.52' whereas the calculated BFE in this area is 154.87'. The resulting Base Flood Elevation Map for Pie Ranch can be found in Appendix A with BFE Cross Sections of Green Oaks Creek in Appendix B of Attachment I. The results indicate that the ground level at the existing Farmstand is - 0.35 below to 0. 77 feet above the BFE for the 100-year 24-hour flood event. It should be noted that finish floor elevation of the Farmstand was not provided but the finish floor elevation is above the ground elevation via several stairs to enter the Farmstand.					

The BFE at the Farmstand is close to or above the ground surface at the Farmstand. The finish floor elevation of the Farmstand should be surveyed. In the future, if the Farmstand is modified or replaced the finish floor elevation shall be set above a minimum elevation of 156.6 feet to be at least one foot higher than the BFE.

The recommendations of this report are included as Mitigation Measure 9:

Mitigation Measure 9: The Base Flood Elevation (BFE) at the Farmstand is close to or above the ground surface at the Farmstand. The finish floor elevation of the Farmstand should be surveyed. For any replacement or major remodel of the Farmstand, the finish floor elevation shall be set above a minimum elevation of 156.6 feet to be at least one foot higher than the BFE.

Furthermore, the project was reviewed by the County Building Official, where the following standard requirements as listed in Mitigation Measure 10 were identified:

Mitigation Measure 10:

- a. Prior to issuance of Building Permit, the Flood Elevation Certificate for Farmstand and Bathroom buildings will be reviewed by Flood Zone Administrator (Building Official) or External Review
- b. Farm Stand (Major Remodel) and New Bathroom buildings* will need to meet elevation of BFE + 1 (Measures from lowest part of structural member supporting finished floor) and the following requirements:
 - i. All Appliances/Vents need to be UL listed and BFE plus one, unless designed/listed for under BFE+1 use
 - ii. Electrical Panel(s) elevation shall meet BFE+1
 - iii. Connections and piping ok under BFE+1, as long as they are UL listed and installed for flood plain conditions
 - iv. Breakaway Walls and/or Flood Vents may be required for portions of building(s) under BFE +1

Outdoor Kitchen* if unenclosed does not have to be at BFE + 1. See further discussion in Sections 9.h and 8.f.

Source: Project plans; County GIS map. Base Flood Elevation (BFE) study for Farmhouse, offices, and the Farmstand at by Sherwood Design Engineers, Inc., Pie Ranch in Pescadero, California, dated March 17, 2021; Meeting with Building Official on April 23, 2026.

8.g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Discussion: See Sections 8.f and 9.h, above.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

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

9.a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
Discussion: No such uses are proposed. The project involves the construction and operation of farm labor housing and the construction of structures necessary for the continued agricultural use of the property. Source: Project plans.					
9.b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
Discussion: No use involving the storage or release of hazardous materials is proposed. The project involves the construction and operation of farm labor housing and the construction of structures necessary for the continued agricultural use of the property. Source: Project plans.					
9.c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
Discussion: No such uses are proposed. The site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Source: County GIS map.					
9.d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
Discussion: The project site is not a listed hazardous materials site. The site is an existing farm. Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Cortese List.					

9.e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
Discussion: The site is not located within an area regulated by an airport land use plan nor is it located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Source: County GIS map.					
9.f.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X		
Discussion: The site is an existing farm. The project involves modification to the use of existing driveways that would improve the safety of the adjoining roads, Cabrillo Highway and Green Oaks Way. See Section 17.a for a discussion of traffic potential impacts.					
9.g.	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?		X		
Discussion: The site is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in a State Responsibility Area (SRA). The project has been reviewed by the San Mateo County Fire Department. See discussion in Sections 10.b and 20.b.					
9.h.	Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?		X		
Discussion: See discussion in Section 8.f.					
9.i.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?		X		
Discussion: See Section 8.f, above.					
9.j.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		X		
Discussion: See discussion in Sections 9.h and 8.f.					

9.k. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	
Discussion: The site is located approximately 7,000 feet to the east and inland of the perimeter of the tsunami and seiche inundation area. Source: County GIS Map.				

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10.a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?			X	
Discussion: The project would result in less than 10,000 sf. ft. of new or replaced impervious surface and is not subject to stormwater treatment requirements. The project is subject to the County Drainage Manual and erosion control requirements. See discussion of construction phase erosion control in Section 10.c. Source: Project C3C6 Form.				
10.b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
Discussion: The project relies on well and in-stream water sources for the following uses: Drinking Water: Potable water on the site comes from a well near the Farmstand. Previous well tests indicate a minimum of 25 gallons per minute. Per the applicant, Pie Ranch has never had a shortage of water. Green Oaks Creek is not a source of potable water for the subject property. Proposed Change: None Agricultural Water: The adjoining parcel (APN 089-230-280), owned by the applicant, has an in-stream 2 acre-ft agricultural pond on Green Oaks creek and uses this water as part of their agricultural water supply, as well as a 275-ft deep well. Water is piped from these sources to the subject parcel to provide adequate Agricultural water supplies.				

Proposed Changes: None

Fire Water: There is currently a 29,500 gallon water tank installed for the fire rebuild of the Steele House (Farmhouse) with wet draft hydrants per permit BLD2021-00921. There are an additional two 5,000 gallon tanks near the Farmstand.

Proposed change: Add a second wet draft hydrant for use by San Mateo County Fire Department at the Farmstand. This proposed change has been added as Mitigation Measure 11.

The County's Environmental Health Division, which regulates well use and permitting, has reviewed and provided preliminary approval to the project. Therefore, the project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

Mitigation Measure 11: The applicant shall demonstrate in project plans submitted at the time of building permit application the addition of a second wet draft hydrant for use by San Mateo County Fire Department at the Farmstand.

Source: Program Statement.

10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
Discussion: See discussion in Sections 7.b for discussion of erosion and 10.c.ii (below) for discussion of drainage.				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	

Discussion: As the project will result in 1,436 sq. ft. of new or replaced impervious surface, the project could potentially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. Mitigation Measure 10, below, requires post-construction project run-off to comply with standard requirements of the Municipal Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Manual. Project compliance with these regulations will prevent the significant alteration of existing drainage patterns of the site and area. The project does not involve alteration of the course of a stream or river.

Mitigation Measure 12: At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan in compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy.

Mitigation Measure 13: Projects subject to Provision C.3.i (individual single-family home projects that create and/or replace 2,500 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface, and other projects that create and/or replace at least 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface but are not C.3 Regulated Projects) shall implement at least one (1) of the three (3) site design measures listed below:

- a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use.
- b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas.
- c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas.

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

Source: Project C3C6 Form.

iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	
Discussion: See discussion in Section 10.c.ii above.				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
Discussion: See discussion in Section 8.g above.				
10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
Discussion: The site is located approximately 7,000 feet to the east and inland of the perimeter of the tsunami and seiche inundation area. Source: County GIS Map.				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or			X	

sustainable groundwater management plan?				
Discussion: See discussion in Section 10.c.ii above for stormwater discussion. See Section 10.b for groundwater discussion. Source: C3C6 Form; Civil plans, Drainage Report				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?			X	
Discussion: As discussed in Section 6.b (above), should there be any precipitation during project grading or construction, there is the potential for sedimentation in areas downslope from the project area, including run-off to Green Oaks Creek. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4 through 6, potential project impacts related to sedimentation would be reduced to a less than significant level. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4 through 6 as discussed in Section 6.b, potential project impacts to surface water quality related to sedimentation would be reduced to a less than significant level. The County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the use of the existing well, which is subject to applicable permitting requirements. Therefore, the project would have minimal impact on surface or groundwater water quality.				
10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?			X	
Discussion: See discussion in Section 10.c.ii above for stormwater discussion. Source: C3C6 Form; Civil plans, Drainage Report				

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a. Physically divide an established community?				X
Discussion: The project site is located within the Planned Agricultural District (PAD) zoning district, is currently used for agricultural uses, and will continue to be used for agricultural use. The proposed farm labor housing and other improvements would support the agricultural use. Development of the property as proposed would not result in the physical division of an established community. Source: Project Plans.				
11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

Discussion: The project generally complies with the PAD Zoning District and the County's General Plan.

11.c. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?

X

Discussion: The project site is an agricultural parcel and proposed improvements support this use. The project includes the provision of services to meet the demands of the proposed project only and would not encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas.

Source: Project Plans.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

Discussion: The project does not involve any mining or extraction of minerals.

Source: Project Plans.

12.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

X

Discussion: The project would not affect any nearby mineral resource recovery site, if such a site should exist nearby.

Source: Project Plans

13. NOISE. Would the project result in:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
Discussion: The project will generate temporary noise associated with grading and construction. However, such noises will be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the County Ordinance Code. Source: Project plans.				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				X
Discussion: The project will generate temporary noise associated with grading and construction. However, such noises will be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the County Ordinance Code. The project does not involve the construction of large structures requiring pile driving. Source: Project plans.				
13.c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located within an area regulated by an airport land use plan nor is it located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. If a private air strip were nearby, the project does not involve exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. See discussion in Section 13.a. Source: County GIS map.				

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

through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
Discussion: The project site is an agricultural parcel and proposed improvements support this use. The project includes the provision of services to meet the demands of the proposed project only and would not induce significant population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly. No new roads are proposed. The Bunkhouse would house farmworkers working at the site or in the area and would not spur off-site population growth. Source: Project plans; Program Statement.				
14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
Discussion: The project site is an agricultural parcel and proposed improvements support this use. The project would not displace people or housing and would provide housing (Bunkhouse) that would house 8 farmworkers working at the site or in the area. Source: Project plans; Program Statement.				

15. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?			X	
15.b. Police protection?			X	
15.c. Schools?			X	
15.d. Parks?			X	
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?			X	
Discussion: The project involves the construction of farm labor housing and other small buildings to support an existing agricultural use within a rural area. The project site has limited public services (electrical only) and would not significantly impact existing public service levels. The project has been reviewed and conditionally approved by the County Fire Department. Source: Project plans; Utility Plans, County GIS Map, Permit System				

16. RECREATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
Discussion: The project involves the construction of a Bunkhouse for 8 farmworkers on an agricultural parcel and would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The proposed housing is meant to be temporary in nature. Source: County GIS map.				
16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
Discussion: See discussion in Section 16.a Source: County GIS map.				

17. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17.a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking?		X		
Discussion: The applicant describes the existing condition of vehicle circulation and parking in the Program Statement: Pie Ranch has a network of unpaved, all weather, agricultural roads which provide access to all buildings on the property. Primary access is via Green Oaks Way which extends along the southern edge of the site, providing access to parking spaces in the front and rear of the site. An additional road along the northern edge of the site provides access between the project driveway/front parking area and rear parking area. The road within this right of way is 18-20 feet wide composed of compacted gravel and serves 5 adjacent properties east and south of Pie Ranch. The right of way is owned by Lee-Moser (adjacent property owner), however, the Pie Ranch property has an easement over this road. Further back in the site another dirt road that connects between Green Oaks Way and the dirt road on the north side of the site. This provides access to the turnaround area. There is				

also a driveway on the north side of the farmstand. This driveway is primarily used for deliveries, staff and by the customers of the farmstand.

Pie Ranch currently has two primary parking areas, one at the front of the site along Cabrillo Highway, and another behind the site along Green Oaks Way. There is no paved parking area for the site. However, there are 59 defined parking places on the site, including a handicap accessible van area at the entrance to the property. For events requiring more parking, 130 cars can be accommodated without double parking the cars. Other than farm vehicles and equipment, no other cars are allowed beyond this parking area shown in the traffic study.

To support the project, including events and structures, the applicant has submitted a traffic study prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. This traffic study was conducted in order for Pie Ranch to obtain a use permit for current activities. Pie Ranch also proposes to build a bunkhouse on the property that can accommodate up to 8 persons. The purpose of the bunkhouse is to provide a place for employees to live.

The purpose of the traffic study was to ensure that the project site has adequate access, and its traffic can be accommodated at the existing driveways and on Cabrillo Highway. Pie Ranch operates a farmstand year round selling produce and pies and typically draws customers from the passerby traffic along Cabrillo Highway. The farmstand operates between Noon and 5:00 PM on weekdays, and 10:00 AM and 5:00 PM on weekends. It is closed on some major holidays, winter vacation, and for major special events like the fundraising dinner.

Although data collection for this study was completed in 2016, Hexagon understands that conditions haven't changed, and the study results still are applicable. Pie Ranch operations have not changed, and traffic conditions on Highway 1 have not appreciably changed.

The following information is from traffic reports prepared by Hexagon, dated November 16, 2022, and September 23, 2016:

Data Collection

Hexagon conducted turning movement counts at the Pie Ranch driveway and at the intersection of Cabrillo Highway and Green Oaks Way in July 2016. These counts were conducted between 10:00 AM and 5:00 PM on a typical weekend (Saturday), which is when the ranch experiences the highest number of visitors, without a special event. These counts are attached at the end of traffic memorandum (Attachment F). The existing site layout, driveways, and access roads are shown in Figure 1 of Attachment F. Counts were not conducted during a special event or workday as such events occur, at most, once a month, and typically do not occur during the peak hours of traffic along Cabrillo Highway.

Trip Generation and Distribution

Based on the counts, a daily trip generation was determined for Pie Ranch on weekends without special events. The counts showed that the ranch generates 372 total trips including 187 inbound and 185 outbound between 10:00 AM and 5:00 PM (see Table 1 of Attachment F).

The count distribution shows that a large majority of the trips (approximately 95 percent) are traveling northbound on Highway 1 and continue northbound or are traveling southbound and continue southbound. These can be considered pass-by trips. These are vehicles that stop in at Pie Ranch while already driving on Highway 1 to and from other destinations. The counts show that very few vehicles make a special trip just to go to Pie Ranch. Based on the counts, Pie Ranch is only generating approximately nine inbound and nine outbound trips that would not have occurred had the ranch not been in operation.

Observed Conditions

Existing traffic operations at the driveways and in the parking area were observed during a typical Saturday peak hour. These observations were made during a non-special event day in July.

Outbound Vehicles

It was observed that vehicles often do not experience delays while waiting to turn left or right out of either project driveway. The driveways are wide enough, and lack any defined lanes, that vehicles are able to make right turns onto Cabrillo Highway while left-turning vehicles are also present at the driveway. Slight sight distance issues exist for vehicles exiting the northern driveway due to the location of the Pie Ranch sign. The location of this sign is not an issue for drivers exiting from the Green Oaks Way driveway. Additionally, due to the close proximity of the two driveways, vehicles turning left from the driveway were observed not immediately spotting vehicles turning right from Green Oaks Way.

Parking

Pie Ranch does not have defined parking spaces or parking areas. A high majority of the vehicles accessing the site parked in the area in front of Pie Ranch. At certain times, the area in front of the ranch building became relatively congested as vehicle entered the site while other vehicles pulled out of parking spaces. Very few vehicles were observed using the rear parking area despite the availability of spaces, and only busses were parked in the rear during the observation period. Very little signage exists notifying drivers that there are additional parking areas at the rear of the ranch building.

Based on the approximate parking map provided by Pie Ranch, there appear to be 59 defined parking places, however, based on the amount of remaining space on the site, this number is considered to be a relatively low estimate. Without parking on roadways, hindering bus/emergency vehicle turnaround, or parking within riparian areas, it is estimated that Pie Ranch would be able to park up to 130 vehicles without the need to double-park. This amount of parking is more than adequate to serve the needs of the ranch during typical operational hours and special events.

Special Events

Pie Ranch supplied Hexagon with a list and description of the special events that occur on site, including the type of event, the typical attendance, the hours and frequency, and the typical on-site circulation and parking. The events are also described in the Program Statement (Attachment C).

Special events that occur at Pie Ranch include:

- Community Workday, Potluck, and Barn Dance. These events occur every third Saturday of the month and attract between 100 and 150 people. The Workday begins at 2:00 PM and is followed by a Potluck at 6:00, and Barn Dance at 7:00 PM. The events end at 10:00 PM. Guests typically arrive as individuals or small groups and park throughout the site.
- Annual Fundraising Dinner on the Farm. The annual fund raiser typically occurs on a Saturday in September and involves approximately 300 people. The fund raiser follows a similar schedule as the Barn Dance.
- Bay Area Youth Day on the Farm. The Bay Area Youth Day on the Farm is a semi-annual event that draws around 200 youth from around the Bay Area. Each event occurs, typically, mid-week (Wednesday or Thursday) and lasts all day (10 AM to 6 PM). Youth arrive at Pie Ranch via bus, van, and carpool.
- Roadside Barn Workshops. Pie Ranch occasionally hosts farm-focused workshops or discussions on farm-related topics in the Roadside Barn. These events have no set schedule and are organized by various organizations. Such events typically occur mid-week in the afternoon and attract 20 to 40 people.

- Site Rentals. Pie Ranch allows groups to use the site for semi-farm-related events such as weddings or birthday parties. The Ranch schedules no more than 13 of these events each year, and attendees can range from 50 to 150 persons. These types of events follow similar schedules to Barn Dances and are usually on Saturdays.
- Youth Education Programs. During the school year Pie Ranch hosts farm-related education programs for various schools. Approximately one education event is scheduled per week while schools are in session. These events involve between 15 and 30 youth plus teachers and/or parent chaperones. Groups arrive via van or bus.
- Corporate/company/organizational off-site group building events 10-40 people maximum. Groups pay a fee to come to the site for hands-on activities of the farm, such as harvesting, weeding, planting, etc. Tours & farm projects are all related to farming. These events are from 9:00-5:00 and occur 10-12 times a year.*
- Farm Tours - As part of honoring the conservation easement, Pie Ranch provides monthly public tours of the property (every 3rd Saturday of the month) to share our historic resources with others on the same day of the workday and barndance. This event is open to the public but averages 10-20 people per month.*
- Farmer Training - The Apprenticeship Program operates 6 months out of the year (June-December) with up to 7 apprentices who live on site. Apprentices work on the farm and lead youth education and other programmatic activities. Apprentices sleep in either the existing yurts on site or in the historic Steele Family Residence. Pie Ranch advertises the apprenticeship opportunity on our website and on other farm-related sites.*

There is an application process stipulating that apprentices have one year of farm-based experience and that they have an interest in continuing their farm education. Apprentices in Pie Ranch's Emerging Farmers program are provided with a modest monthly stipend along with room and board. Apprentices are taught all aspects of a working farm; learning to develop a crop plan, learning about healthy soil maintenance, organic farming techniques, different careers in farm-based businesses, harvesting and production and animal husbandry. Due to the CZU fire, this use has been suspended until the structures are rebuilt.

- Internship Program (college aged students) - Operates only during the summer for 3 interns who camp on site in tents. Interns assist the Apprentices in their daily activities. Summer interns share the apprentice kitchen in the historic Steele Family Farmhouse and are responsible for their own needs. Summer interns share the restroom facilities with the farm apprentices*

(*not in traffic report)

Shared Driveway Scheduling

The Green Oaks Way driveway is shared with other developments farther back on the site not associated with Pie Ranch, including the Green Oaks Farm and Retreat. The retreat is primarily used for private events during weekends. Pie Ranch and the retreat communicate between one another regarding major events occurring at each location. This communication has allowed both venues to operate normally and schedule large events as to not occur at the same time as one another. Pie Ranch has informed Hexagon that there have been no issues with events occurring simultaneously at each venue, and plans to continue this relationship with the retreat, and other neighboring properties, by sharing its event schedules at least a month in advance of major events.

On-Site Circulation

Pie Ranch currently has two primary parking areas, one at the front of the site along Cabrillo Highway, and another behind the site along Green Oaks Way. In total, the ranch provides approximately 59 parking spaces including 13 spaces at the front of the site, and 46 spaces at the rear of the site (see Figure 2). Observations revealed that the parking areas are not clearly marked. However, vehicles typically parked in a similar manner as shown on Figure 2. The site would benefit from better signage and delineation of the parking areas.

Green Oaks Way extends along the southern edge of the site, providing access to parking spaces in the front and rear of the site. This dirt road is wide enough for one vehicle, but provides adequate space for vehicles to pull over to let other vehicles pass. An additional road along the northern edge of the site (labelled as Road 1 on Figure 1) provides access between the project driveway/front parking area and rear parking area. This dirt road is also wide enough for one vehicle but provides numerous places for vehicles to safely pull off if necessary. Further back in the site another dirt road (labelled as Road 2 on Figure 1) connects between Green Oaks Way and Road 1 and provides access to the turnaround area.

Overall, circulation through the site can accommodate the low traffic volume typically occurring. Busses are provided with adequate turnaround space on-site to exit back onto Cabrillo Highway. Busses were observed making this maneuver with ease provided vehicles are parked in the designated areas.

Green Oaks Way Width

Public Works has indicated that the driveways through the Pie Ranch site should provide adequate space for two vehicles to pass each other. Currently, Green Oaks Way and Road 1 are not wide enough for this maneuver. Pie Ranch has indicated that it intends to widen Green Oaks Way to provide adequate width for two vehicles through the removal of vegetation currently alongside the roadway. Based on AASHTO's geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 6th Edition (2011), Pie Ranch should ensure that Green Oaks Way is a minimum of 18 feet wide.

Driveway Operations

Based on the traffic counts and field review of the driveway and Green Oaks Way striping, Hexagon analyzed the weekend driveway operations. Pie Ranch currently has a driveway located approximately 50 feet north of the Green Oaks Way driveway on Cabrillo Highway. A southbound left-turn lane exists on Cabrillo Highway that serves inbound vehicles to both the Pie Ranch driveway and Green Oaks Way. For outbound left turns from Green Oaks Way there is a southbound acceleration lane in the median. Left-turns out of the Pie Ranch driveway cannot legally use the median for refuge because it is an inbound left-turn lane.

Delay and Queuing at the Driveways

The driveways were analyzed for peak hour delay and 95th percentile queuing using a Poisson probability distribution (see analysis in Attachment F). To eliminate potential conflicts between the closely spaced driveway and Green Oaks Way, Hexagon recommends that the driveway be closed, and all Pie Ranch access come from Green Oaks Way. The removal of the driveway access would minimally increase the average delay for the outbound vehicles at Green Oaks Way and would not increase the 95th percentile queue. No issues would arise by consolidating access to Green Oaks Way. Closing the driveway could be accomplished with a gate that remains closed during operational hours but could be opened for emergency vehicles. The question has come up about whether the driveway could be restricted to right turns only with signage. Hexagon's experience has been that simply providing right-turn-only signage is ineffective at preventing left-turning maneuvers.

Driveway Operations for Special Events

A majority of the Pie Ranch special events occur on the weekends and do not have set arrival or departure times for guests. A few of the events, such as the annual fundraiser dinner or select site rentals, may experience high numbers of vehicles arriving and exiting around the same time. Due to the existing left-turn pocket in the southbound direction and the wide shoulder in the northbound direction, arrivals would not be expected to cause any significant operational issues with traffic on Cabrillo Highway. With high numbers of vehicles exiting at the same time, queues on-site are expected as vehicles turn onto Cabrillo Highway. These queues are likely to dissipate in a short amount of time.

Driveway Safety

Pie Ranch is currently accessed via a driveway on Cabrillo Highway and off of Green Oaks Way. Cabrillo Highway has been striped in this location to provide proper left-turn and acceleration lanes for vehicles entering and exiting the site at Greet Oaks Way. Such lanes do not exist for vehicles entering and exiting at the Pie Ranch driveway. The two access points are 50 feet apart, and potential conflicts can occur between them. It is recommended that the project install a barricade of some type to prevent vehicles from using the driveway, ensuring that all vehicles use the Green Oaks Way/Cabrillo Highway intersection. Barricades could include bollards or fences that are permanent and prevent vehicles from maneuvering around them.

Bunkhouse Traffic

Hexagon understands that an 8-bed bunkhouse is proposed to be added to the ranch. The purpose of the bunkhouse is to house employees of Pie Ranch. The bunkhouse would result in a decrease in traffic to and from the ranch because employees would no longer need to drive to and from their off-site homes.

Conclusions

The purpose of the traffic study was to ensure that Pie Ranch has adequate access, and its traffic can be accommodated at the existing driveways and on Cabrillo Highway. Hexagon's recommendations have been incorporated into Mitigation Measure 14 (with some modification to Recommendation 1, as described below) to reduce traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

A high majority of the trips at Pie Ranch are diverted trips that likely would have existed on Cabrillo Highway had the ranch not been in operation. Overall, the ranch is adding very little additional traffic to the highway. The proposed bunkhouse would reduce the number of employee trips to and from the site.

The project is accessed by two driveways, located in close proximity to one another. The intersection at Green Oaks Way has been properly accommodated with the provision of a southbound left-turn lane and a southbound acceleration lane for exiting vehicles. Such roadway facilities do not exist for at the other driveway location.

- Hexagon's Recommendation 1: The project should remove site access at the existing driveway to ensure all inbound and outbound trips use Green Oaks Way. This improvement would result in increased safety and a minimal impact on delay for inbound and outbound vehicles.

Pie Ranch found the above recommendation to be negatively impactful on their operations and sought additional alternatives from Fehr and Peers to address recommendation. In an email from Daniel Rubins of Fehr and Peers, dated June 3, 2024, Mr. Rubins identified additional design options for the two closely spaced driveways, as listed below and incorporated into Mitigation Measure 14:

- a. Close one of the driveways (Hexagon's recommendation)
- b. Enhance one as a main driveway and the second driveway becomes a right-in-right-out driveway

c. Convert each driveway to one direction

Overall, the project site has good circulation between the parking areas and access roads, and provides adequate space for larger vehicles such as busses to turn around at the rear of the site. Very little signage exists to delineate the parking areas and to notify drivers where the various parking areas are located.

- Recommendation 2: Pie Ranch should improve signage to notify drivers of additional parking areas other than those in front of Farmstand. Parking spaces should be better defined through the use of wheel stops to mark each space.

Pie Ranch has numerous special events that occur throughout the year. It is expected that these events will increase on-site queuing and parking demand, but based on the observed conditions during peak times on weekends, they are not expected to interfere with operations on Cabrillo Highway.

The roadways that currently serve the on-site circulation needs of Pie Ranch do not provide adequate space for two vehicles to maneuver around one another without one vehicle pulling to the side of the driveway.

- Recommendation 3: Pie Ranch should widen Green Oaks Way to a minimum of 18 feet in width by removing existing vegetation.

These recommendations are included in Mitigation Measure 14:

Mitigation Measure 14: Prior to issuance of any building permits for any structures, the applicant shall demonstrate the implementation of the following recommendations of the traffic report prepared by Hexagon, dated November 16, 2022, in submitted plans for a building permit:

- a. The project shall comply with one of the following in order to increase safety and minimize impacts on delay for inbound and outbound vehicles:
 - i. Close one of the driveways (Hexagon's recommendation)
 - ii. Enhance one as a main driveway and the second driveway becomes a right-in-right-out driveway
 - iii. Convert each driveway to one direction
- b. Pie Ranch should improve signage to notify drivers of additional parking areas other than those in front of Farmstand. Parking spaces shall be better defined through the use of wheel stops to mark each space.
- c. Pie Ranch shall widen Green Oaks Way to a minimum of 18 feet in width by mowing existing vegetation in riparian areas and removing existing vegetation in non-riparian areas. Areas cleared shall be maintained regularly for the life of the project.

Source: Traffic reports prepared by Hexagon, dated November 16, 2022, and September 23, 2016. Email from Daniel Rubins of Fehr and Peers, dated June 3, 2024.

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

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

X

Discussion: Please refer to discussion in Section 17.a.

17.c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X		
Discussion: Please refer to discussion in Section 17.a.				
17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?		X		
Discussion: Please refer to discussion in Section 17.a.				

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
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: See discussion in Section 5.b				
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			X	

significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)				
Discussion: Please refer to Section 5.b.				

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X		
Discussion: The project includes a new 300 sq. ft. Restroom Building and Septic and Water Storage System that has been reviewed by the County Environmental Health Division and is subject to permitting requirements. No off-site facility expansions would be necessary to serve the project. Source: Project plans.				
19.b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?		X		
Discussion: The County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the use of the existing well, which will be subject to applicable permitting requirements, as described in the mitigation measure below. Also see discussion under Section 10.b. Mitigation Measure 15: Based on the proposed remodel of the Farm Stand as a commercial kitchen, as well as the legalization of the existing “outdoor kitchen” and the proposed increase in water usage, the water system serving the property will need to be permitted as, at a minimum, a non-community, transient public water system (and possibly a non-transient, or Community system) with the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (DDW). Building permits for any new, or proposed remodel of structures that are served by the water system, may be contingent upon permitting of the water system as a public water system regulated by State DDW. Source: Gregory Smith, Environmental Health				
19.c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?				X

Discussion: The project includes an on-site septic system and would not rely on such services from a wastewater treatment provider.

Source: Project plans.

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

X

Discussion: In a report titled, "Engineering Letter Report for Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Pie Ranch, 2080 Highway 1, Pescadero, San Mateo County, California APN 089230210", dated March 31, 2022, Sherwood Engineers evaluated the onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS) for planned improvements at the project site. The report concluded that:

1. Based on the proposed improvements and estimated occupancy, peak wastewater flows that will be collected and treated is estimated to be 1,773 gpd.
2. The site evaluation and SMCEH guidelines indicate that 1,200 linear feet of leachfield trench is required. Mapping of the leachfield area shows there is sufficient disposal area to install leachfields that will match the required capacity.
3. Preliminary designs of OWTS facilities show that grease traps, septic tanks, and pressure dosed leachfields will treat and dispose of all wastewaters generated by the proposed development.
4. Aerial topography of the leachfield area suggests that the slope of the land may exceed 20%, although the aerial topography is approximate. Installation of leachfields on slopes greater than 20% require a geotechnical report and larger spacing between leachlines than is depicted in the preliminary design. A land survey should be conducted in the field to determine the slope of this area prior to engineering design of the leachfield. Regardless of the slope, there appears to be adequate space to construct the leachfield.

As standard procedure, the leachfield expansion is subject to County Environmental Health Division regulations and permit requirements, as described in Mitigation Measure 16.

Mitigation Measure 16: At the application stage for building permit(s) for any structures served by onsite wastewater treatment systems (OWTS), the plans for the actual OWTS will be required along with all justification for sizing of the OWTS based on both residential and non-residential wastewater sources.

Source: "Engineering Letter Report for Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Pie Ranch, 2080 Highway 1, Pescadero, San Mateo County, California APN 089230210", dated March 31, 2022.

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

X

Discussion: See Section 19.d above.

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

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X		
Discussion: The site is an existing farm. As proposed and mitigated, the project involves modification to the use of existing driveways that would improve the safety of the adjoining roads, Cabrillo Highway and Green Oaks Way. See discussion in Section 17.b.				
20.b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X	
Discussion: The project site is located within an area designated as a State Responsibility Area and, specifically as a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Therefore, project construction and operation could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The project, including the Bunkhouse and outbuildings, have been reviewed and approved by San Mateo County Fire Department. Mitigation Measure 17 has been added to include the standard requirement for the use of fire-rated materials in the areas of roofing, attic ventilation, exterior walls, windows, exterior doors, decking, floors, and underfloor protection. Also, see discussion under Section 10.b. Mitigation Measure 17: This project is located in a wildland urban interface area. Roofing, attic ventilation, exterior walls, windows, exterior doors, decking, floors, and underfloor protection to meet CRC R327 or CBC Chapter 7A requirements. You can visit the Office of the State Marshal's website at: http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland.php and click the new products link to view the "WUI Products Handbook." The property owner shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure prior to San Mateo County Fire Department approval of the building permit for the proposed residence. Source: County GIS; San Mateo County Fire Department letters				
20.c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X	
Discussion: The facility is existing. The project has been reviewed and approved by San Mateo County Fire Department. No installation or maintenance to significant infrastructure is needed that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Source: San Mateo County Fire Department letters				
20.d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or		X		

downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				
Discussion: Regarding flooding, please see Section 8.f.				

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
21.a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
Discussion: Yes, as discussed in this document, the project has the potential to impact agricultural, biological, cultural, scenic, and transportation resources, among minor impacts to other resource areas. Implementation of mitigation measures included in this document would adequately reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.				
21.b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
Discussion: As the property includes many elements that have already been implemented and would be legalized through this project (e.g., special events, outdoor kitchen), full project implementation is not likely to result in incremental effects that could be considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. Source: Project description				

21.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		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 a less than significant level.				

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			
Caltrans	X		Encroachment permit
City			
California Coastal Commission (CCC)	X		County CDP appealable to CCC
California Department of Food and Agriculture			
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)			
Other: _____			
National Marine Fisheries Service			
Regional Water Quality Control Board			
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)			
Sewer/Water District:			
State Department of Fish and Wildlife			
State Department of Public Health			
State Water Resources Control Board			
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)			
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)			
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service			

MITIGATION MEASURES

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed.	X	
The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines: <u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> Minimize new exterior lighting. All new exterior lighting shall be task-oriented with rays confined to the site, downward-directed, and have a maximum color rating of 2200 kelvin. No new light posts will be allowed. Exterior light fixtures shall be shown on plans submitted for a building permit application. <u>Mitigation Measure 2:</u> The applicant shall obtain a demolition permit to remove the 3 yurts and complete the demolition process prior to the final approval of the building permit application for the Bunkhouse. The demolition plan shall include a plan to restore the former area of the yurts to open space or farmland uses. Removal of the one unpermitted shipping container located to the north of the Farmstand is required once construction of the Harvest Shed (BLD2023-03339) is complete. The second container to be removed once the Farmstand is complete. <u>Mitigation Measure 3:</u> Upon the start of excavation activities and through to the completion of the project, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that the following dust control guidelines are implemented: - All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. - All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. - All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. - 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. <u>Mitigation Measure 4:</u> The applicant shall obtain a CDX permit to removal of the existing, outdoor, unpermitted produce washing system at back of Farmstand, which borders Green Oaks Creek, and complete the demolition process prior to the final approval of the building permit application for the Harvest Shed. Mitigation Measure 5 shall apply. <u>Mitigation Measure 5:</u> Based on the close proximity of project activities to sensitive habitat and species that may be present in or near to Green Oaks Creek, the following Additional Mitigation Measures (AMMs) are recommended to ensure adequate protection of these species in addition to their habitats. [Reference to tree removal or clearing has been removed as that is not in the scope of this project]. AMM BIO-1: All buffer zones (including wetland and riparian, as well as streamline buffer zones) shall be clearly demarcated in the field during construction-related activities using orange construction fencing and/or silt fencing and signage to prevent incidental trespass by construction personnel into these areas. No project activities including staging of materials, loitering, eating, drinking, smoking, refueling, placement of hazardous materials, parking of vehicles, nor any other construction-related activity is permitted in these areas. Further vegetation clearing and/or removal of topsoil in this area is strictly prohibited; mowing may be performed prior to construction for fire control and/or access. Furthermore, placement of spoils will be restricted to areas outside any buffer zones (including any buffer zones established for sensitive species).		

AMM BIO-2: Water quality best management practices shall be developed using Best Management Practices to prevent any accidental discharge of materials or equipment into nearby sensitive habitats and buffer zones, particularly during construction activities within the current 30-foot buffer zone. At a minimum, refueling and/or maintenance of equipment or vehicles shall be performed outside any of the delineated setback zones. Adequate spill protection kits shall be placed immediately adjacent to refueling/maintenance locations.

AMM BIO-3: A worker awareness environmental training program (program) is required to be presented by a qualified biologist to construction personnel prior to the start of construction activities. The program shall include information on the location of sensitive habitats in the vicinity of the Project along with a map showing their respective "no-disturbance" buffer zones. Buffer zones shall be clearly demarcated in the field as stated above and the program shall include a list of restricted activities within these areas as described in AMM BIO-1. The worker environmental training program (program) provided under AMM BIO-3 (2019 report) shall also include information on the known or potential use of the site by any sensitive species, 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 protocols to follow as well as a contact person if protected biological resources are discovered on the project site during activities.

AMM BIO-4: All outdoor lighting shall be downcast and no outdoor lighting within the 30-foot buffer shall be allowed.

AMM BIO-5: Landscaping within buffer zones shall be appropriate to the surrounding habitat including Green Oaks Creek and its associated riparian habitat. The biologist shall review final landscaping plans to ensure the planting plan is appropriate to the existing landscape. Within the current buffer zone, any invasive species listed as moderate or high on the Cal-IPC website <https://www.cal-ipc.org/plants/inventory/> that are present shall be removed prior to planting. The presence of non-porous pavement of similar material is prohibited within the 30-foot buffer zone, with the exception of underground water or irrigation lines as needed.

AMM BIO-6: Permanent fencing (including either existing fencing or similar structural deterrent including boulders or split rail fencing) shall be maintained between the subject property and Green Oaks Creek to prevent humans and pets from trampling vegetation and/or accessing sensitive aquatic habitats where sensitive species may be present.

AMM BIO-7: Pre-construction surveys for CRLF, SFGS, and NWPT shall be performed no less than 48 hours prior to the start of project activities (including construction, vegetation clearing, staging, and/or any other project-related activity). The survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist with familiarity identifying both species. All areas of the project site and adjacent buffer areas (up to 300 feet) shall be searched. If either species is found, work shall be halted, and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) contacted. If possible, the animal should be allowed to leave the area on its own. If it does not leave on its own, all work shall remain halted until the USFWS provides authorization for work to resume.

AMM BIO-8: Pre-construction surveys for San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat houses shall be performed no less than 30 days prior to construction. If stick houses are found and avoidance is not feasible, the houses shall be dismantled by hand under the supervision of a biologist. If young are encountered during the dismantling process, the material shall be placed back on the house and a buffer of 25 feet shall be established for a minimum of 3 weeks to allow young time to mature and leave the nest. Nest material shall be moved to a suitable adjacent area for reuse.

AMM BIO-9: Pre-construction nesting bird and raptor surveys shall be performed on and in all accessible areas adjacent to the project site (up to 300 feet for songbirds and up to 500 feet for raptors) if activities are proposed to occur during the nesting bird season (February 1 to August

31) including any tree removal and/or noise or visual disturbance; areas where prior nests have been found shall be monitored by the biologist to determine status of the nest and whether occupied or not. Surveys shall be performed no less than 10 days prior to the start of activities by a qualified biologist. If an occupied or active nest is found, a no-disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest site in accordance with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) guidance on the establishment of nest buffers. Nest buffers shall remain in place until all young have fledged and left the nest or are no longer dependent on parents for feeding, or if the nest fails due to natural causes (e.g., storm event or natural predation).

AMM BIO-10: All outdoor work shall be performed during daylight hours; no work shall be performed within 30 minutes of sunrise or sunset.

AMM BIO-11: Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) rolled erosion control products, or similar material should not be used. Acceptable substitutes include coconut coir matting or tackified hydroseeding compounds.

AMM BIO-12: Trenches and holes should be covered and inspected daily for stranded animals. Trenches and holes deeper than one foot should contain escape ramps at a maximum slope of 2:1 to allow trapped animals to escape.

AMM BIO-13. A pre-construction winter roost survey for Monarch butterfly shall be performed in remaining intact stands of eucalyptus, Monterey pine, and/or Douglas fir between November 1 and January 15 to assess the status of roost habitat post fire.

AMM BIO-14. If monarch butterfly winter roost habitat is observed, a 100-foot no disturbance buffer shall be established around the roost until the end of the roost season

Mitigation Measure 6: In the event that prehistoric traces (human remains, artifacts, concentrations of shell/bone/rock/ash) are encountered, all construction within a fifty-meter radius of the find should be stopped, the Planning Department notified, and an archaeologist retained to examine the find and make appropriate recommendations.

Mitigation Measure 7: The property owner, applicant, and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend subsequent measures for disposition of the remains.

Mitigation Measure 8: No habitable structures shall be permitted on this site unless the proposed building area has been investigated and cleared by a geologic study that confirms a minimum 50-foot setback (or more) from identified fault traces. At the time of building permit application, geotechnical and geologic reports shall be provided for project investigation and foundation design for all habitable structures. For all proposed non-habitable structures, a consent letter shall be provided at building permit stage, provided by the current owner, that:

- a. The parcel is located within Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, San Gregorio Fault Zone. Without full trenching at the site, it is unknown if the current project is located on or within 50' of an active fault trace.
- b. It is unknown whether or what damage would be made to the proposed structure without detailed study, so total damage should be expected in case of a major earthquake event.

- c. When and if the current proposed project is going to be converted to a habitable structure, a detailed study shall be provided per county zoning code SECTION 6326.3, and California Geological Survey SP117A.

Mitigation Measure 9: The Base Flood Elevation (BFE) at the Farmstand is close to or above the ground surface at the Farmstand. The finish floor elevation of the Farmstand should be surveyed. For any replacement or major remodel of the Farmstand, the finish floor elevation shall be set above a minimum elevation of 156.6 feet to be at least one foot higher than the BFE.

Mitigation Measure 10:

- a. Prior to issuance of Building Permit, the Flood Elevation Certificate for Farmstand and Bathroom buildings will be reviewed by Flood Zone Administrator (Building Official) or External Review
- b. Farm Stand (Major Remodel) and New Bathroom buildings* will need to meet elevation of BFE + 1 (Measures from lowest part of structural member supporting finished floor) and the following requirements:
 - i. All Appliances/Vents need to be UL listed and BFE plus one, unless designed/listed for under BFE+1 use
 - ii. Electrical Panel(s) elevation shall meet BFE+1
 - iii. Connections and piping ok under BFE+1, as long as they are UL listed and installed for flood plain conditions
 - iv. Breakaway Walls and/or Flood Vents may be required for portions of building(s) under BFE +1

Outdoor Kitchen* if unenclosed does not have to be at BFE + 1. See further discussion in Sections 9.h and 8.f.

Mitigation Measure 11: The applicant shall demonstrate in project plans submitted at the time of building permit application the addition of a second wet draft hydrant for use by San Mateo County Fire Department at the Farmstand.

Mitigation Measure 12: At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan in compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy.

Mitigation Measure 13: Projects subject to Provision C.3.i (individual single-family home projects that create and/or replace 2,500 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface, and other projects that create and/or replace at least 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface but are not C.3 Regulated Projects) shall implement at least one (1) of the three (3) site design measures listed below:

- a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use.
- b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas.
- c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas.

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

Mitigation Measure 14: Prior to issuance of any building permits for any structures, the applicant shall demonstrate the implementation of the following recommendations of the traffic report prepared by Hexagon, dated November 16, 2022, in submitted plans for a building permit:

- d. The project shall comply with one of the following in order to increase safety and minimize impacts on delay for inbound and outbound vehicles:
 - i. Close one of the driveways (Hexagon's recommendation)
 - ii. Enhance one as a main driveway and the second driveway becomes a right-in-right-out driveway
 - iii. Convert each driveway to one direction
- e. Pie Ranch should improve signage to notify drivers of additional parking areas other than those in front of Farmstand. Parking spaces shall be better defined through the use of wheel stops to mark each space.
- f. Pie Ranch shall widen Green Oaks Way to a minimum of 18 feet in width by mowing existing vegetation in riparian areas and removing existing vegetation in non-riparian areas. Areas cleared shall be maintained regularly for the life of the project.

Mitigation Measure 15: Based on the proposed remodel of the Farm Stand as a commercial kitchen, as well as the legalization of the existing "outdoor kitchen" and the proposed increase in water usage, the water system serving the property will need to be permitted as, at a minimum, a non-community, transient public water system (and possibly a non-transient, or Community system) with the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (DDW).

Building permits for any new, or proposed remodel of structures that are served by the water system, may be contingent upon permitting of the water system as a public water system regulated by State DDW.

Mitigation Measure 16: At the application stage for building permit(s) for any structures served by onsite wastewater treatment systems (OWTS), the plans for the actual OWTS will be required along with all justification for sizing of the OWTS based on both residential and non-residential wastewater sources.

Mitigation Measure 17: This project is located in a wildland urban interface area. Roofing, attic ventilation, exterior walls, windows, exterior doors, decking, floors, and underfloor protection to meet CRC R327 or CBC Chapter 7A requirements. You can visit the Office of the State Marshal's website at: http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland.php and click the new products link to view the "WUI Products Handbook." The property owner shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure prior to San Mateo County Fire Department approval of the building permit for the proposed residence.

DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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



(Signature)

August 10, 2026

Senior Planner

Date

(Title)

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Project Plans
- C. Program Statement
- D. Prime Soils Map
- E. Sol Ecology Biological Reports for the project, including 2016 Biological Impact Form; March 2019; Addendum letter, dated November 9, 2022; Ecological Concerns, Inc letter, dated April 10, 2026.
- F. Traffic reports prepared by Hexagon, dated November 16, 2022, and September 23, 2016.
- G. Email from Daniel Rubins of Fehr and Peers, dated June 3, 2024.
- H. Evaluation of Modifications to Pie Ranch, 2080 Highway 1-CA, San Mateo County, CA, dated April 28, 2025.
- I. Base Flood Elevation (BFE) study for Farmhouse, offices, and the Farmstand at by Sherwood Design Engineers, Inc., Pie Ranch in Pescadero, California, dated March 17, 2021
- J. Engineering Letter Report for Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Pie Ranch, 2080 Highway 1, Pescadero, San Mateo County, California APN 089230210, by Sherwood Design Engineers, Inc., dated March 31, 2022.