November 13, 2026

Will Gibson, Planner III
Planning & Building Department
455 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063
Email: wgibson@smcgov.org

CC: Ray Mueller, Board of Supervisors, San Mateo County, SMC_SupMueller@smcgov.org

Re: County of San Mateo Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada - NOP for Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Dear Mr. Gibson,

The SMC Housing Element Rezoning Program identifies six parcels subject to the Rezoning Plan located between Coral Reef Avenue and Sevilla Avenue in El Granada, totaling 12.45 acres of vacant undeveloped land. The County is proposing a density of 30 to 70 units per acre, which could theoretically result in 373.5 to 871.5 new units in buildings up to 70 feet tall. The sites contain senstive habitat, sit in a neighborhood of one and two-story homes, and rely on a highway corridor with limited capacity and few evacutation routes.

The current population of El Granada is 5,232 (https://censusreporter.org/profiles/16000US0621936-el-granada-ca/). If we assume each of these new units has an average of 2.3 people per unit, that increases the population of El Granada between 858 to 2,003 people or by 16.4% to 38.3%. That will put a considerable strain on the infrastructure of this small community.

We ask that the EIR address the following.

Traffic and Evacution

- Study Highway 1, Highway 92, and nearby streets (including effects on coastal access) under the following conditions:
  - Weekday (particularly rush hours)
  - Weekend
  - School start/end times (elementary, middle and high schools all have staggered times)
  - Summer (particularly holiday traffic for Memorial Day, July 4th and Labor Day weekends) or when the temperatures in Sacramento are higher than 90 degrees (as folks flock to the beaches)
  - October (for pumpkin season and particularly Pumpkin Fest weekend)
- Study any impacts to air quality as a result of the increase in traffic.
- Test whether one parking space per unit is realistic, and the effect of spillover parking on neighborhood streets. Per this census data (https://censusreporter.org/profiles/16000US0621936-el-granada-ca/), there are currently 2.3 people per household in El Granada with 87% over the age of 18.

- Model wildfire, tsunami and highway-closure evaculation, including cumulative growth from the rest of the Coastside. The 12/5/24 tsunami warning event caused much chaos and congested traffic as residents tried to evacuate.

Infrastructure

- Water and sewer: confirm in writing that the Coastside County Water District and Granada Community Services District have capacity, including in drought, heavy rain or catastrophic fire events (such as the CZU Fire from 2020).
- Electrical Grid: Evaluate the stability of the electrical grid to handle the capacity.
  - Particularly if residents own electric vehicles and all utilities are required to be electric (rather than gas).
- Internet and other telecommunications: Study the stability and availability of mobile signal and high speed network.
  - Telecommunications are already fragile and there is not internet redundancy on the coast. Evaluate the stability of internet access with increased demand, particularly during an emergency event.

Other Impacts

- Aesthetics: Visual simulations of 60-70 foot high buildings from Highway 1, coastal routes, and neighborhood streets, plus lighting and glare.
- Light Pollution: Study the impact of light pollution on insects, birds and other wildlife.
  - https://www.nwf.org/Magazines/National-Wildlife/2023/Summer/Conservation/Light-Pollution-Wildlife
- Flight Path: Evaluate whether there are any impacts for the flight path for the Half Moon Bay airport regarding the 60-70 foot high structures.
- Fire Safety: https://www.fire.ca.gov/osfm/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones This site in located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Study the fire mitigation / defensible-space conflicts with this site location for such a high density structure.
  - Determine whether the local fire departments have the appropriate fire engine ladder heights for structures of this size.
- Public Services: fire, emergency medical, sheriff, and schools. Please add Public Services to the list of topics analyzed.
    - Note: Much of El Granada does not have sufficient sidewalks or street lights to ensure the safety of children en route to school.

Habitat and Wetlands

- Complete a wetland delineation before the EIR is circulated. The NOP notes wetland vegatation across much of the site, and residents have observed about 12 vernal pools.
  - https://wiki.bugwood.org/Eucalyptus_globulus#POLLINATION
- Survey in the right seasons, including the winter monarch overwintering period and spring rare plant bloom, rather than relying on a single visit.
  - https://westernmonarchcount.org/map-of-overwintering-sites/
- Analyze impacts on wildlife including but not limited to monarch habitat, the red-legged frong, nesting birds, woodrats, and bats.

- Analyze drainage, groundwater, and runoff to Denniston and Deer Creeks.
- Evaluate consistency with Coastal Act and LCP habitat and wetland policies, and use avoidance first, with protective buffers and long-term monitoring.

Please add our email addresses to the notification list for all future documents and hearings.

Thank you,

Kelly & Jeff Rogers
PO Box 2932
El Granada, CA 94018

From: GABRIEL SILVA
To: Will Gibson
Subject: STRONG OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED EL GRANADA REZONING – REZONING PROGRAM
Date: Saturday, November 14, 2026 8:31:35 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Mr. Gibson,

I am writing to express my strong and unequivocal opposition to the El Granada phase of the proposed Rezoning Program, specifically the proposal to rezone six currently undeveloped, residentially zoned parcels in El Granada to allow higher-density multifamily housing.

I believe this proposal is fundamentally misguided and fails to adequately consider the existing conditions, infrastructure limitations, public safety concerns, and long-term consequences for the El Granada community.

El Granada is an established single-family residential community, and this proposal threatens the character and quality of life that residents have worked hard to preserve. Increasing residential density in an area that is already challenged by limited infrastructure and constrained transportation access is irresponsible without first demonstrating that the community can adequately support the additional population.

My concerns include the following:

1. Inadequate Infrastructure

El Granada's existing infrastructure is already limited. Before considering additional housing density, the County must demonstrate that water supply, sewer capacity, stormwater drainage, roads, and other essential public infrastructure can accommodate the increased demand. Rezoning land without first addressing these fundamental limitations places an unreasonable burden on existing residents and public services.

2. Highway Access and Traffic Congestion

Access to and from El Granada is already constrained by the limited highway access points and the area's dependence on Highway 1. Additional multifamily housing will generate more vehicle trips, increasing congestion on local roads and Highway 1. This will further complicate daily commutes, school transportation, and access for residents, visitors, and emergency vehicles.

The County cannot simply approve increased density without providing a credible, comprehensive traffic and transportation plan that addresses these existing constraints.

3. Insufficient Medical Facilities and Emergency Services

The availability and accessibility of medical facilities and emergency services are significant

concerns. El Granada and the surrounding coastal communities have limited medical resources and are dependent on emergency responders who must navigate the same constrained roadways as everyone else.

Adding population without demonstrating that fire protection, emergency medical response, ambulance services, and other critical public safety resources can meet the increased demand is unacceptable. In an emergency, additional traffic congestion and limited access routes could have serious consequences for public safety.

4. Increased Residential Congestion and Overburdened Public Services

Higher-density multifamily development will increase the number of residents, vehicles, parking demands, and the overall strain on an already limited community infrastructure. This will affect neighborhood streets, parking availability, public services, and the daily lives of existing homeowners.

The cumulative impact of these changes must be considered, rather than evaluating the six parcels in isolation.

5. Irreversible Impact on the Character and Quality of Life of El Granada

El Granada has a distinct residential character that is largely defined by its established single-family neighborhoods, coastal setting, and community atmosphere. Introducing higher-density multifamily housing into areas that have historically been designated for residential use consistent with the surrounding neighborhood risks fundamentally changing that character.

Residents should not be expected to absorb the consequences of increased density, congestion, parking pressures, and strained public services without a clear and compelling demonstration that the benefits outweigh the negative impacts.

Housing policy should not come at the expense of responsible planning, public safety, environmental considerations, and the well-being of existing communities.

The County's responsibility is not simply to identify land that can be rezoned, but to ensure that any proposed development is appropriate for the location and supported by the infrastructure and services necessary to sustain it. Rezoning these six parcels before resolving the community's existing infrastructure, transportation, and emergency service limitations reverses that responsibility.

I strongly urge the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the proposed rezoning of these six El Granada parcels for higher-density multifamily housing.

At an absolute minimum, no rezoning should move forward without comprehensive and independently supported assessments of infrastructure capacity, traffic and Highway 1 access, emergency response capabilities, medical service availability, parking, and the cumulative impact on the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

The concerns of existing residents must be given meaningful consideration, not treated as

an obstacle to predetermined housing objectives.

El Granada is more than a collection of parcels available for increased development. It is an established residential community with finite resources, limited access, and a quality of life worth protecting. Future planning decisions must respect those realities.

I respectfully request that the County remove these six parcels from the proposed higher-density rezoning plan and preserve the existing residential zoning.

Please include this letter in the official public record and provide confirmation that my opposition has been received and considered.

Sincerely,

Gabriel Silva
El Granada Resident

From:	Barbara Neumann
To:	Will Gibson
Cc:	acostar@cabrillo.k12.ca.us
Subject:	Public Scoping Comments: Phase 2 Housing Element Rezoning Program – Burnham Strip & El Granada CUSD Parcels EIR
Date:	Sunday, November 15, 2026 12:28:40 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Mr. Gibson,

I am writing as a resident of El Granada to submit scoping comments for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) regarding the proposed Phase 2 Housing Element Rezoning of the six Cabrillo Unified School District (CUSD) parcels in El Granada, with a particular focus on the **Burnham Strip** corridor (between Coral Reef Avenue and Sevilla Avenue).

Rezoning this narrow, undeveloped greenbelt corridor to allow high-density residential development (up to 70 units per acre and 60-to-70-foot building heights) poses severe site-specific and cumulative impacts. To ensure a thorough and legally defensible CEQA review, please ensure the Draft EIR fully evaluates the following issues:

- **Wildlife Habitats, Wetlands, and Monarch Overwintering Sites:** The Burnham Strip contains sensitive coastal habitats, including documented wetland vegetation, seasonal vernal pools, and a verified Xerces Monarch Butterfly overwintering grove. The EIR must include a formal wetland delineation prior to Draft EIR circulation, multi-season biological surveys (including winter monarch overwintering and spring rare plant blooms), and targeted studies for special-status species such as the California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, nesting birds, bats, and native bumblebees. It must also enforce strict Coastal Act and Local Coastal Program (LCP) protective buffers rather than allowing streamlined, staff-level approvals to bypass habitat avoidance. [1, 2]
- **Drainage, Groundwater, and Creek Runoff:** Because the Burnham Strip acts as a natural permeable buffer that absorbs coastal rainfall, paving this corridor will dramatically increase impervious surface runoff. The EIR must analyze localized flooding on adjacent residential streets, groundwater recharge impacts, and polluted stormwater runoff flowing toward Denniston Creek, Deer Creek, and Pillar Point Harbor. [1]
- **Highway 1 Traffic Bottlenecks and Local Access:** Analyze cumulative Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and level-of-service impacts along Highway 1, specifically modeling how hundreds of additional trips entering and exiting Highway 1 from the Burnham Strip intersections (such as Coral Reef Avenue, Santiago Avenue, and Sevilla Avenue) will worsen peak commute congestion

and weekend coastal visitor gridlock.

- **Emergency Evacuation Routes and Wildfire Risk:** Conduct a dedicated evacuation clearance time analysis under wildfire, tsunami, and seismic scenarios. The EIR must evaluate both the wildfire hazard posed by the dense eucalyptus, pine, and cypress stands along the Burnham Strip and how adding high-density housing directly adjacent to Highway 1 will bottleneck emergency ingress and egress along Highway 1 and Highway 92. [1]
- **Water and Sewer Capacity:** Require written verification from the Coastside County Water District (CCWD) and the Granada Community Services District (GCSD) / Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM) confirming adequate capacity to serve up to 370 to 870 new units. This analysis must address GCSD's documented sewer collection limitations in El Granada, wet-weather overflow risks, and drought-year water supply reliability. [1]

Finally, please ensure the Draft EIR evaluates a reasonable range of project alternatives, including an alternative that preserves the Burnham Strip's wetlands and monarch overwintering habitat, lowers maximum building heights to match El Granada's one- and two-story character, and shifts density to less environmentally constrained sites.

Thank you for incorporating these issues into the EIR scope and entering these comments into the public record.

Sincerely,

Barbara and Rainer Neumann
714 Sonora Ave, El Granada, CA

[mailing address is 714 Sonora Ave, Half Moon Bay, CA 94919]

From: Ben Nitzan
To: Will Gibson; Ray Mueller
Subject: EIR Rezoning Parcels El Granada
Date: Friday, November 13, 2026 3:14:27 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Supervisor Mueller, Planner Gibson and San Mateo County Planning Commission,

As a long-time resident of El Granada I am astounded by the San Mateo County's Housing Element Rezoning Program to rezone parcels to accommodate 30 to 70 residential units per acre, with building heights potentially reaching 60 to 70 feet! Is this some kind of joke?!

Assuming an average of 2.2 residents per unit, that could mean approximately 823 additional residents at 30 units per acre, or 1,918 additional residents at 70 units per acre. That's absurd!
Why? Let me count the ways.

1. More people sharing the same neighborhood streets, parks, and public facilities.
2. Greater demand for parking, recreation, pedestrian facilities, and community services.
3. More activity throughout the day and evening.
4. A change from a relatively low-density residential neighborhood to a much more urban residential environment.
5. Traffic:
    a. More congestion at Highway 1 intersections, particularly during morning and evening commutes.
    b. Increased traffic on Coronado Street, Coral Reef Avenue, Sevilla Avenue, andsurroundingresidential streets.
    c. More difficulty entering and exiting residential driveways. Greater competition for street parking.
    d. More pedestrian and bicycle conflicts, particularly around intersections and school routes.
    e. Increased pressure on Highway 1 during accidents, road closures, and emergency evacuations.
6. Parking:
    a. The County's proposed standards contemplate a maximum of one parking space per residential unit. At 872 units, that would mean a maximum of 872 required or provided spaces under that standard, depending on how the final regulations are written. Some households have two or more vehicles. Visitors, service providers, caregivers, and deliveries also need places to stop. This raises an important question: Will parking spill into the existing residential streets? The EIR should examine parking demand, on-street parking capacity, and traffic circulation together, rather than treating them as separate issues.
7. Water and sewer:
    a. This is particularly important because El Granada is served by separate local water and sewer agencies: Coastside County Water District and Granada Community Services District. If the development adds approximately 823–1,918

residents, water consumption and wastewater generation could increase substantially.

8. Schools, recreation, and community services: More residents could mean more children, families, and demand for local facilities. The County's environmental review identifies nearby schools including El Granada Elementary, Wilkinson School, Pilarcitos High School, and Half Moon Bay High School.
    a. Potential impacts include:
        i. Increased school enrollment.
        ii. Greater demand for classrooms and school transportation.
        iii. More use of playgrounds, parks, and recreational facilities.
        iv. Greater demand for public gathering spaces.
        v. Increased demand for local healthcare and other community services.
    b. The impact will depend heavily on the eventual housing mix. Smaller apartments may attract different household sizes than larger family-oriented units.
    c. The County should obtain enrollment projections and capacity information from the affected school districts rather than assume that existing facilities can absorb the additional population.
9. Neighborhood character: A potentially dramatic visual change existing neighborhood character: predominantly one- and two-story homes
    a. This is arguably one of the most visible changes residents would experience.
    b. A building reaching 70 feet could be approximately five to six stories, depending on floor-to-floor heights and building design.
    c. Compared with surrounding one- and two-story houses, this could create a very different built environment. Potential effects include:
        i. **Views:** Buildings could obstruct existing views of hills, trees, and surrounding landscapes.
        ii. **Privacy:** Upper-floor windows and balconies could overlook neighboring backyards and homes.
        iii. **Shadows:** Taller buildings could shade nearby homes and outdoor spaces, especially during winter.
        iv. **Visual scale:** Large buildings could dominate the existing residential streetscape.
        v. **Noise:** More residents, deliveries, parking activity, and outdoor recreation could increase neighborhood noise.
        vi. **Trees and vegetation:** Construction could remove existing trees and reduce the green character of the area.
        vii. **Open space:** Greater building coverage could reduce the amount of undeveloped land and natural habitat.
    d. The proposed zoning standards also contemplate setbacks of 10 feet or less and eliminating existing residential floor-area and minimum lot-area-per-unit standards. Those changes make building mass, landscaping, and transitions to neighboring properties especially important.
10. Environmental and coastal impacts
    a. Because these parcels are within the Coastal Zone, environmental considerations deserve particular attention.
    b. Potential concerns include:
        - Loss of trees, vegetation, and wildlife habitat.
        - Increased impervious surfaces and stormwater runoff.
        - Construction-related noise, dust, and air pollution.
        - Increased greenhouse gas emissions from additional vehicle trips.

Drainage and flooding concerns.
- Geotechnical issues and potential wildfire exposure.
- Effects on the visual character of the coastal community.

c. The California Coastal Commission will also have a role because the rezoning requires a Local Coastal Program amendment.

The Planning Commission must ensure that El Granada's housing needs are addressed responsibly, without sacrificing the infrastructure, environmental quality, safety, and neighborhood character that make the community special.

Thank you for all of the good work you do, we truly appreciate it!

Sincerely,
Ben Nitzan, Concerned EG Resident

From:	Sierra, Jessica@Wildlife
To:	Will Gibson
Cc:	Husband, Shannon@Wildlife; Stokes, Wesley@Wildlife; Weightman, Craig@Wildlife; state.clearinghouse@lci.ca.gov
Subject:	San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2-El Granada-SCH2026100845
Date:	Friday, November 13, 2026 3:59:51 PM
Attachments:	Outlook-4ext5xut.png Outlook-c2hzbsoj.png San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2-El Granada-SCH2026100845-Gibson-HUSBAND11132026.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached letter for your records. If you have any questions, contact Shannon Husband, cc'd above.

Thank you,

Jessica Sierra
Analyst I/ Administrative Support Analyst
California Department of Fish and Wildlife – Bay Delta Region

2109 Arch Airport Rd., Stockton, CA 95206
209-616-6011
jessica.sierra@wildlife.ca.gov

Docusign Envelope ID: 3E2D34C5-B212-84EB-81AD-DC15D598589B

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
MEGHAN HERTEL, Director

Bay Delta Region
2825 Cordelia Road, Suite 100
Fairfield, CA 94534
wildlife.ca.gov

November 13, 2026

Will Gibson, Planner III
San Mateo County
455 County Center
Redwood City, CA, 94063
WGibson@smcgov.org

Subject: San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2- El Granada, Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report, SCH No. 2026100845, San Mateo County

Dear Will Gibson:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed the San Mateo County (County) Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada (Project) pursuant the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.[1]

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may be required to carry out or approve through the exercise of its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

CDFW is providing the County, as the lead agency, with specific detail about the scope and content of the environmental information related to CDFW's area of statutory responsibility that must be included in the EIR (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15082, subd. (b)).

CDFW ROLE

CDFW is California's **Trustee Agency** for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State. (Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subd. (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; CEQA Guidelines § 15386, subd. (a).) CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species. (*Id.*, § 1802.) Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW is also submitting comments as a **Responsible Agency** under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381.) CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) regulatory authority. (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.) Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take" as defined by State law of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.), the project proponent may seek related take authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code.

[1] CEQA is codified in the California Public Resources Code in section 21000 et seq. The "CEQA Guidelines" are found in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, commencing with section 15000.

Docusign Envelope ID: 3E2D34C5-B212-84EB-81AD-DC15D598589B

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

California Endangered Species Act

A CESA Incidental Take Permit (ITP) must be obtained from CDFW if the Project has the potential to result in "take" of plants or animals listed under CESA, either during construction or over the life of the Project. Under CESA, "take" means "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill." (Fish & G. Code, § 86.) CDFW's issuance of an ITP is subject to CEQA and to facilitate permit issuance, any project modifications and mitigation measures must be incorporated into the CEQA document analysis, discussion, and mitigation monitoring and reporting program. If the Project will impact CESA listed species, early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to the Project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA Permit.

CEQA requires a mandatory finding of significance if a project is likely to substantially impact threatened or endangered species. Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21001, subd. (c) & 21083; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15380, 15064 & 15065.) In addition, pursuant to CEQA, the lead agency cannot approve a project unless all impacts to the environment are avoided or mitigated to less-than-significant levels, or the lead agency makes and supports Findings of Overriding Consideration (FOC) for impacts that remain significant despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation. FOC under CEQA, however, do not eliminate the Project proponent's obligation to comply with the Fish and Game Code.

Lake and Streambed Alteration

CDFW requires an LSA Notification, pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1600 et seq., for Project activities affecting river, lakes or streams and associated riparian habitat. Notification is required for any activity that may substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow; change or use material from the bed, channel, or bank (including associated riparian or wetland resources); or deposit or dispose of material where it may pass into a river, lake, or stream. Work within ephemeral streams, drainage ditches, washes, watercourses with a subsurface flow, and floodplains is generally subject to notification requirements. In addition, infrastructure installed beneath such aquatic features, such as through hydraulic directional drilling, is also generally subject to notification requirements**.** Therefore, any impact to the mainstems, tributaries, or floodplains or associated riparian habitat caused by the proposed Project will likely require an LSA Notification. CDFW may not execute a final LSA Agreement until it has considered the final EIR and complied with its responsibilities as a responsible agency under CEQA.

Migratory Birds and Raptors

CDFW has authority over actions that may result in the disturbance or destruction of active bird nest sites or the unauthorized take of birds. Fish and Game Code sections protecting birds, their eggs, and nests include section 3503 (regarding unlawful take, possession, or needless destruction of the nests or eggs of any bird), section 3503.5 (regarding the take, possession, or destruction of any birds-of-prey or their nests or eggs), and section 3513 (regarding unlawful take of any migratory nongame bird). Migratory birds are also protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Proponent: San Mateo County

Objective: The proposed Project is the implementation of the second phase of Housing Element Program HE 11.2 consisting of amendments to the San Mateo County General Plan, Local Coastal Plan, Montara-Moss-Beach-El Granada Community Plan, and Zoning Regulations of San Mateo County Ordinance Code to expand opportunities to construct high-density housing on six parcels within the El Granada area of unincorporated San Mateo

Docusign Envelope ID: 3E2D34C5-B212-84EB-81AD-DC15D598589B

County. The intent of the Project's policy and regulatory amendments is to streamline the entitlement process for future housing development proposals; no specific development is proposed or approved in conjunction with the Project.

Location: The Project location is six parcels between Coral Reef Avenue and Sevilla Avenue in the census-designated coastal community of El Granada, east of Highway 1, within the Coastal Zone in unincorporated San Mateo County, situated on the San Francisco Peninsula. The six parcels included within the project location include the following Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs): 047-048-150; 047-049-170; 047-051-040; 047-052 100; 047-053-130; and 047-054-100.

Timeframe: To be determined

The CEQA Guidelines (§§15124 & 15378) require that the draft EIR incorporate a full project description, including reasonably foreseeable future phases of the Project, and that contains sufficient information to evaluate and review the Project's environmental impact. Please include a complete description of the following Project components in the Project description including, but not limited to the information below:

- Land use changes resulting from, for example, rezoning certain areas;
- Footprints of permanent Project features and temporarily impacted areas, such as staging areas and access routes;
- Area and plans for any proposed buildings/structures, ground disturbing activities, fencing, paving, stationary machinery, landscaping, and stormwater systems;
- Operational features of the Project, including level of anticipated human presence (describe seasonal or daily peaks in activity, if relevant), artificial lighting/light reflection, noise, traffic generation, and other features; and
- Construction schedule, activities, equipment, and crew sizes.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Sufficient information regarding the environmental setting is necessary to understand any potentially significant impacts on the environment of the proposed Project and any alternatives identified in the draft EIR (CEQA Guidelines, §§15125 & 15360). CDFW recommends the draft EIR provide baseline habitat assessments for special-status plant, fish and wildlife species located and potentially located within the Project area and surrounding lands, including all rare, threatened, and endangered species (CEQA Guidelines, §15380). The draft EIR should describe aquatic habitats, such as wetlands or waters of the U.S. or State, and any sensitive natural communities or riparian habitat occurring on or adjacent to the Project site (for sensitive natural communities see: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/NaturalCommunities#sensitive%20natural%20communities), and any stream or wetland setback distances the County may require. Fully protected, threatened or endangered, candidate, and other special-status species or sensitive natural communities that are known to occur, or have the potential to occur in or near the Project site, include, but are not limited to: the species listed in Attachment A.

Habitat descriptions and species profiles included in the draft EIR should include robust information from multiple sources: aerial imagery; historical and recent survey data; field reconnaissance; scientific literature and reports; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) Information, Planning, and Consultation System; California Aquatic Resources Inventory; and findings from "positive occurrence" databases such as California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). Only with sufficient data and information can the County adequately assess which special-status species are likely to occur in the Project vicinity.

Docusign Envelope ID: 3E2D34C5-B212-84EB-81AD-DC15D598589B

CDFW recommends surveys be conducted for special-status species with potential to occur, following recommended survey protocols if available. Survey and monitoring protocols and guidelines are available at: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocol.

Botanical surveys for special-status plant species, including those listed by the California Native Plant Society (http://www.cnps.org/cnps/rareplants/inventory/), should also be conducted during the blooming period for all sensitive plant species potentially occurring within the Project area and include the identification of reference populations. Please refer to CDFW protocols for surveying and evaluating impacts to rare plants available at: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Plants.

IMPACT ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The CEQA Guidelines (§15126.2) necessitate the draft EIR discuss all direct and indirect impacts (temporary and permanent) that may occur with implementation of the Project. This includes evaluating and describing impacts such as:

- Land use changes that would reduce open space or agricultural land uses and increase residential or other land use involving increased development;
- Changes in hydrological conditions that could alter the timing and magnitude of streamflow both during construction and operation of the Project;
- Potential for impacts to special-status species;
- Loss or modification of breeding, nesting, dispersal and foraging habitat, including vegetation removal, alternation of soils and hydrology, and removal of habitat structural features (e.g., snags, roosts, overhanging banks);
- Permanent and temporary habitat disturbances associated with ground disturbance, noise, lighting, reflection, air pollution, traffic or human presence;
- Obstruction of movement corridors, fish passage, or access to water sources and other core habitat features;
- Water quality impacts resulting from construction and operation of the Project;
- Impacts both from construction and operation of the Project;
- Impacts to the bed, channel, and bank, in the reservoirs and creeks downstream of the Project; and
- Impacts to bed, channel, bank, and riparian habitat, and the direct and indirect effects to fish, wildlife, and their habitat.

The CEQA document also should identify existing and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the Project vicinity, disclose any cumulative impacts associated with these projects, determine the significance of each cumulative impact, and assess the significance of the Project's contribution to each impact (CEQA Guidelines, §15355). Although a project's impacts may be insignificant individually, its contributions to a cumulative impact may be considerable; a contribution to a significant cumulative impact (e.g., reduction of available habitat for a listed species) should be considered cumulatively considerable without mitigation to minimize or avoid the impact.

The CEQA Guidelines direct the County, as the lead agency, to consider and describe in the draft EIR all feasible mitigation measures to avoid and/or mitigate potentially significant impacts of the Project on the environment based on comprehensive analysis of the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the Project. (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15021, 15063, 15071, 15126.2, 15126.4 & 15370.) This should include a discussion of take avoidance and

Docusign Envelope ID: 3E2D34C5-B212-84EB-81AD-DC15D598589B

minimization measures for special-status species, which are recommended to be developed in early consultation with the USFWS, the National Marine Fisheries Service and CDFW. These measures can then be incorporated as enforceable Project conditions to reduce potential impacts to biological resources to less-than-significant levels.

Fully protected species such as San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*) may not be taken or possessed at any time and no licenses or permits may be issued for their take except as follows:

- Take is for necessary scientific research;
- Efforts to recover a fully protected, endangered, or threatened species, live capture and relocation of a bird species for the protection of livestock; or
- They are a covered species whose conservation and management is provided for in a Natural Community Conservation Plan (Fish and G. Code §§ 3511, 4700, 5050, & 5515).

Specified types of infrastructure projects may be eligible for an ITP for unavoidable impacts to fully protected species if certain conditions are met (see Fish & G. Code §2081.15). Project proponents should consult with CDFW early in the project planning process.

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e).) Accordingly, please report any special-status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the CNDDB. The CNDDB field survey form can be filled out and submitted online at the following link: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Submitting-Data. The types of information reported to CNDDB can be found at the following link: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Plants-and-Animals.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEES

The Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of environmental document filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the environmental document filing fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089.)

CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the NOP to assist the County in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources.

Questions regarding this letter or further coordination should be directed to Shannon Husband, Environmental Scientist, at 707-337-1364 or Shannon.Husband@wildlife.ca.gov; or Wesley Stokes, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisory), at Wesley.Stokes@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Erin Chappell
B77E9A6211EF486...

Erin Chappell
Regional Manager
Bay Delta Region

Docusign Envelope ID: 3E2D34C5-B212-84EB-81AD-DC15D598589B

Attachment: Attachment A. Species List

ec: Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation, State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2026100845)
Craig Weightman, CDFW Bay Delta Region – Craig.Weightman@wildlife.ca.gov

Docusign Envelope ID: 3E2D34C5-B212-84EB-81AD-DC15D598589B

Selected Elements by Common Name

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

California Natural Diversity Database

Query Criteria: BIOS selection

ATTACHMENT A

Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
California red-legged frog *Rana draytonii*	AAABH01022	Threatened	None	G2G3	S2S3	SSC
coastal marsh milk-vetch *Astragalus pycnostachyus var. pycnostachyus*	PDFAB0F7B2	None	None	G2T2	S2	1B.2
monarch - California overwintering population *Danaus plexippus plexippus pop. 1*	IILEPP2012	Proposed Threatened	None	G4T1T2Q	S2	
Monterey vagrant shrew *Sorex vagrans paludivagus*	AMABA01072	None	None	G5T1	S2	
Northern Coastal Salt Marsh *Northern Coastal Salt Marsh*	CTT52110CA	None	None	G3	S3.2	
Ornduff's meadowfoam *Limnanthes douglasii ssp. ornduffii*	PDLIM02039	None	None	G4T1	S1	1B.1
saltmarsh common yellowthroat *Geothlypis trichas sinuosa*	ABPBX1201A	None	None	G5T3	S3	SSC
San Francisco gartersnake *Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*	ARADB3613B	Endangered	Endangered	G5T2Q	S2	FP
San Francisco owl's-clover *Triphysaria floribunda*	PDSCR2T010	None	None	G2?	S2?	1B.2

Record Count: 9

From:	Matthew Goldhaber
To:	Planning_Commission; Will Gibson
Subject:	Subject: RE: Public Comment Opposing the San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase II – El Granada | EIR Scoping Session, November 18, 2026
Date:	Monday, November 16, 2026 8:37:01 AM
Attachments:	Public Comment Opposing the San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase II - El Granada (EIR Scoping Session, November 18, 2026).pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Please find attached my formal public comment opposing the proposed San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase II – El Granada, submitted in connection with Agenda Item 3, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Scoping Session scheduled for November 18, 2026.

I strongly urge the Commission to give careful consideration to the substantial environmental and community concerns outlined in my letter and to ensure that these issues are thoroughly evaluated and meaningfully addressed throughout the environmental review process.

Along with many fellow Coastside residents, I am firmly opposed to the proposed rezoning and the high-density development it would permit on these environmentally sensitive parcels. **I remain committed to actively participating in this process and advocating vigorously for the preservation of these irreplaceable coastal lands.**

Please include my attached comment in the official administrative record for this proceeding and in the public comments considered during preparation of the EIR.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Matthew Goldhaber
Resident of El Granada, California

November 10, 2026

San Mateo County Planning Commission
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
planning_commission@smcgov.org

RE: Public Comment for Agenda Item 3 — Scoping Session for an Environmental Impact Report for the San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase II – El Granada (November 18, 2026)

Dear Planning Commissioners:

My wife and I live in El Granada. We bought our first home here largely because we love being so close to nature. I'm writing to ask you not to rezone the six undeveloped parcels between Coral Reef Avenue and Sevilla Avenue (about 12.45 acres) for high-density housing, and to make sure the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) takes a hard look at what that would mean.

I understand the County has housing obligations. But I don't think meeting them should mean building over some of the last open coastal land we have left in town.

Here's what worries me most, and what I'd like the EIR to cover:

Wildlife and wetlands. The County's own Notice of Preparation says these parcels may have wetlands, monarch butterfly overwintering habitat, and upland habitat for the California red-legged frog. Please require proper biological surveys and a formal wetland delineation, rather than assuming nothing is there because nobody has looked yet. Please also study how building here would affect water runoff and the wildlife movement between El Granada and Montara Mountain.

Traffic and evacuation. Anyone who lives here knows how backed up Highway 1 gets on weekends, holidays, and during pumpkin season. Please study whether our roads can handle this many more people, especially getting everyone out during a wildfire while emergency crews are trying to get in, and please include the other development planned along the Midcoast.

Sewer and water. The Granada Community Services District told the County that building at 70 units per acre could add roughly 192,602 gallons of wastewater a day. That is close to the 200,000 gallons a day the district was handling at the time. Please look at whether the sewer and water systems can really handle that, and what it would take to fix.

Size and character. Current limits are 8 or 17 units per acre. The proposal goes as high as 70, with buildings 60 to 70 feet tall in a neighborhood of one- and two-story homes. Please study the effects on views, nighttime lighting, noise, and access to the trails, and whether it fits with the Local Coastal Program.

Clear numbers and real alternatives. The Notice of Preparation says a maximum of 70 units per acre, but the November 18 agenda says 70 to 120. Please clear that up and study the maximum that would actually be allowed. Please also look at real alternatives, like keeping the current zoning or leaving out the parcels with sensitive habitat.

My request is simple: please take these six El Granada parcels out of the high-density rezoning program and find other ways to meet the County's housing goals. Once this land is built on, we don't get it back.

Please include my comments in the official record for the EIR scoping process, and let me know when the Draft EIR is available for public review.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Matthew Goldhaber

El Granada resident

From: Saya Wallace
To: Planning_Commission; Will Gibson
Cc: SMC_SupMueller
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rezoning of Six El Granada Parcels
Date: Monday, November 16, 2026 3:11:27 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

November 16, 2026

San Mateo County Planning Commission
c/o William Gibson, Senior Planner
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
Via email: Planning_Commission@smcgov.org; wgibson@smcgov.org; cc: Supervisor Ray Meuller

Re: Opposition to Proposed Rezoning of Six El Granada Parcels – Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 (SCH No. 2026100845); Comments on the Scope of the Draft EIR

Dear Chair and Members of the Planning Commission:

I am a resident of El Granada, and I am writing to express my deep concerns with the proposed rezoning of six parcels in El Granada to allow high-density multifamily housing. I support the goal of providing housing for the Coastside community, and I understand that the County has obligations to meet the state-mandated Regional Housing Needs Allocation. Unfortunately, the proposed rezoning of these six parcels is a lose-lose-lose for the existing community, proposed future residents who need housing that makes sense, and for the wildlife that currently call this space home. High-density development in these parcels not only destroys the sensitive wildlife habitat, but it creates public safety risks with no proposed mitigation for both existing and future residents of the area. I ask the Commission to recommend against the rezoning, and I ask that the Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") fully analyze the concerns below.

1. Public Safety and Emergency Evacuation

In case of an emergency, there is only one way in and out of El Granada: Highway 1, which is a one lane highway. Even worse, there are only two roads from the parcels at issue leading to Highway 1: Coral Reef Avenue (which has only a stop sign at the intersection of Highway 1) and Capistrano Road (via Avenida Granada).

The proposal could add up to 870 units in the 12.45 acres of open green space. Assuming even just two people per-unit, that is a 1,740 person increase to the population. The population of *all* of El Granada according to the 2020 census is 5,481. That means that the proposal aims to increase the population by around one-third and stuff it into a space that is .004 the size of the entire square mileage of El Granada. The current infrastructure was not built to support this type of zoning. As a resident of El Granada for five years, and a resident of the Coastside for even longer, I have experienced first hand how congested our one-lane roads are even under normal traffic conditions. Just one accident on Highway 1 and suddenly our escape routes and emergency vehicle access routes are eliminated. The area is at risk of wildfire, tsunami, landslide and storm-related emergencies and road closures. Adding a large number of residents would significantly increase the number of people who would need to evacuate at once, along routes that already have no redundancy. I ask that the EIR include the following:

- A quantitative evacuation analysis that models a realistic worst-case scenario, including peak-season and weekend visitor traffic, school-day conditions, and a highway closure at one or more points.
- Analysis of emergency response times, including fire protection and ambulance access, with the project's added population.
- Cumulative analysis that includes all other approved and reasonably foreseeable Midcoast development.

2. Overloading of Coastside Infrastructure and Public Services

As noted above, the proposal would significantly and rapidly increase the population of El Granada. Public services including medical services, public utilities, wastewater and sewer capacity, schools, fire and emergency services, and road capacity are all limited on the Coastside, and some are already stretched. The EIR should identify the current remaining capacity of each system, the demand the project would add, and whether capacity exists without displacing priority uses or compromising service to existing residents.

3. Loss of Sensitive Wildlife Habitat – Monarch Butterfly Overwintering Site

Not only would the proposed rezoning create public safety hazards, it would destroy important sensitive wildlife habitat. The proposed parcels are not just empty land, it is a verified and documented Monarch butterfly overwintering site. Western Monarch populations have collapsed in recent decades and are endangered due to habitat loss. It is absolutely critical to protect every remaining overwintering site. Overwintering groves can

qualify as environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) under the Coastal Act, which restricts development in and adjacent to such areas, and the Local Coastal Program must be consistent with that protection. The EIR at a minimum should include the following:

- Surveys conducted across all seasons, and specifically during the monarch overwintering period (roughly late October through February), to establish an accurate baseline. Further, the EIR should ensure that there is no disturbance of the habitat during this time (unlike this year when CUSD conducted significant tree destruction during the overwintering period).
- Evaluation of direct impacts, and of indirect impacts such as shading, wind changes, lighting, noise and loss of nectar sources, including impacts on adjacent grove trees.
- Analysis of seasonal wetlands and other sensitive habitat on or near the parcels.

On a personal note, I live just one block from the proposed six parcels. For the past five years, I have sat on my back deck and listened to the birdsong coming from this green space. I have watched hawk families call those trees home. I have walked my dog along the side of the land and enjoyed the immediate sense of relief and calm from seeing, smelling, and hearing the sounds from this beautiful space. It absolutely breaks my heart to think that the sound of the owl hoots will be replaced with chainsaws; that the cool breeze coming through the beautiful trees will be replaced by the hot sun radiating off of concrete; and that the critical wetlands will be paved over by asphalt for more cars on roads that cannot bear them.

I have never written to a public official, made a public comment, or called my representative. I have tremendous respect for the hard work and tough decisions that our local government makes for the benefit of its citizens. However, I cannot standby knowing that my silence may lead to the permanent silence of this wildlife in this space and be replaced by housing development that the area cannot support.

Meeting housing needs is important, but it must be done in places that can safely and sustainably support it. These six parcels cannot. I respectfully ask the Commission to recommend against the rezoning, and to ensure that the EIR analyzes the issues above in full.

Respectfully,

Saya Wallace

331 Avenue Granada, El Granada, CA 94018