

County of San Mateo  
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA's Animal Sanctuary
2. **County File Number:** PLN2021-00316
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Summer Burlison, Senior Planner, [sburlison@smcgov.org](mailto:sburlison@smcgov.org), 650-363-1815
5. **Project Location:** 12429 Pescadero Creek Road, Loma Mar
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:**  
Project Site Parcels: 082-050-020 (56 acres), 082-050-011 (160 acres)  
Off-site Access Road Parcels: 083-320-060 (40 acres), 083-320-070 (715 acres)
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA, 1450 Rollins Road, Burlingame, CA 94010
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** N/A
9. **General Plan Designation:** Project Site: Open Space; Off-site Access Road: Private Recreation
10. **Zoning:** Resource Management (RM)
11. **Description of the Project:**  
The Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA (a local, private, non-profit charitable organization) is seeking a Resource Management (RM) Permit, Use Permit, Kennel Permit, and Grading Permit to develop an Animal Sanctuary facility ("Sanctuary") to provide permanent housing for dogs, cats and small animals (rabbits, goats, other small farm animals). As a sanctuary for animals, the facility will not be open to the public. As a permanent home for animals, the facility will operate 7 days a week and will be managed by 10 staff (6 animal care staff, 1 veterinary, 1 behavior and training staff, 1 facilities maintenance staff, and 1 sanctuary director) and 3 volunteer staff. New animals to the facility are expected to be transferred to the Sanctuary approximately 1 to 2 times per week and remains of animals that pass onsite would be transported to Pet's Rest in Colma, or a similar vendor. Delivery of animal care supplies are anticipated to be made 1 to 2 times per week during normal business hours. Deliveries of facility maintenance supplies would occur less frequently, approximately 1 to 2 times per month.

## *Buildings*

A total of 70 dog cottages are proposed in clustered groups of 2 to 5 cottages along a new internal driveway that dead-ends at the southern side of the project site area. A majority (66) of the dog cottages will each be 192 sq. ft. of heated indoor space with an additional 450 sq. ft. of chain link fenced outdoor space. A small number (4) of the dog cottages will each be slightly larger at approximately 320 sq. ft. of heated indoor space with an additional 900 sq. ft. (each) of chain link fenced outdoor space. A 3,000 sq. ft. covered dog arena is also proposed within these clustered dog cottage groupings.

A total of 14 cat cottages, each 320 sq. ft. of heated indoor space, are proposed in two groups - 10 cat cottages that will share a large common chain link fenced area of 26,400 sq. ft. and 4 "senior" cat cottages each with their own 900 sq. ft. of chain link fenced outdoor space. All fenced outdoor areas for the cats will include chain link fenced ceilings.

The facility will also include a new 2,000 sq. ft. unconditioned farm animal barn to accommodate both larger and smaller farm animal rescues; a 6,500 sq. ft. administration (offices, break rooms and ancillary support space for staff and volunteers) and veterinary medical center (solely for the animals who live at the sanctuary); a new 660 sq. ft. maintenance building; and a new 995 sq. ft. two bedroom, two bathroom caretaker's residence with a two-car garage. These support buildings will be located around the periphery of the facility. An existing 3,000 sq. ft. barn will be restored and used for ancillary storage and an existing cottage will be demolished.

## *Access and Parking*

An existing ~13-ft. wide unimproved access road (known as Burns Chalk Fire Road) extends from Pescadero Creek Road through the Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA (PHS & SPCA) parcels. The initial ~1,200 linear ft. of the Burns Chalk Fire Road crosses over two separately owned parcels, owned by the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) of San Francisco. The entire length of the road from Pescadero Creek Road to the project site, ~2,200 linear ft., will be widened to 20-ft. and improved to a predominantly gravel roadway surface to meet Fire Department requirements for emergency access. An access and utility easement has been recorded between the project applicant and the YMCA for access improvements on YMCA property. An entrance gate is proposed near Pescadero Creek Road with a new median island to limit access from Pescadero Creek Road to right-turn in and right-turn out for safe traffic movement. New retaining walls ranging in height up to 6-ft. at maximum points will be installed along portions of the improved access road for support from surrounding topography. The existing narrow dirt Burns Chalk Fire Road will remain as-is past the project site area. Approximately 1,200 linear ft. west of the project site area, on project parcel APN 082-050-011, along the existing narrow dirt road that runs throughout the project parcels, a new minimally improved connecting access road (approximately 400 linear ft.) will be created to provide access from the existing dirt road to a new well that will serve the project.

At the project site, a new gravel driveway will extend approximately 800 linear ft. off the improved main access road in a southward direction to meander through the facility with gravel trails/walkway paths spurring off of this new internal driveway to the numerous clustered cat and dog cottages; this driveway will dead-end with a fire turnaround at the southern end of the project site area.

A total of ten (10) designated parking spaces will be provided at the facility's entrance Administration building for staff and volunteers. Additionally, a two-car garage is proposed with the new caretaker residence.

### *Utilities*

The project includes a new septic system with tank, leach field, holding tank and lift pump. An existing onsite well on the east side of the project site area will be abandoned and a new well located approximately 1,600 ft. west of the project site area will be utilized; onsite fire hydrants within the facility, as required by the Fire Department, will also be installed. Water pump stations and water storage tanks for domestic, fire and irrigation will be constructed near the existing barn and new maintenance building area. Stormwater facilities include vegetated swales and catch basins connected to bio-treatment planters/flow-thru planter with rocked outfalls installed throughout the facility and access road. New power poles to support new overhead electrical service is proposed from the west, along with dedicated space within the facility's premise to accommodate generators and solar panels.

### *Grading and Tree Removal*

A total of 12,090 cubic yards (c.y.) of grading (6,230 c.y. of cut and 5,860 c.y. of fill) is proposed to construct the project, including 1,120 c.y. (270 c.y. of cut and 850 c.y. of fill) for buildings, 6,570 c.y. (1,560 c.y. of cut and 5,010 c.y. of fill) for site improvements, and 4,400 c.y. (cut) for roadway improvements; excess cut material (370 c.y.) will be spread onsite to result in a balance of cut and fill with no import or export needed. The majority of the project site area is void of trees. However, a total of 7 trees are proposed for removal, including 4 trees (one (1) multi-trunk Douglas fir, 16/23/14 inches dbh; three (3) coast live oaks, 22 inches and (2) 18 inches dbh's) located in the access easement on YMCA property that conflict with proposed road access improvements, and 3 coast live oak trees (two (2) multi-trunk 15/22/24 inches dbh and 16/13 inches dbh; 22 inches dbh) located at the project site area that conflict with the proposed fire and domestic water tanks and pump station equipment.

12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The approximately 11.5-acre project site is located within 216 acres of rural open space land owned by the Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA. The project site area is approximately 1.5 miles south of the Town of La Honda and approximately 6 miles northeast of the Town of Pescadero. The project site is located on a southern facing ridgeline that runs northwest to southeast. The northeast-facing side of the ridgeline is the Sam McDonald County Park which consists of dense oak woodland and redwood forest and has a significant drop in elevation (from the ridgeline) down throughout the parkland. The southwest-facing side of the ridgeline is the project site area and the rest of the Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA land which consists of annual grassland and coastal scrub with gentle to moderate slopes downward to the southwest. The general surrounding vicinity includes parklands (Sam McDonald County Park to the adjacent north and San Mateo County Memorial Park and Pescadero Creek County Park approximately 1.5 miles south), recreation and open space lands (YMCA Camp Jones Gulch to the east) and private ranchland (west).

The project parcels support the headwaters to McCormick Creek (APN 082-050-020) and a tributary to Kingston Creek (APN 082-050-011). According to a Biological Resource Report prepared by Sol Ecology, McCormick Creek is considered a perennial creek although water does not flow year-round through it in the portion on the project parcel. The tributary to Kingston Creek is an intermittent feature. Drainage across the existing predominantly undeveloped project site sheet flows to natural swales and a small stock pond located upslope of the drainage headwaters to McCormick Creek. The property has historically been used for

cattle grazing and open space. The stock pond is observed to have highly eroded banks due to heavy cattle use.

The PHS & SPCA property is accessible by a narrow, dirt access road that commences at its intersection with Pescadero Creek Road and climbs approximately ½-mile northwest along the south-facing ridgeline to the project site, and beyond. Existing development at the project site consists of a residential cottage and barn that were both estimated to have been built in late 1976. The existing cottage will be demolished and the existing barn will be renovated for continued use as ancillary storage for the Sanctuary.

- 13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None
- 14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?:** Project notices were sent to California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. No tribal requests for consultation were received by County staff.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

<b>1. AESTHETICS.</b> 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	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located on the gentle southwest downward sloping face of a ridgeline adjacent to Haskins Hill, and is approximately ½-mile west of Pescadero Creek Road. Pescadero Creek Road traverses uphill in both directions to Haskins Hill and due to topography and dense rural vegetation and tree canopy in the area, the project site is not visible from scenic vistas, existing residential areas, or public views. Although the proposed Sanctuary is not in a scenic corridor, a segment (0.21 miles) of the access road commencing at Pescadero Creek Road is within the Pescadero Creek Road County Scenic Corridor. Topography and existing vegetation and tree canopy limit view of the access road to nearest its intersection with Pescadero Creek Road. The access road entrance is visible and therefore proposed improvements to the access road entrance, including the removal of 2 trees at the entrance, a new 4-ft. tall double door gate, and a new island median to manage traffic turning to and from Pescadero Creek Road will be visible to passing traffic along Pescadero Creek Road. These improvements are not uncharacteristic of access entrance improvements typical in the rural setting within the County and would only be visible for a few seconds during travel along this meandering segment of roadway. Therefore, these visual impacts are not considered significant.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location; Project site conditions; Project plans.</p>				
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	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located in an undeveloped open space area consisting of moderate slopes with primarily low-growing vegetation. Dense tree canopy exists adjacent to the project site area and along the access drive connection to Pescadero Creek Road. Aside from access road improvements at Pescadero Creek Road, the project would not be visible and would not cause damage to any scenic resources. Furthermore, the project parcels are not located within a state scenic highway. See staff's discussion in Section 1.a. and 1.c.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location; Project site conditions, Project plans.</p>				
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			X	

urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located in the rural South Skyline area of San Mateo County. While the project area is located on a ridgeline, the site and proposed development will be screened from public views by the natural sloped topography of the area and dense surrounding tree canopy. The access road entrance from Pescadero Creek Road will be improved and a new site access gate will be installed. The site access gate is a simple 4-ft. double-door gate that will blend in with the surrounding rural scenic area. Two trees are proposed for removal to accommodate the access entrance improvements; however, the area along Pescadero Creek Road consists of dense naturally growing trees and vegetation and the applicant proposes to replant two 15-gallon coast live oak trees in this area. Therefore, the project does not result in substantial degradation to the existing visual character or quality that would require further mitigation.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; Google Earth; Project site conditions.</p>				
1.d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project would include exterior building and site lighting as necessary to maneuver around the facility grounds at night. Provided lighting is kept to a minimum and fixtures are downward directed to shield light and glare, these new light sources would not have a substantial impact to the area. Furthermore, the project site is not visible to public view areas. The following mitigation is recommended:</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 1:</b> All proposed exterior lighting shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the Sanctuary's project site area and prevent glare in the surrounding area, including to nearby water bodies. Manufacturer cut sheets for any exterior light fixtures shall be submitted for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All exterior fixtures shall be downward directed and designed to minimize light pollution beyond the confines of the project site area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; Google Earth; Project location.</p>				
1.e. Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Approximately 0.21 miles of the access road, commencing at Pescadero Creek Road, is located within the Pescadero Creek Road County Scenic Corridor. See staff's discussions in Section 1.a.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County GIS.</p>				
1.f. If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are not located within a Design Review District.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County Zoning Map.</p>				

1.g. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?		X		
<b>Discussion:</b> See staff's discussions in Sections 1.a. – 1.d.				
<b>Source:</b> See sources cited in Sections 1.a. – 1.d.				

<p><b>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES.</b> 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:</p>					
		<b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> According to the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the project area does not consist of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location; California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Important Farmland Finder (2018).</p>					
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?					X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are zoned Resource Management (RM), which is the County's open space zoning designation. The parcels are not encumbered by an existing Open Space Easement or Williamson Act contract.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County GIS.</p>					



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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are zoned RM and do not consist of Farmland, as designated by the State Department of Conservation. Cattle grazing occurs throughout the parcels and would continue. The project site area is on open moderately sloped land that supports low-growing vegetation; no forestland will be converted.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location; Project site conditions; California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Important Farmland Finder (2018).</p>				
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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located in the coastal zone.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location.</p>				
2.e. Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> According to the San Mateo County General Plan's Productive Soil Resources Map, the project parcels consist of soil which supports vegetation suitable for grazing. Cattle grazing does occur in areas of the parcels. The project will disturb approximately 11.5 acres of the project parcels' 216 acres of land. There are several ponds on the property that serve as an attraction for cattle and will remain unchanged as they are outside of the project site area. Thus, continued use of the property to support cattle grazing would be minimally impacted.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project site conditions; San Mateo County General Plan Productive Soil Resources Map.</p>				
2.f. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?  <i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i>				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Forestland is land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources. The project site consists of moderately sloped open space land that supports natural low-growing vegetation.</p>				

**Source:** Project location; Project site conditions.

**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:

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

**Discussion:** The Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan (CAP), developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), is the current regulating air quality plan for San Mateo County. The CAP was created to improve Bay Area air quality and to protect public health and the climate. The project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the BAAQMD's 2017 Clean Air Plan. During project construction, air emissions would be generated from site grading, equipment, and work vehicles; however, any such grading-related emissions would be temporary and localized. Once constructed, the facility would have minimal impacts to the air quality standards set forth for the region by the BAAQMD. Proposed generators for use during operation of the project would require separate permits from the BAAQMD to operate.

As defined in the BAAQMD's 2017 CEQA Guidelines, the BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction emissions due to the number of variables that can impact the calculation of construction emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of all feasible construction measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures that they have determined, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. These control measures have been included in Mitigation Measure 2 below:

**Mitigation Measure 2:** The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:

- a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day; the use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- e. All roadways, driveways, and walkways to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

- g. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact 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:** Project plans; Project location; Bay Area Air Quality Management District Clean Air Plan (2017), CEQA Guidelines (2017).

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

X

**Discussion:** As of December 2012, San Mateo County is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5. On January 9, 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to determine that the Bay Area attains the 24-hour PM-2.5 national standard. However, the Bay Area will continue to be designated as “non-attainment” for the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard until the BAAQMD submits a “re-designation request” and a “maintenance plan” to the EPA and the proposed redesignation is approved by the EPA. A temporary increase in the project area is anticipated during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations reduce the potential effects to a less than significant impact. Mitigation Measure 2 in Section 3.a. would minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction to a less than significant level. No further mitigation is necessary.

**Source:** Project location; Bay Area Air Quality Management District Clean Air Plan (2017).

3.c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?

X

**Discussion:** Any pollutant emissions generated from the proposed project would primarily be temporary in nature. The project site is in the South Skyline area of the County where sensitive receptors are limited due to the remote and rural setting of the area. The nearest residences are approximately 2,700 ft. north of the project site and obstructed by the natural topography of the rural area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 2 will help in minimizing any potential exposure to sensitive receptors; thus, no mitigation is necessary.

**Source:** Project location.

3.d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

X

**Discussion:** The project would result in short-term grading related emissions, such as fugitive dust and exhaust from construction vehicles. Long-term use of the project for housing animals has the potential to generate odor related to animal waste. Daily cleaning of outdoor dog and cat use areas will be completed; waste will be disposed of in commercial trash containers and picked up by a contracted trash company. Monthly hosing down of outdoor areas will be scheduled during the dry months of the year for odor control. Daily cleaning of indoor dog and cat housing areas will include spot cleaning or mopping of any urine, feces, dog hair or dirt using industry-standard cleaning products. The project site is located in a relatively remote, rural area. Given the location, both short-term and long-term emissions and/or odors are expected to be minimal and would not adversely affect a substantial number of people.

**Source:** Project plans; Project location.

**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:** According to a Biological Resources Report prepared by Sol Ecology for the project's study area, 89 special status plant species have been documented within a 9-quad search of the study area. Due to hydrologic, soil, topographic, and unique pH conditions of the project site area, and type of vegetation communities present in the study area, only 7 special status plant species have the potential to occur at the project site:

*Arctostaphylos andersonii* (Anderson's manzanita), *A. regismontana* (Kings Mountain manzanita), *Plagiobothrys chorisianus* (Choris' popcornflower), *Pedicularis dudleyi* (Dudley's lousewort), *Malacothamus arcuatus* (arcuate bush-mallow), *Fissidens pauperculus* (minute pocket moss), and *Dirca occidentalis* (western leatherwood).

Based on two separate special status plant survey site visits, in May 2019 and June 2020, for these 7 and other special status plant species, Sol Ecology reported that none of these or other special status plants were found on the project site.

Sol Ecology reports that based on database search, 60 special status wildlife species have been documented within a 9-quad search of the project study area. Due to the absence of suitable hydrologic conditions, absence of associated vegetation communities, absence of suitable habitat elements and absence of suitable sized burrows or evidence of potential dens on or immediately adjacent to the project study area, only 8 species have the potential to occur in the study area:

*Lasiurus cinereus* (Hoary bat; moderate potential), *Neotoma fuscipes annectens* (San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat; low potential), *Aquila chrysaetos* (Golden eagle; low potential),

*Brachyramphus marmoratus* (Marbled murrelet; low potential), *Asio otus* (long-eared owl; high potential), *Chamaea fasciata* (wrenit; moderate potential), *Emys marmorata* (western pond turtle; low potential), and *Rana draytonii* (California red-legged frog; moderate potential).

The project would result in the removal of six oak trees and one fir tree that may provide suitable roost habitat for special status and/or common bats, including hoary bat and pallid bat. Additionally, most native birds are protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. In order to minimize potential impacts to a less than significant level if bats, or other nesting are present at the time of tree removal, mitigation measures are recommended for pre-construction surveys.

San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat has the potential to occur in scrub habitats to the south of the project study area. Due to the project setbacks to these potential areas being more than the minimum prescribed setback of 25-ft. where woodrats nest, the project is not likely to affect this species.

The project site area and surrounding habitats provide suitable nesting substrate for non-status migratory birds as well as special status birds and raptors (including golden eagle, marbled murrelet, long-eared owl, and wrenit). Impacts on such species can occur from vegetation removal and proximity to noise and/or visual disturbances during construction. A small amount of foraging habitat would be affected by the project construction; however, given availability of suitable foraging habitat in the immediate surrounding area, the project would not likely pose a significant affect on foraging habitat for these species, if present.

Western pond turtle are not likely to nest on the site due to the absence of loose friable soils for egg laying and the presence of cattle which could trample nests. The project will not result in any impacts to pond habitat and will not create any barriers to dispersal, therefore, the project is not likely to impact western pond turtle.

The project site area is not within any viable dispersal corridor between downstream aquatic habitats and pond habitat for California red-legged frog (CRLF). Additionally, the lack of emergent and/or submerged vegetation for egg attachment within onsite ponds preclude suitable breeding habitat for CRLF. Nonetheless, incidental take (mortality, harassment, or harm) would be considered a significant effect and therefore, a mitigation measure is recommended to ensure the project will not have any unintended impact on CRLF.

Sol Ecology notes that while McCormick Creek may provide foraging habitat for San Francisco garter snake and California giant salamander downstream of the property, these species are not likely to be found in headwaters near the project footprint. Additionally, lack of vegetation and cover within the stock pond habitat likely precludes San Francisco garter snake as well as western pond turtle.

**Mitigation Measure 3: Special Status Bat Surveys.** Prior to any tree removal, a qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment for bats a minimum of 30 to 90 days prior to removal. The assessment should include a visual inspection of all potential roosting features (e.g., cavities, crevices, peeling bark, etc.). If suitable trees are found, the following measures shall be initiated:

1. To the extent feasible, tree removal should be initiated between September 1 and October 15 to avoid maternity roosting bats if present and/or between March 1 and April 15 to avoid bats in hibernation. Trees may be removed during these two periods using the two-step removal process described below:
  - a. On the first day, in the afternoon, under the direct supervision of a qualified biologist, limbs and branches shall be removed by a tree cutter using chainsaws only. Limbs with cavities, crevices, or deep bark fissures shall be avoided.

- b. On the second day, the entire tree shall be removed and left overnight prior to chipping or hauling off the site to allow any bats to exit.
2. If tree removal is performed outside the windows prescribed above and bat habitat is observed, an acoustic bat roost survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist between April 15 and September 1 to evaluate whether a maternity roost (solitary or colonial) is present. If a maternity roost is found, a no-disturbance buffer should be placed around the roost until September 1 when pups are likely to be weaned; the buffer shall be determined by the qualified biologist. Additionally, a bat mitigation and monitoring plan shall be prepared and submitted to California Department of Fish and Wildlife for approval. No tree removal shall occur between October 15 and April 15 to avoid impacts to hibernating bats.

**Mitigation Measure 4:** If work will occur within the bird breeding season (generally February 1 to September 15), a pre-construction nesting bird and raptor survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist in all potential nesting areas within one-quarter mile of proposed activities. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted during the time of day when birds are active and shall factor in sufficient time to perform the survey adequately and completely. If nests are found, their locations shall be flagged, and all work shall cease until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged or an appropriately sized no-disturbance buffer has been placed around the nest at the direction of the qualified biologist conducting the survey. Buffers shall be maintained, and active nests shall be monitored until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged and/or are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival. If no nesting birds are observed during pre-construction surveys, no further action is necessary.

Nest buffers for special status species shall be set as follows, or as otherwise directed by the qualified biologist:

- For golden eagle or marbled murrelet = one quarter mile
- For long eared-owl or other raptor species = 250 feet
- For wrentit and/or other songbird species = 25 to 50 feet

**Mitigation Measure 5:** Temporary exclusion fence shall be placed between the project footprint and sensitive vegetation communities to avoid potential effects during grading/vegetation removal activities.

**Mitigation Measure 6:** Environmental awareness training shall be provided to all construction crew prior to the start of work. Training shall include a description of all biological resources that may be found on or near the Project site, the laws and regulations that protect those resources, the consequences of non-compliance with those laws and regulations, instructions for inspecting equipment each morning prior to activities, and a contact person if protected biological resources are discovered on the Project site.

**Mitigation Measure 7:** A pre-construction survey for special status reptiles and amphibians shall be performed within 48 hours of any ground disturbing activities within 300 feet of any aquatic (pond) or riparian habitat when water is present. Non-listed species, if found, may be relocated to suitable habitat outside the Project Site. If California red-legged frog is found, work shall be halted, and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted. Work shall remain halted until authorized to resume by the project biologist.

**Mitigation Measure 8:** If California-red legged frog is observed during pre-construction surveys or at any time during construction, a biological monitor shall be present until work in the affected area is completed.

**Mitigation Measure 9:** No work shall be performed within 300 feet of stock pond habitats during or within 24 hours of any rain event (greater than 0.5 inches) between February 1 and April 31 when

frogs are most likely to utilize upland habitats. No work shall occur within 30 minutes of sunrise or sunset.

**Source:** Project site conditions; Biological Resources Report, prepared by Sol Ecology, dated February 23, 2021, Addendum Memo, dated July 1, 2022, and Addendum Memo, dated October 13, 2022.

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:** Sensitive biological communities on the project parcels observed by Sol Ecology include redwood forest vegetation alliance, riparian habitat, and potential Waters of the State including two headwater streams, two stock ponds, and a small seep. The proposed project has been designed to avoid all sensitive communities on the site, including wetlands, riparian habitat, and species habitats, including movement corridors. The project will also avoid an erosional gully located to the west of the project site area. Construction work will maintain a minimum distance of 25 ft. – 50 ft. from any riparian or aquatic features on the site, including intermittent and ephemeral streams and erosional gullies. Additionally, construction work will maintain a minimum distance of 50 ft. from perennial streams (including McCormick Creek and the nearby man-made stock pond). Mitigation measure 1 will prevent excess lighting to the nearby pond areas and supported habitats. Additionally, the following is recommended for Best Management Practices (BMPs) for work occurring near waterways:

**Mitigation Measure 10:** Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as silt fence or straw wattles shall be installed and maintained between the work area and adjacent waterways to prevent any contaminants from entering the waterway. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) rolled erosion control products, or similar material should not be used to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Acceptable substitutes include coconut coir matting or tackified hydroseeding compounds.

**Source:** Project site conditions; Biological Resources Report, prepared by Sol Ecology, dated February 23, 2021, Addendum Memo, dated July 1, 2022, and Addendum Memo, dated October 13, 2022.

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:** According to the Biological Resources Report by Sol Ecology and the proposed project plans, there will be no substantial effect on any state or federally protected wetlands. Sol Ecology identified wetland and non-wetland waters potentially subject to federal and state regulation within the 216 acres of land owned by the project sponsor (PHS & SPCA); however, these aquatic features are not within the proposed 11.5-acre project site area and project-related construction and improvements would maintain at least a minimum distance of 25 ft. – 50 ft. from these features.

**Source:** Project site conditions; Biological Resources Report, prepared by Sol Ecology, dated February 23, 2021, Addendum Memo, dated July 1, 2022, and Addendum Memo, dated October 13, 2022.

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:** The project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish species or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites as the project will not involve work within minimally 25-ft. to 50 ft. of any riparian habitat buffer zones to any waterways on the project parcels. Additionally, the project parcels consist of open space with cattle grazing and do not support any native wildlife nursery. The project area is not a designated wildlife corridor and does not contain viable dispersal corridor habitat for California red-legged frog as concluded by Sol Ecology. Nonetheless, the project will provide chain link fencing enclosures within the facility grounds to ensure housed animals are secured at all times to avoid conflicts with wildlife in the area. However, no new parcel perimeter fencing is proposed so that wildlife may go around the Sanctuary project area without significant impediment or impact to existing wildlife movement throughout the project parcels.

**Source:** Project plans; Project site conditions; Biological Resources Report, prepared by Sol Ecology, dated February 23, 2021, Addendum Memo, dated July 1, 2022, and Addendum Memo, dated October 13, 2022.

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 majority of the project site area is void of trees. However, a total of 7 trees are proposed for removal, including 4 trees (one (1) multi-trunk Douglas fir, 16/23/14 inches dbh; three (3) coast live oaks, 22 inches and two (2) 18 inches dbh's) located in the access easement on YMCA property that conflict with proposed road access improvements, and 3 coast live oak trees (two (2) multi-trunk 15/22/24 inches dbh and 16/13 inches dbh; 22 inches dbh) located at the project site area along the edge of the adjacent redwood forest encumbering the north facing slope of the ridgeline to Sam McDonald County Park that conflict with the proposed fire and domestic water tanks and pump station equipment. The trees proposed for removal are not located near any waterways to support potential riparian forest. The trees for removal are within dense tree canopy areas and a total of 73 tree plantings are proposed as part of the project's landscaping plan, including but not limited to a mix of coast live oak, blue oak, California black oak, and valley oak trees. The tree replanting locations include replacement of trees in areas where trees are proposed for removal. No additional mitigation is necessary.

**Source:** Project plans; Tree Protection & Removal Plan, prepared by Ralph Osterling Consultants, Inc, dated August 4, 2021.

4.f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other				X
---	--	--	--	---



approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is not located in an area with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved regional or State habitat conservation plan.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Community Conservation Plans (April 2019).</p>				
4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, National Wildlife Refuge System Locator.</p>				
4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> State Senate Concurrence Resolution No. 17 requires state agencies to preserve and protect native oak woodlands containing Blue, Engleman, Valley, or Coast Live Oak trees to the maximum extent feasible or provide replacement plantings when oak woodlands are removed as compensatory mitigation. For the purposes of the measure, “oak woodlands” means a five-acre circular area containing five or more oak trees per acre. The project proposes the removal of 6 coast live oak trees within less than a five-acre area. The project proposes new landscaping and tree plantings to mitigate the loss of oak trees, including but not limited to, 16 new coast live oak trees, 11 blue oaks, and 10 valley oak trees throughout the project area. No further mitigation is recommended.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; State Senate Concurrence Resolution No. 17; Biological Resources Report Addendum Memo, prepared by Sol Ecology, dated October 13, 2022.</p>				

<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Three existing structures – a caretaker cottage, a barn, and a corral stand, are located in the project area near the proposed administrative/veterinary clinic building. The cottage is proposed to be removed and the barn will be renovated for use as ancillary storage for the Sanctuary. These structures were estimated to have been built in late 1976 and were determined to not have any historical value, based on a cultural resources survey prepared for the project site.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Daniel Shoup, RPA and Molly Fierer-Donaldson, dated August 2011.</p>				

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

**Discussion:** The project area has a low possibility of containing archaeological resources based on a cultural resources survey for the project site. Therefore, the Northwest Information Center has recommended that no further study for archaeological resources is necessary. Nonetheless, to ensure any unanticipated finds are made, the following best practice mitigation is recommended:

**Mitigation Measure 11:** In the event that archaeological resources are inadvertently discovered during construction, work in the immediate vicinity (within 25 feet) of the find must stop until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. Construction activities may continue in other areas beyond the 25-foot stop work area. A qualified archaeologist is defined as someone who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in archaeology. The Current Planning Section shall be notified of such findings, and no additional work shall be done in the stop work area until the archaeologist has recommended appropriate measures, and those measures have been approved by the Current Planning Section and implemented.

**Source:** Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Daniel Shoup, RPA and Molly Fierer-Donaldson, dated August 2011.

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

**Discussion:** Based on a cultural resources survey for the project area, there is a low potential for human remains to exist on the project parcels.

**Source:** Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Daniel Shoup, RPA and Molly Fierer-Donaldson, dated August 2011.

<b>6. ENERGY.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> 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 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</p>				

during operation and construction of the project given the financial implication of the inefficient use of such resources.

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

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

**Discussion:** The project design and operation would comply with applicable State Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local renewable energy plans.

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

**7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

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

**Discussion:** The project site is not located in a State Earthquake Fault Zone. According to a Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, the nearest major fault is the San Andreas fault, located 5.5 miles from the project site. Two quaternary faults existing in the general area include the Butano Fault located about 2 miles south of the project site and the Pilarcitos Fault located approximately 4.76 miles northeast of the project site. The project will be required to comply with applicable Building Code and recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation Report as approved by the County's Geotechnical Section for safe construction methods. Furthermore, the Geotechnical Investigation Report concluded the potential for fault surface rupture occurring at the site is considered low.

**Source:** Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021; Project location.

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

**Discussion:** The project location is in an area that could experience strong ground shaking, according to the Geotechnical Investigation Report. The proposed project will be required to comply with applicable Building Code, including geotechnical considerations for construction methods that address seismic ground shaking.

**Source:** Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021; Project location.

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

**Discussion:** The project is in an area of low liquefaction potential, according to the County and Association of Bay Area Governments liquefaction hazard zone maps. According to a geotechnical investigation by Cornerstone Earth Group, surficial soils consist of lean clays or sandstone; siltstone and claystone bedrock were primarily encountered during a liquefaction screening, which are materials generally not susceptible to liquefaction. Additionally, Cornerstone Earth Group reports that the soils encountered in the project area were predominantly medium stiff to very stiff clays, and medium dense clayey sands, or claystone and sandstone bedrock. Therefore, the potential for significant differential seismic settlement in the project area is low.

**Source:** Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021; Project location.

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

**Discussion:** Based on site reconnaissance and subsurface exploration by Cornerstone Earth Group, several small to moderate sized landslide features (shallow slumps, scarp) in proximity to the project site were identified, including three areas below the main access road to the project site and two areas northwest of the project site; no landslide features were found within the proposed project site area for development. The nearby landslide features are theorized to be a result of past unmanaged or natural surface runoff flows. As recommended in the Geotechnical Investigation Report, the control of construction runoff and long-term runoff is essential for the stability of slopes at the site. An erosion control plan has been prepared in accordance with the County's Grading Ordinance and a drainage plan has been prepared for the project which demonstrates runoff from project improvements being collected and directed to suitable discharge locations that avoid the mapped landslide areas. The County's Geotechnical Section and Civil (Drainage) Section have reviewed and conditionally approved the project plans and technical reports.

**Source:** Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021; Project location; County of San Mateo Geotechnical Section and Civil (Drainage) Section.

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

*Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).*

**Discussion:** The project parcels are not located near a coastal cliff/bluff.

**Source:** Project location.

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

**Discussion:** The project proposes 12,090 cubic yards (c.y.) of earthwork, including 6,230 c.y. of cut and 5,860 c.y. of fill to support building, site and access improvements for the project. Excess cut material (370 c.y.) is proposed to be spread onsite to result in a balance of cut and fill with no import or export needed. Compliance with the County’s Grading Ordinance, including design and control standards in Section 9296 (Standards) and inspection responsibilities outlined in Section 9297 (Responsibilities During Project Implementation) of the Grading Ordinance will ensure that grading activity complies with County requirements to minimize adverse effects on the existing terrain and to minimize the potential for erosion. Due to increased concern for runoff management during grading and construction relative to nearby landslide areas (see staff’s discussion in Section 7.a.iv.) and downslope aquatic resources (see staff’s discussion in Section 4), the following mitigation measures are recommended in addition to Mitigation Measure 10:

**Mitigation Measure 12:** An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit “hard card” and building permit to ensure the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

**Mitigation Measure 13:** The site is considered a Construction Stormwater Regulated Site (SWRS). Any grading activities conducted during the wet weather season (October 1 to April 30) will require monthly erosion and sediment control inspections by the Building Inspection Section, as well as prior authorization from the Community Development Director to conduct grading during the wet weather season.

**Mitigation Measure 14:** No grading activities shall commence until the applicant has been issued a grading permit “Hard Card”, which will only be issued concurrently with the associated building permit.

**Mitigation Measure 15:** No grading shall be allowed during the wet weather season (October 1 through April 30) to avoid increased potential soil erosion, unless the applicant applies for an Exception to the Winter Grading Moratorium and the Community Development Director grants the exception. Exceptions will only be granted if dry weather is forecasted during scheduled grading operations, and the erosion control plan includes adequate winterization measures (amongst other determining factors).

**Source:** Project plans.

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:** According to the Geotechnical Investigation Report, there are no open faces within a distance considered susceptible to lateral spreading and therefore, the potential for lateral spreading at the site is considered low. Additionally, see staff’s discussion in Sections 7.a. and 7.b.

**Source:** Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021; Project location.

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:** According to the Geotechnical Investigation Report, borings identified the presence of sandstone and claystone bedrock of the Tahana formation at the project site; these materials are reported to be highly to very highly expansive. Therefore, the Geotechnical Investigation Report recommends that the proposed buildings be supported on drilled pier foundations and that cuts be limited to approximately 3 ft. to mitigate potential heave of the very highly expansive claystone, or where cuts greater than 3 ft. into claystone are necessary, the minimum drilled pier embedment should be increased to 15 ft. The project has been conditionally approved by the County's Geotechnical Section and the project will be required to provide detailed foundation design and grading plans that adhere to the recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation Report, including those to address expansive soils, for further review at the building permit stage of the project. No further mitigation is necessary.

**Source:** Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021; Project location.

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 includes the installation of a septic system for sewage disposal. The County's Environmental Health Services has reviewed and conditionally approved the proposed septic system plans for the project. No mitigation is necessary.

**Source:** Project plans; San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.

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

**Discussion:** Based on a cultural resources survey, the project site is not expected to support a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature.

**Source:** Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Daniel Shoup, RPA and Molly Fierer-Donaldson, dated August 2011.

<b>8. CLIMATE CHANGE.</b> 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	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO2) air emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. Project-related grading and construction would result in the temporary generation of GHG emissions along travel routes and at the project site. In general, construction involves GHG emissions mainly from exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal vehicles of construction workers). Even assuming construction vehicles and workers are based in and traveling from urban areas, the potential project GHG emission levels from construction would be considered minimal. Vehicles and equipment associated with construction are subject to California Air Resources Board emissions standards.</p> <p>Relative to long-term facility operation, the Sanctuary is not intended to be open to the public, therefore, visitors to the facility are limited to a small team of staff and volunteers to operate the facility on a daily basis. The Sanctuary will also encourage carpooling for staff and volunteers to minimize car trips. Although the project scope is not likely to generate significant amounts of greenhouse gases, Mitigation Measure 2 would help to ensure that any impacts are less than significant.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location; Project plans.</p>				
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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The County's 2022 Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) identifies priority actions to achieve the County's updated goals of 45% reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions over 1990 levels by 2030 and carbon neutrality by 2040. To achieve these goals, the CCAP is structured to focus on: Building Energy, Transportation, Waste, and Working Lands. The project will not conflict with the applicable focus areas of the County's CCAP as the project will be required to comply with Reach Codes and Energy Codes for building energy efficiency; the project will not result in significant traffic due to the facility not being open to the general public, and the facility will utilize the local waste disposal service for proper waste disposal and recycling. Therefore, the project conforms with the County's CCAP.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; San Mateo County Community Climate Action Plan, 2022.</p>				
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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project is proposed in a rural open space area and will not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. A total of 7 trees are proposed for removal to accommodate aspects of the project; however, a total of 73 trees are proposed as part of the project's landscape planting plan.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location; Project plans.</p>				

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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are not located near coastal cliffs/bluffs.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location.</p>					
8.e.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are not located near the coast or area at risk of exposure to sea level rise.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location.</p>					
8.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are not located in a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> FEMA Map Panel 06081C0391E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
8.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are not located in a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> FEMA Map Panel 06081C0391E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					

<b>9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project does not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p>					



<b>Source:</b> 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
<b>Discussion:</b> The project does not involve activities that would result in conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. <b>Source:</b> 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
<b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; and are not expected to emit any hazardous emissions. <b>Source:</b> Project location; Project plans.					
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
<b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials. <b>Source:</b> Project location; California Department of Toxic Substances, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site 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
<b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. <b>Source:</b> Project location.					
9.f.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X

<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project will include improvements to the existing access road off Pescadero Creek Road to the project site in compliance with Fire Department standards for emergency access. The San Mateo County Fire Department has reviewed and conditionally approved the project plans.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; San Mateo County Fire Department.</p>					
9.g.	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are located in a high fire hazard risk, State Responsibility Area, for wildland fires. The proposed project includes improved emergency ingress/egress to the project site, and water storage and hydrant infrastructure for fire suppression. All new structures will be constructed to applicable fire code. The San Mateo County Fire Department has reviewed and conditionally approved the project, ensuring health and safety risk as a result of wildland fire is minimized.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; Project location; San Mateo County GIS; San Mateo County Fire Department.</p>					
9.h.	Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are not located in a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> FEMA Map Panel 06081C0391E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
9.i.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcels are not located in a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> FEMA Map Panel 06081C0391E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
9.j.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located in an area at risk of flooding.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location; San Mateo County General Plan, Natural Hazards Map.</p>					
9.k.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> According to the County General Plan Natural Hazards Map, the project site is not located in an area at risk of seiche, tsunami or mudflow.</p>					

**Source:** Project location; San Mateo County General Plan, Natural Hazards Map.

<b>10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10.a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project has the potential to generate polluted stormwater runoff during site grading and construction-related activities; however, such impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of the project's proposed erosion control plan.</p> <p>The project is required to comply with the County's Drainage Policy requiring post-construction stormwater flows to be at, or below, pre-construction flow rates. Additionally, the project is a C.3 regulated project that requires permanent stormwater treatment measures pursuant to the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit. The project proposes low-impact development measures and permanent measures, including a system of catch basins, bio-retention areas, vegetated swales, and rock energy dissipators to self-treating areas to capture and filter stormwater from new impervious areas. As a C.3 regulated project site, ongoing monitoring and maintenance is required for the property with oversight by the County. The project was reviewed and conditionally approved by the County Building Inspection's Civil Section for compliance with County drainage standards and standards of the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit. The project will disturb over 1 acre and therefore will be required to file a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared by a Qualified Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Developer to the State Water Board for a Waste Discharge Identification Number (WDID) and undergo routine construction stormwater inspections by a Qualified Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Practitioner. Furthermore, the proposed septic system has been reviewed and conditionally approved by the County's Environmental Health Services. Therefore, the project would not violate any quality standards or waste discharge requirements or substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; San Mateo County Building Inspection, Civil Section; San Mateo County Environmental Health Services; San Mateo County Drainage Policy; San Mateo County Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit.</p>				
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:** According to the Geotechnical Investigation Report, the project site is underlain at shallow depths by sedimentary bedrock which the report suggests does not serve as a laterally continuous shallow aquifer. Evidence of groundwater in the project site area was not encountered in any geotechnical exploration for the proposed project.

**Source:** Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021; Project location.

10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project proposes a significant volume of grading for new buildings, site improvements, and on- and off-site access road improvements. Additionally, the project proposes more than 50,000 sq. ft. of new impervious surface which significantly alters the existing (sheet flow) drainage pattern of the site. All grading will be in conformance with the County’s Grading Ordinance and the project consultant’s geotechnical recommendations, including recommendations for runoff to be collected and directed to suitable discharge points to specifically avoid the small to medium sized landslide areas in the vicinity of the project site and to locate discharge points downslope of the proposed development and roadway. The project has been preliminarily reviewed and conditionally approved by the County’s Geotechnical Section and Civil (Drainage) Section. No further mitigation is necessary.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021; Project plans; County of San Mateo Geotechnical Section; County of San Mateo Civil (Drainage) Section.</p>				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	

**Discussion:** The project proposes more than 50,000 sq. ft. of new impervious surface which will substantially increase surface runoff from pre-existing sheet flow conditions. The project incorporates drainage design measures to meet the County’s Drainage Policy for post-construction stormwater runoff not to exceed pre-construction runoff. The project proposes new appropriately sized vegetated swales below the perimeter of the project site to capture runoff from improvements. The captured runoff will be directed to appropriately sized pre-treatment bio-swales and flow-through bio-retention planters that are connected to bio-retention rocked outfalls that are strategically located to avoid identified small to medium sized landslide areas in the nearby vicinity of the project site area (as recommended by the Geotechnical Investigation Report). The pre-treatment bio-swales will slow runoff. The bio-retention planter will provide stormwater treatment and retention by using the planter subdrain to meter the release of captured stormwater. These proposed drainage measures will ensure the increase in runoff resulting from the project will not result in flooding or ponding on- or off-site.

**Source:** Project plans; Hydrology Study, prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., dated June 2, 2022 (last revised); Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021.

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:** While the project proposes more than 50,000 sq. ft. of new impervious surface, a preliminary drainage plan and hydrology study prepared for the project demonstrate that new drainage measures are being appropriately sized to accommodate the increased runoff generated by the project. The proposed drainage measures include measures to provide stormwater treatment as required under Provision C3 of the County’s Municipal Regional (Stormwater) Permit to minimize polluted runoff.

**Source:** Project plans; Hydrology Study, prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., dated June 2, 2022 (last revised).

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				X
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project is not in an area prone to flood (hazard); therefore, the project will not impede or redirect flood flows. See also staff’s discussion in Section 10.b. and 10.c.i. – 10.c.iii.

**Source:** Project plans; Hydrology Study, prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., dated June 2, 2022 (last revised); FEMA Map Panel 06081C0391E, effective October 16, 2012.

10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project site is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone.

**Source:** Project location; San Mateo County General Plan Natural Hazards Map.

10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or				X
---	--	--	--	---

sustainable groundwater management plan?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not within any of the 9 County groundwater basins. See staff's discussion in Sections 10.a. and 10.b.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location.</p>				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project proposes a use and amount of development that could degrade surface water water quality; however, the project is subject to Provision C3 of the County's Municipal Regional (Stormwater) Permit which requires project runoff be treated onsite to minimize polluted runoff. The project incorporates landscape areas and appropriately sized bio-retention planters that will provide stormwater treatment in compliance with Provision C3. Furthermore, see staff's discussion in Section 10.b. No further mitigation is recommended.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; Hydrology Study, prepared by Lea &amp; Braze Engineering, Inc., dated June 2, 2022 (last revised).</p>				
10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See staff's discussion in Sections 10.a., 10.c., and 10.f.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans.</p>				

<b>11. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> 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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project is located in a rural area of the County and will be contained entirely on the project parcels. The project does not involve elements that would result in the physical division of an established community.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project location; Project plans.</p>				
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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</p>				

**Source:** Project plans; Project location; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County General Plan.

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

**Discussion:** The proposed Animal Sanctuary will provide permanent housing for dogs, cats, and a small number of farm animals that for various reasons may not find their way into a family’s home through a traditional adoption program. The proposed project has a specific intended purpose with all proposed development and infrastructure limited to serving the use. The Sanctuary will not be open to the general public. The project does not serve to encourage off-site development of undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas.

**Source:** Project plans; Project location.

**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:** According to the San Mateo County General Plan Mineral Resources Map, one of the two project parcels, APN 082-050-011, is located in a Significant Mineral Resource Area for (oil) fields. The project includes limiting development on this project parcel to a new water well with an access driveway; thus, the project will not result in significant loss of any oil resources.

**Source:** Project location; San Mateo County General Plan Mineral Resources Map.

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

**Discussion:** See staff’s response to Section 12.a.

**Source:** Project location; San Mateo County General Plan Mineral Resources Map.

<b>13. NOISE.</b> 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 would generate short-term noise associated with grading and construction activities. Short-term noise associated with these activities are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the San Mateo County Noise Ordinance Code which limits noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays; such activities are prohibited on Sundays, Thanksgiving, and Christmas.

The San Mateo County General Plan defines a Noise Impact Area as those areas experiencing noise levels of 60 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or greater. The County's Noise Ordinance allows a daytime (7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.) noise level of 60 dBA for a cumulative of 15 minutes in any hour and a nighttime (10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.) noise level of 55 dBA for the duration of time. It is expected that Sanctuary staff would be able to quiet down barking dogs within 15 minutes or less.

A noise study prepared by Wilson Ihrig considered four project sources of noise: 1) nighttime animal noise, 2) daytime noise from animals in outdoor areas, 3) mechanical equipment, and 4) traffic. Dog barks are expected to be the highest noise source from animals on the site and therefore were the focus of the noise study.

*Nighttime Animal Noise*

During evening and nighttime hours of operation, from dusk to approximately 8:00 a.m., dogs will be indoors with no outdoor access (unless directly supervised by staff on a one-by-one case). In a rare occurrence that a dog would bark outside in the middle of the night, the maximum expected noise level at the closest residence, approximately 2,700 ft. away, would be 10 dBA; and at the YMCA Camp Jones Gulch, approximately 6,200 ft. southeast, the maximum expected noise level would be 20 dBA. Therefore, nighttime animal noise level would be well below the County's thresholds.

*Daytime Animal Noise in Outdoor Areas*

Dogs would be strategically matched up to live together in pairs or small groups in arrangements that would innately foster play and social structure that would help to alleviate boredom and stress, both of which can contribute to nuisance barking. During the daytime hours, dogs would be in fenced outdoor areas with each other. Should a group of dogs start barking, the expected maximum noise level generated would be 20 dBA at the nearest residence and 30 dBA at the YMCA camp. These levels are below the County's thresholds.

*Mechanical Equipment*

The project would include heat and ventilation equipment for the animal cottages, caretaker's residence, and veterinary/administration building. In a worse-case scenario, expected maximum noise level for mechanical equipment would be 11 dBA; well below the County's thresholds.



<i>Traffic</i>				
The project would increase traffic along Pescadero Creek Road by approximately 10%, per Hexagon Traffic Study. This traffic increase would result in a negligible increase in noise for the area.				
<b>Source:</b> Project plans; Project location; San Mateo County General Plan; Noise Study for the Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA Haskin Hill Sanctuary, prepared by Wilson Ihrig (2021).				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	
<b>Discussion:</b> Construction and grading activities may generate ground-borne vibration; however, it would be localized to the rural project site and temporary in nature. The operation of the Sanctuary would not generate any ground-borne vibration or noise.				
<b>Source:</b> Project plans; Project location; Noise Study for the Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA Haskin Hill Sanctuary, prepared by Wilson Ihrig (2021).				
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
<b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.				
<b>Source:</b> Project location.				

<b>14. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The project includes development limited to supporting the proposed Animal Sanctuary use. Aside from off-site improvements to an existing access road leading directly to the project site, all proposed development and infrastructure will be contained on the project site.				
<b>Source:</b> Project plans.				

14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves the removal of an older 1970's cottage and construction of a new caretaker residence. Therefore, the project will not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans.</p>				

<p><b>15. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?			X	
15.b. Police protection?				X
15.c. Schools?				X
15.d. Parks?				X
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project will add demand to fire services and the public electrical supply system (PG&amp;E services). The project will include access road improvements (road widening, resurfacing, turnarounds) and fire system improvements (fire tanks, hydrants, water) to comply with Fire Department standards. The project is also designed to receive overhead electrical service from PG&amp;E through installation of power poles to the project site. There is no evidence to suggest the increased demand in these services will be significant. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; San Mateo County Fire Department.</p>				

<p><b>16. RECREATION.</b> Would the project:</p>				
	<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 will not generate a demand in use of parks or other recreational facilities.

**Source:** Project plans.

16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The project includes recreational area for animals. As evidenced throughout this Initial Study, expected adverse environmental impacts will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels.

**Source:** Project plans.

**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 project is located in a rural area of the County, accessible from Pescadero Creek Road; a two lane roadway that winds through Loma Mar. A Transportation Study for the project was prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. The study describes that during the facility’s daytime operating hours, 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. daily, there would be a maximum of 10 employees and 3-5 volunteers on site. After hours, the onsite caretaker would be responsible for monitoring the property and animals. Shifts for animal care and facility staff would start first, with admin staff and veterinary medical staff working a more typical 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. workday (Hexagon, 2022). A second animal care shift would start around mid-day and work until approximately 7:00 p.m. Volunteer shifts would start in the late morning and be staggered throughout the day, concluding by 7:00 p.m. Based on a conservative consideration of project generated traffic that all employees would arrive at work during the AM peak hour and leave during the PM peak hour, the project is estimated to generate approximately 32 daily trips, including 10 trips during the peak AM hours (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.) and 13 trips during the peak PM hours (4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.). The estimated 32 daily trips would increase the daily traffic on Pescadero Creek Road by approximately 10%. Due to the relatively low traffic volume near the site, the project traffic can be accommodated on Pescadero Creek Road. The proposed trip generation does not meet the threshold of a significant adverse impact on traffic conditions in San Mateo County pursuant to the County Department of Public

Works' 2013 Traffic Impact Study Requirements or the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Traffic Demand Management Policy.

**Source:** Project plans; Project location; Transportation Study for Proposed Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., March 31, 2022; County Department of Public Works, Traffic Impact Study Requirements, September 1, 2013; C/CAG TDM Policy, January 1, 2022.

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:** Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines provides specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. A project's effect on automobile delay does not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA. Per Section 15064.3, an analysis of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) attributable to a project is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. Based on the County Department of Public Works' Inter-Departmental Correspondence on VMT for determining transportation impacts under CEQA analysis, the significance of VMT impacts in rural areas are set on a case-by-case basis. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the project documents, including the Transportation Study prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., and has determined that based on the use and minimal increase in trips that will be generated by the project, the project screens out of the need for a VMT study as a "small project" as it generates fewer than 110 daily trips, is consistent with the General Plan, and there is no evidence indicating a potentially significant level of VMT would result from the project.

**Source:** Project plans; Project location; Transportation Study for Proposed Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., March 31, 2022; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3; San Mateo County Department of Public Works Inter-Departmental Correspondence for Change to Vehicle Miles Traveled as Metric to Determine Transportation Impacts under CEQA Analysis, dated September 23, 2020.

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:** Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. conducted a sight distance evaluation for the project's driveway at Pescadero Creek Road and concluded that while safe line of sight stopping distance is provided to traffic heading southbound on Pescadero Creek Road, line of sight stopping distance for traffic heading northbound on Pescadero Creek Road is limited due to the curvature of Pescadero Creek Road and an embankment on the west side of the road. Correcting the sight distance deficiency would require significant changes and extensive grading and tree loss. Alternatively, Hexagon recommends that the proposed driveway be converted to a right-turn in and right-turn out only driveway with a median island and right arrow installed at the entrance of the driveway with additional signage to alert northbound drivers along Pescadero Creek Road and exiting drivers of the right-in, right-out only driveway. The applicant's latest revised plans incorporate these recommendations into their project scope and the Department of Public Works

has reviewed and conditionally approved the project. Additionally, the following mitigation measure, based on recommendation by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. is proposed:

**Mitigation Measure 16:** Subject to approval by the Department of Public Works, the installation of “blind driveway” warning signs shall be installed on Pescadero Creek Road to alert approaching drivers to the existence of the project driveway.

**Source:** Project plans; Project location; Transportation Study for Proposed Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., March 31, 2022; San Mateo County Department of Public Works.

17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project includes access improvements to comply with Fire standards. The San Mateo County Fire Department has reviewed and conditionally approved the project.

**Source:** Project plans; San Mateo County Fire Department.

**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:** A Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands search was completed, and the results were negative. The Commission also provided the contact information for Native American tribes who could have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Staff has reached out to these tribes, along with outreach to the Tamien Nation, but to date has received no response for consultation. Additionally, a cultural resources survey for the project site did not identify any resources that could qualify for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources. Nonetheless, the following Best Practices measures, as determined by the Native American Heritage Commission, are recommended:

**Mitigation Measure 17:** In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall stop until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resource in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource, and those measures shall be approved by the Current Planning Section prior to implementation and continuing any work associated with the project.

**Mitigation Measure 18:** Any inadvertently discovered tribal cultural resources shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting the traditional use of the resource, and protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

**Source:** Project location; Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Daniel Shoup, RPA and Molly Fierer-Donaldson, dated August 2011; Native American Heritage Commission correspondence, December 6, 2022.

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

**Discussion:** The project area has a low possibility of containing cultural resources based on a cultural resources survey for the project site, sacred lands search by the Native American Heritage Commission, and lack of responses from notification to Native American tribes who could have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area.

**Source:** Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Daniel Shoup, RPA and Molly Fierer-Donaldson, dated August 2011; Native American Heritage Commission correspondence, December 6, 2022.

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

<p><b>Discussion:</b> The existing project area consists of minimal development from the 1970's, including a cottage, a barn, and a shed structure. The project includes abandonment of an existing water well and relocation/replacement with a new private water well, a new septic system, new overhead electrical lines supported by new power poles, and new stormwater infrastructure to support the development. These proposed utilities will be designed to be sized to serve the project's needs and are located and designed to minimize tree removal and grading to that necessary for installation and operation. These elements are not within any sensitive habitat areas and are not within a scenic corridor. Therefore, there are no expected environmental impacts from proposed utilities.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans.</p>				
19.b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Based on projected water demands for the proposed project, a total of 8.76 – 10.44 gpm is estimated to be needed (low season – high season). There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed well will not be able to serve the project in the reasonably foreseeable future. A 2019 well completion report for an existing well on the project site, proposed to be abandoned, yielded 25 gallons-per-minute (gpm). Additionally, the County's Environmental Health Services has reviewed and conditionally approved the project plans.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; Well Completion Report, July 29, 2019; San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.</p>				
19.c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed onsite wastewater treatment system has been reviewed and conditionally approved by the County's Environmental Health Services for location, preliminary design, and capacity.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.</p>				
19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project is not expected to generate excessive solid waste that would conflict with any State or local standards or impact the capacity of local infrastructure. Animal areas would be cleaned daily with waste picked-up, bagged, and placed in commercial trash containers for regular pick-up from a contracted trash company.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans.</p>				

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

**Discussion:** The project intends to comply with all statutes and regulations related to solid waste.  
**Source:** Project plans.

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

	<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 project is located in a high fire hazard severity zone, State Responsibility Area. The project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The facility will maintain an evacuation plan for animals and staff in the case of emergency and staff will complete regular emergency response training. The San Mateo County Fire Department has reviewed and conditionally approved the project relative to fire risk and emergency service requirements.

**Source:** Project plans; San Mateo County GIS; San Mateo County Fire Department.

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 adjacent to a densely forested area and on a ridgeline of a gentle to moderately sloped area. The Sanctuary will operate with a small staff, up to 10 employees and 3-5 volunteers. Fire safety measures are proposed, including fire access improvements and new fire suppression system infrastructure. The San Mateo County Fire Department has reviewed and conditionally approved the project. Additionally, the facility proposes to develop a fire evacuation plan and conduct annual fire drills.

**Source:** Project plans; San Mateo County Fire Department.

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



**Discussion:** The project includes the installation of new overhead power poles and power lines to serve the project. The project also includes the installation of a well, storage tank, and fire hydrant for fire suppression that would help to reduce fire risk at the project site. These utilities would not result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

**Source:** Project plans; Project location.

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

X

**Discussion:** The project site is not located in a flood zone; however, is located on gentle to moderately sloped open space terrain. The project includes stormwater facilities that consider the Geotechnical Investigate Report’s findings (see staff’s discussion in Section 7 and Section 10) to avoid runoff, slope instability, or drainage changes that could exacerbate flooding or landslides in the area. Therefore, risks and potential impacts are less-than-significant.

**Source:** Project plans; Geotechnical Investigation Report for Peninsula Humane Society Animal Sanctuary, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated July 21, 2021.

**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:** While the project could result in significant impacts to special status wildlife species as discussed in detail in Section 4, mitigation measures have been included to reduce those impacts to less than significant levels.

**Source:** See source citations in Section 4.

21.b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects

X

of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project is located in a rural area of the County with all improvements contained on private property. The nature of the proposed use is low intensity and would not contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts beyond the individual impacts discussed throughout this document.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project plans; Project location.</p>				
21.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project as proposed with all recommended mitigation measures discussed in the previous sections of this document would minimize potential impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> See source citations throughout this document.</p>				

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

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Bay Area Air Quality Management District	X		Generators: Authority to Construct, Permit to Operate; "J" Number for demolition.
Caltrans		X	
City		X	
California Coastal Commission		X	
California Department of Food and Agriculture		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
Other: _____			
National Marine Fisheries Service		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
Sewer/Water District:		X	
State Department of Fish and Wildlife		X	

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
State Department of Public Health		X	
State Water Resources Control Board	X		Waste Discharge Identification Number (WDID).
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)		X	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		X	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		X	

<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed.	X	
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 1:</b> All proposed exterior lighting shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the Sanctuary's project site area and prevent glare in the surrounding area, including to nearby water bodies. Manufacturer cut sheets for any exterior light fixtures shall be submitted for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All exterior fixtures shall be downward directed designed to minimize light pollution beyond the confines of the subject premises.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 2:</b> The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.</li> <li>All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</li> <li>All roadways, driveways, and walkways to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</li> <li>All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.</li> </ol>		

- g. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact 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.

**Mitigation Measure 3: Special Status Bat Surveys.** Prior to any tree removal, a qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment for bats a minimum of 30 to 90 days prior to removal. The assessment should include a visual inspection of all potential roosting features (e.g., cavities, crevices, peeling bark, etc.). If suitable trees are found, the following measures shall be initiated:

1. To the extent feasible, tree removal should be initiated between September 1 and October 15 to avoid maternity roosting bats if present and/or between March 1 and April 15 to avoid bats in hibernation. Trees may be removed during these two periods using the two-step removal process described below:
  - a. On the first day, in the afternoon, under the direct supervision of a qualified biologist, limbs and branches shall be removed by a tree cutter using chainsaws only. Limbs with cavities, crevices, or deep bark fissures shall be avoided.
  - b. On the second day, the entire tree shall be removed and left overnight prior to chipping or hauling off the site to allow any bats to exit.
2. If tree removal is performed outside the windows prescribed above and bat habitat is observed, an acoustic bat roost survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist between April 15 and September 1 to evaluate whether a maternity roost (solitary or colonial) is present. If a maternity roost is found, a no-disturbance buffer should be placed around the roost until September 1 when pups are likely to be weaned; the buffer shall be determined by the qualified biologist. Additionally, a bat mitigation and monitoring plan shall be prepared and submitted to California Department of Fish and Wildlife for approval. No tree removal shall occur between October 15 and April 15 to avoid impacts to hibernating bats.

**Mitigation Measure 4:** If work will occur within the bird breeding season (generally February 1 to September 15), a pre-construction nesting bird and raptor survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist in all potential nesting areas within one-quarter mile of proposed activities. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted during the time of day when birds are active and shall factor in sufficient time to perform the survey adequately and completely. If nests are found, their locations shall be flagged, and all work shall cease until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged or an appropriately sized no-disturbance buffer has been placed around the nest at the direction of the qualified biologist conducting the survey. Buffers shall be maintained, and active nests shall be monitored until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged and/or are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival. If no nesting birds are observed during pre-construction surveys, no further action is necessary.

Nest buffers for special status species shall be set as follows, or as otherwise directed by the qualified biologist:

- For golden eagle or marbled murrelet = one quarter mile
- For long eared-owl or other raptor species = 250 feet
- For wrentit and/or other songbird species = 25 to 50 feet

**Mitigation Measure 5:** Temporary exclusion fence shall be placed between the project footprint and sensitive vegetation communities to avoid potential effects during grading/vegetation removal activities.

**Mitigation Measure 6:** Environmental awareness training shall be provided to all construction crew prior to the start of work. Training shall include a description of all biological resources that may be found on or near the Project site, the laws and regulations that protect those resources, the consequences of non-compliance with those laws and regulations, instructions for inspecting equipment each morning prior to activities, and a contact person if protected biological resources are discovered on the Project site.

**Mitigation Measure 7:** A pre-construction survey for special status reptiles and amphibians shall be performed within 48 hours of any ground disturbing activities within 300 feet of any aquatic (pond) or riparian habitat when water is present. Non-listed species, if found, may be relocated to suitable habitat outside the Project Site. If California red-legged frog is found, work shall be halted, and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted. Work shall remain halted until authorized to resume by the project biologist.

**Mitigation Measure 8:** If California-red legged frog is observed during pre-construction surveys or at any time during construction, a biological monitor shall be present until work in the affected area is completed.

**Mitigation Measure 9:** No work shall be performed within 300 feet of stock pond habitats during or within 24 hours of any rain event (greater than 0.5 inches) between February 1 and April 31 when frogs are most likely to utilize upland habitats. No work shall occur within 30 minutes of sunrise or sunset.

**Mitigation Measure 10:** Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as silt fence or straw wattles shall be installed and maintained between the work area and adjacent waterways to prevent any contaminants from entering the waterway. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) rolled erosion control products, or similar material should not be used to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Acceptable substitutes include coconut coir matting or tackified hydroseeding compounds.

**Mitigation Measure 11:** In the event that archaeological resources are inadvertently discovered during construction, work in the immediate vicinity (within 25 feet) of the find must stop until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. Construction activities may continue in other areas beyond the 25-foot stop work area. A qualified archaeologist is defined as someone who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in archaeology. The Current Planning Section shall be notified of such findings, and no additional work shall be done in the stop work area until the archaeologist has recommended appropriate measures, and those measures have been approved by the Current Planning Section and implemented.

**Mitigation Measure 12:** An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" and building permit to ensure the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

**Mitigation Measure 13:** The site is considered a Construction Stormwater Regulated Site (SWRS). Any grading activities conducted during the wet weather season (October 1 to April 30) will require monthly erosion and sediment control inspections by the Building Inspection Section, as well as prior authorization from the Community Development Director to conduct grading during the wet weather season.

**Mitigation Measure 14:** No grading activities shall commence until the applicant has been issued a grading permit "Hard Card", which will only be issued concurrently with the associated building permit.

**Mitigation Measure 15:** No grading shall be allowed during the wet weather season (October 1 through April 30) to avoid increased potential soil erosion, unless the applicant applies for an Exception to the Winter Grading Moratorium and the Community Development Director grants the exception. Exceptions will only be granted if dry weather is forecasted during scheduled grading operations, and the erosion control plan includes adequate winterization measures (amongst other determining factors).

**Mitigation Measure 16:** Subject to approval by the Department of Public Works, the installation of "blind driveway" warning signs shall be installed on Pescadero Creek Road to alert approaching drivers to the existence of the project driveway.

**Mitigation Measure 17:** In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall stop until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resource in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource, and those measures shall be approved by the Current Planning Section prior to implementation and continuing any work associated with the project.

**Mitigation Measure 18:** Any inadvertently discovered tribal cultural resources shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting the traditional use of the resource, and protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

**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)

2/27/23

Senior Planner

---

Date

---

(Title)

Attachments:

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Project Plans
- C. Biological Resources Report, by Sol Ecology, February 23, 2021, and subsequent Addendum Memos dated July 1, 2022 and October 13, 2022
- D. Tree Protection & Removal Plan, by Ralph Osterling Consultants, Inc., August 4, 2021
- E. Geotechnical Investigation Report, by Cornerstone Earth Group, July 21, 2021
- F. Transportation Study, by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., May 31, 2022
- G. Noise Study, by Wilson Ihrig, February 18, 2021