

APPENDIX B
CEQA Initial Study

Appendix B Initial Study for the
Cypress Point Affordable Housing
Community Project, San Mateo
County, California

JULY 2023

PREPARED FOR
County of San Mateo

PREPARED BY
SWCA Environmental Consultants

**DRAFT INITIAL STUDY FOR THE
CYPRESS POINT AFFORDABLE HOUSING
COMMUNITY PROJECT,
SAN MATEO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

Prepared for

County of San Mateo
455 County Center
Redwood City, California 94063
Attn: Michael Schaller

Prepared by

SWCA Environmental Consultants
60 Stone Pine Road, Suite 100
Half Moon Bay, California 94019
www.swca.com

SWCA Project No. 73999

July 2023

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Project Location and Environmental Setting.....	2
1.2	Project Description	2
2	Environmental Checklist and Environmental Evaluation.....	2
2.1	Aesthetics	4
2.2	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	5
2.3	Air Quality.....	8
2.4	Biological Resources.....	9
2.5	Cultural Resources	12
2.6	Energy – To be Submitted with Part 2	17
2.7	Geology and Soils	23
2.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.....	25
2.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	27
2.10	Hydrology and Water Quality	30
2.11	Land Use and Planning.....	33
2.12	Mineral Resources	34
2.13	Noise.....	35
2.14	Population and Housing	36
2.15	Public Services	38
2.16	Recreation.....	47
2.17	Transportation	48
2.18	Tribal Cultural Resources.....	49
2.19	Utilities and Service Systems	51
2.20	Wildfire	52
2.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance	54

This page left intentionally blank.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Cypress Point Affordable Housing Community Project (proposed project) is described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the environmental impact report (EIR), to which this initial study is attached and included as Appendix B.

The County of San Mateo (County) Planning and Building Department (Planning Department, CEQA Lead Agency) distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting on December 9, 2022, announcing its intent to prepare an EIR, including an initial study, and to solicit comments from the public about the scope of this EIR (the NOP is presented as EIR Appendix A). This initial study determined that project-specific and cumulative impacts in certain resource topic areas would not require additional analysis in the EIR because the proposed project or project variants would have no impact, less than significant impacts, or less than significant impacts with mitigation included. These topic areas consist of the following:

Agricultural and Forestry Resources (all topics)

Cultural Resources (all topics)

Tribal Cultural Resources (all topics)

Energy (all topics)

Geology and Soils (septic tanks)

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (all topics)

Population and Housing (all topics)

Noise (aviation-related topics)

Recreation (all topics)

Utilities and Service Systems (all topics)

Public Services (all topics)

Biological Resources (all topics)

Hydrology and Water Quality (all topics)

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (all topics)

Mineral Resources (all topics)

Wildfire (all topics)

This initial study provides a discussion and the impact analysis of the proposed project or project variants with respect to these resource topics.

1.1 Project Location and Environmental Setting

The project location, environmental setting, and land use characteristics are described in EIR Chapter 2, Project Description. The cumulative setting is provided in EIR Chapter 3, Environmental Impacts Analysis.

1.2 Project Description

Chapter 2, Project Description, of the EIR, provides a detailed description of the proposed project. This chapter includes a project background, objectives, location, existing site land use characteristics, project components and characteristics, and construction schedule (including anticipated construction activities), and identifies required project approvals.

2 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The proposed project could have a Potentially Significant Impact for environmental factors checked below. Please refer to the attached pages for discussion of mitigation measures or project revisions that would either reduce these impacts to less than significant levels or require further study.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildfire |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. 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.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measure based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Date: _____

Signed: _____

2.1 Aesthetics

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</i>				
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within State or County Scenic Corridor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.1, Aesthetics, provides a detailed analysis of effects on scenic resources, views, visual character, and light and glare associated with the proposed project, including explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (g) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing visual setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures. The significance of the proposed project’s aesthetic effects is based on local policies and standards, photographic documentation of the project site, and viewshed analysis.

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

See EIR Section 3.1, Aesthetics, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to scenic vistas.

b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

See EIR Section 3.1, Aesthetics, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway.

- c) In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?**

See EIR Section 3.1, Aesthetics, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to visual character and public views.

- d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

See EIR Section 3.1, Aesthetics, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to light and glare.

- e) Would the project be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within State or County Scenic Corridor?**

See EIR Section 3.1, Aesthetics, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to Scenic Corridors.

- f) If within a Design Review District, would the project conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?**

See EIR Section 3.1, Aesthetics, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions.

- g) Would the project visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?**

See EIR Section 3.1, Aesthetics, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to visual intrusion.

2.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i></p>				
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) 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 forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(g) Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

a) For lands outside of the Coastal Zone, would the project 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?

The California Department of Conservation (CDOC) Division of Land Resource Protection lists Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Farmland of Statewide Importance under the general category of Important Farmland in California. The project site is split between Urban and Built-Up Land and Other Land. Other Land is designated as land not included in other mapping categories. The project site contains no land that the CDOC designates as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.^{1,2} Therefore, the project would have no impact on the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

The Williamson Act of 1965 allows local governments to enter into agreements with local landowners with the purpose of trying to limit specific parcels of land to agricultural or other related open space use. Given the project site is zoned Planned Unit Development District 140/Coastal Development District (PUD-140/CD), is not subject to a Williamson Act contract, and is not located adjacent to a designated

¹ CDOC. 2019. Important Farmland Categories. Available at: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/finmp/Pages/Important-Farmland-Categories.aspx>. Accessed January 20, 2023.

² CDOC. 2012. DOC Maps: Agriculture. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/agriculture/>. Accessed January 20, 2023.

agricultural use, the project would not conflict with any agricultural use.^{3,4} Therefore, no impact with respect to land zoned for agricultural use or land under a Williamson Act contract would occur, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (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))?

The project site is zoned PUD-140/CD and surrounded by roadways, residential land uses, and open space. It is not located on forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined by California Government Code Section 51104. Therefore, no impact related to conflicts with existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production would occur, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The project site is zoned PUD-140/CD; surrounded by roadways, residential land uses, and open space; and is not located on forest land. Therefore, no impact related to the loss or conversion of forest land would occur, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

e) Would the project 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 forest land to non-forest use?

The project site is zoned PUD-140/CD. Neither the project site nor the surrounding parcels are used for agricultural uses or forest land for timber production. There is no agricultural production or forest land in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no impacts related to conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use would occur and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

f) For lands within the Coastal Zone, would the project 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?

The project site is located in the Coastal Zone. The San Mateo County Prime Soils Map shows areas of unincorporated San Mateo County with soils rated and mapped by the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) as Class I, Class II, and Class III soils capable of growing artichokes or Brussels sprouts.⁵ The Prime Soils Map shows the closest mapped soils as being several miles east of the project site. The map does not show the project site as being located in or adjacent to soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts. Therefore, no impacts related to the conversion or division of lands identified as Class I, Class II, and Class III soils rated good or very food for artichokes or Brussels sprouts would occur and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

³ County of San Mateo. 2013. Local Coastal Program. Available at: <https://www.smcgov.org/planning/local-coastal-program>. Accessed January 20, 2023.

⁴ California Williamson Act Enrollment Finder. 2021. Williamson Act County Participation 2021. Available at: <https://gis.conservation.ca.gov/portal/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=18f7488c0a9d4d299f5e9c33b312f312>. Accessed January 20, 2023.

⁵ County of San Mateo. 2009. Prime Soils Map. Available at: <https://www.smcgov.org/media/73091/download?inline=>. Accessed April 5, 2023.

g) Would the project result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?

The project site contains concrete building foundations and retaining walls from when the site was developed as the Point Montara Artillery Training Station. In some areas, these foundations are covered by graffiti and thick vegetation. Thick vegetation also covers the majority of the project site outside the areas of the building foundations. While grading is proposed throughout the site as part of project development, the soil has already been developed and there would be no damage to capabilities over existing conditions.

As stated in Sections 2.2a, 2.2e, and 2.2f, the project site is zoned PUD-140/CD and has been classified as Urban and Built-Up Land and Other Land. Neither of these CDOC-designated categories are considered agricultural. Additionally, the San Mateo County Prime Soils Map does not map the project site as agricultural. Therefore, no impacts related to soil capability and loss of agricultural land would occur and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Cumulative Discussion

There is no agricultural or forest land on the project site or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impact on farmland or forest resources and no contribution by the proposed project to a significant cumulative impact with respect to agricultural or forest resources. No mitigation measures are necessary.

2.3 Air Quality

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>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>				
(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.2, Air Quality, provides a detailed analysis of construction and operation air quality impacts associated with the proposed project, including explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (d) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing air quality setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project and its variants and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures. The significance of the proposed project’s local and regional air quality effects is based on detailed air quality study modeling.

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

See EIR Section 3.2, Air Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to the applicable air quality plan.

b) Would the project 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?

See EIR Section 3.2, Air Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to criteria pollutants.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?

See EIR Section 3.2, Air Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to sensitive receptors and pollutant concentrations.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

See EIR Section 3.2, Air Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to other emissions and odors.

2.4 Biological Resources

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(h) Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources, provides a detailed analysis of construction and operation biological impacts associated with the proposed project, including explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (h) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing biological resources setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures. As discussed below, initial study checklist topic (f) is less than significant and is not addressed within EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources.

a) *Would the project 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

See EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

b) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?*

See EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

c) *Would the project 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?*

See EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to wetlands.

d) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

See EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to migratory wildlife corridors.

e) Would the project 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)?

See EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

The project site is located within a habitat conservation plan (HCP) specific to Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E's) Bay Area Operations and Maintenance (O&M) activities. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has issued PG&E an Endangered Species Act Section 10(a)(1)(B) incidental take permit for the company's Bay Area O&M HCP. This HCP is designed only to cover PG&E's activities; the HCP includes strategies to avoid, minimize, and offset potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of PG&E's operations, maintenance, and minor new construction activities on 32 species federally listed as threatened or endangered.⁶ The purpose of the Bay Area O&M HCP is to enable PG&E to continue to conduct current and future O&M activities within the nine counties of the Bay Area while avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating for temporary and permanent impacts on threatened and endangered species habitat that could result from PG&E's ongoing O&M activities.

As the HCP is designed only to cover PG&E's activities, aspects of the proposed project outside of PG&E's activities are not subject to the provisions contained within the PG&E O&M HCP. To the extent that PG&E conducts maintenance activities on their facilities on the project site, these activities would be subject to the HCP, but they would not be part of the proposed project, and thus project activities would not be subject to that HCP.

There are no other HCPs or natural community conservation plans in effect on the project site. As the project does not include PG&E O&M activities on the project site, and no other HCPs exist that contain the project site, implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

g) Would the project be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?

See EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to marine or wildlife reserves.

⁶ USFWS. 2017. Habitat Conservation Plan for Pacific Gas and Electric Company's San Francisco Bay Area Operations and Maintenance. 82 FR 15063 no. 2017-05856. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/03/24/2017-05856/habitat-conservation-plan-for-pacific-gas-and-electric-companys-san-francisco-bay-area-operations>. Accessed January 31, 2023.

h) Would the project result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?

See EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to woodlands.

Cumulative Discussion

The project would not conflict with the PG&E O&M HCP. Therefore, there would be no contribution by the proposed project to a significant cumulative impact with respect to HCPs, natural community conservation plans, or other approved local, regional, or state HCPs. No mitigation measures are necessary.

2.5 Cultural Resources

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

A combined cultural resources evaluation was prepared by Archaeological Resource Management (ARM) dated June 1, 2018, to address potential cultural resources related to the project.

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Historically, the proposed project site was part of the Point Montara Artillery Training Station, a World War II-era military complex in use between 1943 and 1945. Several structures within this complex were located on the proposed project site, including barracks, offices, a mess hall, a library, a garage, a boiler room, an incinerator, a hanger, and a drill field.⁷

A combined cultural resources evaluation was completed for the Cypress Point project on June 1, 2018, by ARM. The evaluation included a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search conducted at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) in 2017 (NWIC No. 17-0815). The records search and supplemental archival research revealed that there were no previously recorded cultural resources within the project site, while four previously recorded resources were located within a 0.25-mile radius of the proposed project site. These four previously recorded resources within the vicinity of the project site are as follows:

⁷ ARM. 2018a. *Cultural Resources Evaluation of the Cypress Point Project in Moss Beach, County of San Mateo*. Archaeological Resource Management.

- CA-SMA-55: Referred to as Nelson 405, this prehistoric site was a shell mound documented in 1908 by N. Nelson. During the early twentieth century, Nelson investigated shell mounds along the Central California Coast, many of which have been damaged or destroyed.
- CA-SMA-171H: The Point Montara Artillery Training Station and Point Montara Light Station Historic District was originally identified in 1973. The combined cultural resources evaluation notes that none of the recorded elements associated with the historic district are located within the project site.
- P-41-2108: The Montara Cottage is a historic building that was recorded by D. Painter and C. Losee in 2003.
- P-41-2154: The Montara Water and Sanitary District Office at Point Montara Training Station is a historic resource was recorded in 2005 by D. Edwards. It is described as the Montara Water and Sanitary District Office at Point Montara Training Station.⁸

The studies above did not identify any potential historic resources within the project site, including various elements associated with the Point Montara Artillery Training Station Historic District. This recording occurred after the proposed project site had been transitioned to use as a training facility for firefighters in the 1960s, during which time the former Point Montara Artillery Training Station buildings on the project site were destroyed by controlled burns, leaving only concrete foundations, as described in the 2018 combined cultural resources evaluation. A general surface reconnaissance survey conducted by a field archaeologist on all open land surfaces on the project site found only building foundations and other concrete features such as culverts and other infrastructure associated with military activities on the site.

None of the extant structures within the project site are currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or designated a County Historic Landmark. The extant foundations and concrete infrastructure within the project site were found to not appear eligible for listing in any historic register, inventory, or landmark program in the 2018 combined cultural resources evaluation, as they do not convey the architectural design, materiality, and functionality of the buildings in association with the Point Montara Artillery Training Station's operations to a degree that would support their eligibility. Given this, they do not qualify as historic resources.

Although the combined cultural resources evaluation prepared by ARM mentioned the Point Montara Light Station as part of the 1973 documentation of the Point Montara Artillery Training Station Historic District, the report did not identify that the Point Montara Light Station—located outside of the project site but in the vicinity—is also listed on the NRHP, as well as the CRHR.⁹ The Point Montara Light Station was documented as part of the California Light Station Multiple Property Documentation project, and subsequently listed in the NRHP in 1991, and automatically listed in the CRHR. The property was determined significant as an example of a late nineteenth and early twentieth century lighthouse, and for its associations with maritime transportation in California. The property is a cohesive complex of support buildings centered around the prominent lighthouse tower located on the bluffs of Point Montara, east of Highway 1 at 16th Street. The complex features a series of contributing elements:

- Lighthouse Tower (constructed 1928)
- Fog-Signal Building (constructed 1902)
- Keeper's Quarters (constructed 1875)

⁸ ARM, 2018a, pp. 7–8.

⁹ California Office of Historic Preservation. 2022. Built Environment Resource Directory: San Mateo County. Available at: https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=30338. Accessed February 10, 2023.

- Coal Shed Building (constructed 1902)

These buildings correspond to the established period of significance for the resource, which is 1875 to 1940, and correlates with the initial founding of the property by the federal government as a fog-signal station and continued use as a light station in support of maritime travel.¹⁰ The cutoff date of 1940 was derived from the 50-year age threshold used for assessing NRHP eligibility, although it is likely appropriate chronologically as well due in part to the change in use in the area with U.S. involvement in World War II. The NRHP listing also notes multiple non-contributing elements of the light station property, namely the Assistant Keeper's Quarters (constructed 1961), the Garage and Tank House (constructed 1907, extensively altered 1939), and two World War II-era storage facilities.¹¹ The nomination states that the property generally retains its integrity of setting due to its prominence on the coastal bluff overlooking the Pacific Ocean and the surrounding cypress trees, although the encroachment of suburban residential development surrounding the property is noted.¹²

Although the Point Montara Light Station is not within the project site and will not be physically impacted, it is within the vicinity of the project. However, there is no potential for visual, atmospheric, or audible impacts from the project. The light station is over 900 feet from the project site, reducing the potential for any audible or vibratory impacts, both of which would be temporary in nature and associated with construction activities. Visually, the potential for impacts is limited due to the distance between the light station and the project site but is reduced further through the presence of extensive tree groves and the varied topography of the intermediate area. Furthermore, any changes to the setting related to the project will be consistent with the existing character of the area surrounding the light station, which features Highway 1 directly east, and suburban residential developments surrounding the property to the north, east, and south. As a historic resource, the Point Montara Light Station would retain its existing levels of integrity and would not be significantly impacted by the project.

Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts to historical resources and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?*

The 2018 combined cultural resource evaluation prepared by ARM identified a portion of the proposed project site as containing potentially significant archaeological resources (a midden site). The report concluded that “based upon the lack of diagnostic artifactual material within the deposit, and its heavily disturbed nature, CA-SMA-431 does not appear to have the potential to yield important prehistoric or historic information, and thus does not appear eligible for either the CRHR or the NRHP. However, there is the possibility that isolated artifacts/remains are present.”¹³

Archaeological testing for the purpose of determining the boundaries, depth, and constituents of the archaeological deposit within the proposed project site was recommended. In February 2018, ARM returned to the proposed project site, and testing excavation was carried out. Testing determined that the proposed earthmoving activities at the project site have the potential to impact cultural materials. A treatment plan was designed to mitigate the specific impacts of earthmoving during the proposed project construction. Preservation in place was determined not to be feasible as the proposed project could not

¹⁰ Bookwalter, Jack. 1989. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form for Point Montara Light Station. Reference No. 91001094. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

¹¹ Bookwalter, 1989.

¹² California Office of Historic Preservation, 2022.

¹³ ARM. 2018b. *Archaeological Testing Program for CA-SMA-431 at the Cypress Point Project in Moss Beach*. Archaeological Resource Management.

avoid the resource. Mitigation Measure (MM)-CR-1: Additional Site Excavation, MM-CR-2: Archaeological Monitoring, and MM-CR-3: Unanticipated Findings during Construction are recommended to reduce potential impacts to cultural resources to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.¹⁴

CR-1 Additional Site Excavation. An archaeological salvage program shall take place prior to the earthmoving activities and shall consist of four hand-excavated 1 × 1-m mitigation units. Placement of the units shall be based on available archival background data, field observations, and proposed project plans. Hand excavation shall be conducted using standard archaeological techniques with trowels, picks, and shovels at arbitrary levels and dry screened through ¼-inch mesh. All identified artifactual material shall be collected from each level. Collected material shall be placed in level bags, and each level shall be recorded using level forms. Artifacts, soil type, color, stratigraphy, and features present shall be recorded. All artifactual material from this process shall then be placed within its appropriate level bag during the field process.

CR-2 Archaeological Monitoring. Archaeological monitoring shall be conducted during all earthmoving activities involved with the project in accordance with the schedule coordinated between the general contractor and project archaeologist. This shall consist of full-time monitoring during all earthmoving activities within 50 feet of CA-SMA-431. Archaeological spot-check monitoring, consisting of periodic monitoring of the project site during ground-disturbing activities, including during demolition of the existing concrete foundations, shall take place for the remainder of the project. The timing and frequency of these spot checks shall be determined throughout the course of earthmoving activities for the proposed project based upon the construction schedule and the nature of any cultural materials encountered. Per the schedule, the archaeologist shall inspect the site and shall subsequently provide an archaeological monitoring report. This report shall document all cultural materials encountered and be submitted to project representatives within 40 working days of the completion of earthmoving activities for the project.

Considering that cultural resources frequently exist below the surface, their location is often not visible. Field archaeologists therefore monitor earthmoving activities to observe whether artifactual remains, soil changes indicating cultural use, and/or other indicators of human activity are present within a project site. Monitoring consists of a qualified archaeological field technician observing the ground-disturbing activities in native soil.

CR-3 Unanticipated Findings during Construction. If any individual artifacts (prehistoric or historic), features, potential midden soils, or other indicators of cultural use are noted by the archaeological monitor during the earthmoving activities, work within 50 feet of the find shall be stopped until appropriate measures are formulated by the project archaeologist and accepted by the County and the project representative. If the project archaeologist is not present on the site, the County, owner, and project archaeologist shall be notified by telephone, and the project archaeologist shall examine the materials encountered within 24 hours. Any archaeological materials found at the site shall be collected and stored for further analysis by a qualified archaeologist and may require consultation with appropriate Tribal representatives, as dictated by the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and County.

¹⁴ ARM, 2018b.

If an intact archaeological deposit is discovered during archaeological mitigation/monitoring, construction activities shall be halted within 50 feet of the find for the purpose of identifying and mapping the deposit, and appropriate investigative methods and approaches shall be formulated by the project archaeologist and discussed with the project representative. If these materials are determined to be significant, a preservation plan or data recovery program shall be prepared and submitted to the County for approval prior to implementation.

Impacts related to archaeological resources would be less than significant with implementation of MM-CR-1 through MM-CR-3 and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

c) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?*

There are no known subsurface human remains within the project site. If human remains are discovered, MM-CR-4: Procedures for Discovery and Treatment of Human Remains shall be implemented. Adherence to the guidance under MM-CR-4 would mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.

CR-4 Procedures for Discovery and Treatment of Human Remains. If human remains are found during excavation or construction, work shall be halted at a minimum of 50 feet from the find, the area shall be staked off, and the owner and project archaeologist shall be notified. The owner shall contact the County Coroner, and no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains shall be performed until the coroner determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours of this determination. The NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent (MLD) of the deceased. The MLD may then make recommendations to the owner and execute an agreement for the means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated grave goods, as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

If required, reinternment of human remains shall be performed according to California law for Native American burials (Chapter 1492, Statutes of 1982). The intent of the California state law is to protect Native American burials, isolated and disarticulated human remains, and associated cultural materials found during the course of an undertaking. It also serves to insure proper analysis prior to their final disposition. The location and procedures of this undertaking shall be recorded by the project archaeologist. Reinternment shall take place with all due speed upon completion of all necessary analysis. This information shall be included in the final report prepared by the project archaeologist, or if necessary, as an addendum to the report.

The owner shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with the appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance if:

1. The NAHC is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.
2. The descendent identified by the NAHC fails to make a recommendation for burial and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the owner.

Any associated grave goods and soil samples from the burial site shall be analyzed per the agreement between the owner and the MLD. Dependent upon the nature of this agreement, diagnostic artifacts such as projectile points, shell beads, and ground stone artifacts may be studied and illustrated in the final report to be prepared by the project archaeologist. Radiocarbon dating and obsidian hydration and sourcing may be undertaken in order to provide a chronology for newly identified features.

Impacts related to archaeological resources would be less than significant with implementation of MM-CR-4 and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Cumulative Discussion

The proposed project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts on cultural resources is evaluated in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future development expected in the San Mateo County. As described in MM-CR-1 above, the proposed project would have no impact on historic architectural resources, and therefore would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact on the built environment.

The project’s cumulative archaeological resource impacts, including disturbance to any human remains, are evaluated in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future development expected in San Mateo County. Archaeological resources (a midden site) were identified on the project site and could be disrupted by project construction. However, with implementation of MM-CR-1 through MM-CR-4, potential impacts to these resources would be less than significant. Cumulative impact contributions to these cultural resources are site-specific and are assessed on a site-by-site basis. The extent of the cultural resources (if any) that occur at the sites of the potential future projects is unknown, and thus, it is not known whether any of the potential projects would result in significant impacts to cultural resources. A determination of project-specific impacts would be made on a case-by-case basis and, if necessary, the applicants of each reasonably foreseeable project would be required to implement the appropriate mitigation measures. Therefore, with implementation of MM-CR-1 through MM-CR-4, the project’s contribution to cultural resources would not be cumulatively considerable and the project’s cumulative impact would be less than significant.

2.6 Energy

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

An Energy Technical Report was prepared by RCH Group (RCH) dated April 3, 2019, to address potential energy impacts related to the project.¹⁵ The report is included as Appendix S.

Energy use, especially through fossil fuel consumption and combustion, relates directly to environmental quality since it can adversely affect air quality and generate GHG emissions that contribute to climate change. Electrical power is generated through a variety of sources, including fossil fuel combustion, hydropower, wind, solar, biofuels, and others. Natural gas is widely used to heat buildings, prepare food in restaurants and residences, and fuel vehicles, among other uses. Fuel use for transportation is related to the fuel efficiency of cars, trucks, and public transportation; choice of different travel modes such as auto, carpool, and public transit; and miles traveled by these modes, and generally based on petroleum-based fuels such as diesel and gasoline. Electric vehicles may not have any direct emissions but do have indirect emissions via the source of electricity generated to power the vehicle. Construction and routine operation and maintenance of transportation infrastructure also consume energy.

- a) *Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?***

Construction Energy Usage

During construction, the project would result in energy consumption through the combustion of fossil fuels in construction vehicles, worker commute vehicles, and construction equipment. No natural gas would be utilized as part of construction. Fossil fuels used for construction vehicles and other energy-consuming equipment would be used during construction activities. The types of equipment could include gasoline- and diesel-powered construction and transportation equipment, including trucks, tractor/loader/backhoes, excavators, dozers, and graders. Other equipment could include electrically driven equipment such as pumps and other tools. Limitations on idling of vehicles and equipment and requirements that equipment be properly maintained would result in fuel savings. Idling from both on- and off-road diesel-powered equipment is limited in 13 CCR Sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485 and enforced by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). In addition, given the cost of fuel, contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to avoid wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction. Because of the temporary nature of construction and the financial incentives for developers and contractors to implement energy-efficient practices, project construction activities would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy.

Project construction would require demolition, site preparation, site grading and excavation, building construction, architectural finishing, paving and landscaping. Construction would be typical for the region and building type, and the project site does not include unusual building challenges that would require unusually high energy usage. The importation of fill material, exportation of any contaminated soils and transport of building materials would require haul truck trips to and from the project, as indicated in the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) modelling estimates in Appendix C, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Report.¹⁶

Potential fuel consumption during construction was calculated using information provided by CalEEMod, a statewide land use emissions computer model developed for the California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA) in collaboration with the California Air Districts. The model inputs assumed

¹⁵ RCH Group. 2019. *Energy Technical Report*. Available at: <https://www.smcgov.org/media/104206/download?inline=>. Accessed June 20, 2023.

¹⁶ SWCA. 2023. *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Report*. June 2023. (Appendix XX)

project construction would occur eight hours per day, five days per week, for a period of 18 months. The project would be constructed in six phases: 1) demolition (including removal of the existing impervious surface and tree removal/wood chip dispersion); 2) site preparation (including site clearing, leveling, and transport of building materials); 3) grading (excavation, import fill and export any contaminated soils); 4) building construction (including surveying, excavation/leveling for foundations, hydrostatic testing, watermain connections tested and connected, utility trenches, importation of building materials for residential buildings and the Community Building, all building construction); 5) paving (paving of onsite parking and roads and site concrete (curb, gutter, flatwork, etc.)); and 6) finishing (including finishing activities, architectural coatings, final landscaping, and removal of temporary fencing and erosion control). Worker, vendor and haul truck trips vary for each phase and CalEEMod calculated the emissions and related fuel use for each construction phase.

Based on CalEEMod results for project construction and standard fuel consumption conversion factors, construction would require approximately 120 gallons of gasoline and 59,202 gallons of diesel fuel. This includes all off-road construction equipment, hauling, vendor, and worker trips over an approximate 380-working day construction period. For the finishing phase of construction, some electricity may be used (e.g., for power tools and work lighting). While this electricity usage cannot be quantified at this time, it is anticipated to be relatively minor compared to normal building operations. When not in use, electric equipment would be powered off so as to avoid unnecessary energy consumption. Natural gas would not be used during construction.

In 2022, 13.6 billion gallons of gasoline were sold Statewide, according to the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration. If it is conservatively assumed that all of the fuel used during construction would be consumed in one year, gasoline consumption would represent approximately 0.00044 percent of Statewide gasoline consumption in 2022. According to the state Board of Equalization, in 2015 4.2 billion gallons of diesel, including offroad diesel, was sold in California. The proposed project's diesel consumption during construction would represent 0.000003 percent of Statewide consumption in 2015. This increase in consumption would be temporary, of relatively short duration, and would cease once project construction is completed. This minor increase in fuel consumption would not require development of new petroleum supplies or construction of new production or distribution facilities.

For all proposed projects, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) recommends the implementation of BMPs, regardless of whether construction-related emissions exceed applicable thresholds of significance. In addition, several other basic measures to control dust and exhaust during construction are included as part of **Mitigation Measure (MM) AQ-2a and 2b**. Implementation of the mitigation measures during construction would ensure that fuel powering the equipment would not be used in an inefficient or wasteful manner.

MidPen Housing Corporation (the project sponsor) has also committed to the following construction actions that would reduce the energy consumption from project construction:

- Preserve a portion of the site as undeveloped land.
- Make best efforts to use of at least 10 percent local building materials.
- Recycle or reuse at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the consumption of fuel and other energy during project construction would have a less-than-significant impact on energy resources and no mitigation is required.

Operations

Project operations would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Once the project is operational, transportation fuels (predominantly gasoline) would continue to be consumed through vehicle trips by residents, visitors, maintenance workers, delivery truck drivers, etc. Similar to the construction analysis, operational fuel consumption was calculated using CalEEMod assumptions. CalEEMod calculates energy consumption and associated emissions for transportation, areas sources, electricity consumption, electricity usage associated with water usage and wastewater discharge, and transport and disposal of solid waste. Key assumptions used in the analysis included the default trip lengths and trip types specified by CalEEMod for San Mateo County. Approximately 188,883 trips per year was assumed which is approximately 515 trips per day.

CalEEMod does not break down fuel usage into gasoline and diesel components; since the majority of residential vehicles are gasoline-fueled, it was assumed that all of the fuel consumption would be gasoline, resulting in estimated annual fuel consumption of approximately 107,139 gallons of gasoline. This would represent approximately 0.001 percent of Statewide gasoline consumption in 2022. However, this is a conservative estimation because EV spaces are required as part of project design, and the actual fuel consumption would be less than the CalEEMod outputs.

The CalEEMod was also used to estimate the consumption of electricity associated with space and water heating and landscape maintenance (i.e., electricity to control irrigation equipment) expected to occur during operation of the project. No natural gas use is proposed as part of the project. The project land use type and size and other project-specific information were input to the CalEEMod. The CalEEMod results indicated that the project's estimated electricity consumption would be approximately 353,265 kWh of electricity. The project's annual electricity usage would represent approximately 0.00014 percent of Statewide electricity sales in 2021.

While implementation of the project would result in consumption of non-renewable energy resources, such consumption is an inherent characteristic of typical development projects. The energy demands of the project would be reduced by energy conservation features that are required in the project type (new multi-family construction using the current Title 24 Building Code and CalGreen), the location (coastal zone with minimal annual air conditioning and heating needs) and energy conservation features that are included in MidPen additional environmental commitments.

As listed in the Project Description, MidPen has agreed to a list of environmental commitments to minimize the environmental effects. From that list, the commitments outlined below would reduce the consumption of non-renewable energy resources.

- Operational Energy Saving Features - MidPen has agreed that the project would be developed in accordance with the minimum requirements of one of the following programs: Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED); Green Communities; Passive Housing; Living Building Challenge; National Green Building Standard, or the GreenPoint Rated program. The following are features that may be included:
 - Natural cross-ventilation of every unit with windows in 3 sides of most units (2-3 BR), and 2 sides of 1 BR units;
 - Cool roofs with low reflectance for reduced heat-island effect;
 - High-efficacy lighting fixtures throughout; “Night-sky” compliant site lighting;
 - Drought-tolerant landscaping with native species and minimized and efficient irrigation;

- Passive on-site storm water management;
- PV ready roofs;
- No air conditioning;
- Shared laundry facilities;
- Secure bike parking facilities to encourage less vehicle use;
- Install toilets using less than 1.6 gallons per flush;
- Install showerheads providing maximum flows of 2.5 gallons per minute or less;
- Install self-closing faucets in non-residential lavatories; and
- Install high-efficiency washing machines with a water factor of 5 or less.

The energy savings from the operational energy savings features above cannot be estimated at this time because the actual program and features that would be included have not been selected. However, it is clear that adopting the minimum requirements of one of the programs would improve the project energy efficiency beyond Title 24 building standards and would comply with CalGreen.

The project sponsor would also implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures to provide options to future residents to allow use of non-auto modes; strategies to encourage carpooling, biking, walking, and transit use; and site design features to promote shifts from automobiles to transit and non-auto modes such as walking and bicycling, reducing energy demand. Furthermore, the project sponsor has committed to set aside 52 of the 70 affordable housing units as Local Preference Units where eligible households are those that include at least one member who lives or works in the City of Pacifica, the City of Half Moon Bay, and/or the unincorporated County region between the City of Pacifica and the City of Half Moon Bay (Greater Moss Beach Region). The below market rate housing provides greater opportunity for lower income families to live closer to job centers and achieve a jobs/housing match near transit.

The project would not consume energy resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner and would therefore have a less-than-significant impact on the consumption of energy resources and no mitigation is required.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

The project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The project would comply with all plans, policies and goals for energy usage and conservation at the federal, State, and local level. For building projects, Title 24 (California Code of Regulations) is of particular importance, as it sets standards for energy performance. There is also the California Green Building Standards Code (24 CCR, Part 11, known as “CALGreen”) was adopted as part of the California Building Standards Code and the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which are energy conservation standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the CEC). The project would comply with applicable State standards.

The project has also been reviewed relative to the San Mateo County General Plan Energy and Climate Change and the San Mateo County Community Action Plan (CCAP). The project would not conflict with or obstruct either of these plans. The project would provide energy efficiency consistent with Title 24 and

CalGreen requirements and would support the intent of the General Plan and CCAP, which is to reduce GHG emissions in San Mateo County. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan and any project effect would be a less-than significant impact.

In 2002, the California State Legislature passed SB 1389, which required the CEC to develop an integrated energy plan every two years for electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuels for the Integrated Energy Policy Report. The plan calls for the State to assist in the transformation of the transportation system to improve air quality, reduce congestion, and increase the efficient use of fuel supplies with the least environmental and energy costs. To further this policy, the integrated energy plan identifies a number of strategies, including assistance to public agencies and fleet operators in implementing incentive programs for ZEVs and their infrastructure needs, and encouragement of urban designs that reduce VMT and accommodate pedestrian and bicycle access.

The most recently adopted reports include the 2021 Integrated Energy Policy Report and the 2022 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update. The Integrated Energy Policy Report provides the results of the CEC's assessments of a variety of energy issues facing California. The State integrated energy plan, as well as the local San Mateo County General Plan and San Mateo County CCAP help to address renewable energy or energy efficiency.

The expected energy consumption during construction and operation of the proposed project would be consistent with typical usage rates for residential uses; however, energy consumption is largely a function of personal choice and the physical structure and layout of buildings. Because California's energy conservation planning actions are conducted at a regional level, and because the proposed project's total impact on regional energy supplies would be minor, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct California's energy conservation plans as described in the CEC's Integrated Energy Policy Report. Additionally, as demonstrated above, the proposed project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. Potential impacts related to conflict with or obstruction of a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Discussion

The proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment if it, in combination with other projects, would contribute to a significant cumulative impact related to energy.

The geographic area for cumulative analysis of electricity and natural gas is the PG&E service area. The proposed project would result in an increased service demand for electricity. In 2020, a total of 31 percent of PG&E's delivered electricity came from renewable sources, including solar, wind, geothermal, small hydroelectric and various forms of bioenergy. PG&E reached California's 2020 renewable energy goal in 2017 and is positioned to meet the State's 60 percent by 2030 renewable energy mandate set forth in SB 100 (. In addition, PG&E plans to continue to provide reliable service to their customers and upgrade their distribution systems as necessary to meet future demand.

The proposed project would be all-electric and would not include natural gas infrastructure or use. Although the proposed project would result in a net increase in demand for electricity, this increase would be minimal and would not require PG&E to expand or construct infrastructure that could cause significant environmental impacts. In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with Energy Efficiency Standards (CCR Title 24, Part 6) the CALGreen Code (CCR Title 24, Part 11), San Mateo County General Plan and San Mateo County CCAP, which are also aimed at reducing energy consumption. Further, the project includes certain design features that meet or exceed standards that contribute to the overall energy efficiency (e.g., increase in EV-ready charging capabilities, increased solar capabilities, and elimination of natural gas associated with residential space and water heating), well

beyond projects designed or constructed in the recent past. As such, the proposed project would not contribute to potential cumulative impacts associated with the potential inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy within the PG&E service area.

Transportation energy use would also increase; however, this transportation energy use would not represent a major amount of energy use when compared to the amount of existing development and to the total number of vehicle trips and VMT throughout San Mateo County and the region. The proposed project and related projects are required to comply with federal and State legislation to improve energy efficiency in buildings, equipment, and appliances, and reduce VMT. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to impacts related to the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required.

2.7 Geology and Soils

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
(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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Landslides?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(v) Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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, liquefaction or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soil, provides a detailed analysis of the impacts to geology and soils associated with the proposed project, including an explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (d) and (f) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing geologic setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project, cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures. As discussed below, initial study checklist topic (e) is less than significant and is not addressed within EIR Section 3.4.

a) *Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

a-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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*

See EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soils, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to earthquake faults.

a-ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

See EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soils, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to seismic ground shaking.

a-iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

See EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soils, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to seismic-related ground failure.

a-iv) *Landslides?*

See EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soils, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to landslides.

a-v) *Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?*

See EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soils, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to coastal cliff/bluff instability and erosion.

b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

See EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soils, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to soil erosion and topsoil.

c) *Would the project 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, liquefaction or collapse?*

See EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soils, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to unstable soils.

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

See EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soils, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to expansive soil.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

The new buildings associated with the proposed project would connect to the existing combined sewer system associated with Montara Water and Sanitary District and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, the project would have no impact on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

See EIR Section 3.4, Geology and Soils, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to paleontological resources, sites, and unique geologic features.

Cumulative Discussion

The proposed project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts on soils incapable of supporting septic tanks is evaluated in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future development expected in the San Mateo County. The project does not propose using septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, there would be no cumulative contribution to this specific geology and soils cumulative impact. The proposed project would not substantially contribute to a significant cumulative impact and no mitigation is required.

2.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(e) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, provides a detailed analysis of the construction and operation greenhouse gas impacts associated with the proposed project, including explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (g) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing air quality and greenhouse gas setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures.

a) *Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

See EIR Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to greenhouse gas emissions.

b) *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

See EIR Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to greenhouse gas emission reductions.

c) *Would the project 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?*

See EIR Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to greenhouse gas sequestering.

d) *Would the project expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?*

See EIR Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to coastal cliff and bluff erosion.

e) *Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?*

See EIR Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to sea level rise.

f) Would the project 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?

A similar question is asked in the Hydrology and Water Quality section. See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to flood hazard delineation maps.

g) Would the project place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

A similar question is asked in the Hydrology and Water Quality section. See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to 100-year flood flows.

2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(k) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, provides a detailed analysis of hazards and hazardous material impacts associated with the proposed project, including explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (k) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing environmental setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures. As discussed below, initial study checklist topics (c) and (e) are less than significant and are not addressed within EIR Section 3.6.

a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

See EIR Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

b) *Would the project 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?*

See EIR Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

There are no schools located within ¼ mile of the project site. The nearest school is Farallone View Elementary School, 1 mile northeast of the project site; therefore, hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of a school would not occur. Given this, the project would have no impact on an existing or proposed school, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

d) *Would the project 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?*

See EIR Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to hazardous materials sites.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?**

The Half Moon Bay Airport, a public airport owned and operated by the County, is located approximately 0.9 mile south of the proposed project site.¹⁷ The airport is subject to the Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), as adopted by the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) in 2014.¹⁸ The ALUCP is designed to encourage compatible land uses in the vicinity surrounding an airport. The project site falls within Zone 7 of the airport influence area (AIA), the outermost area indicated in the ALUCP. The aircraft accident risk level in Zone 7 is considered to be low.¹⁹ The ALUCP places no limits on the number of dwelling units per acre within the AIA. The ALUCP provides height requirements for new development within Zone 7, allowing structures to be no taller than 300 feet.²⁰

With a base elevation of up to 186.5 feet above mean sea level (amsl) for the building pads of the proposed buildings and a maximum building height of 36 feet, all new development on the project site would comply with the height and residential density limitations of the ALUCP. Residents of the proposed housing units may experience over-flights from airplanes traveling to or from the Half Moon Bay Airport; however, the project does not require or attract large numbers of people to the site and does not include facilities or processes that create hazards to aircraft. The buildings and residents would not be exposed to or contribute to safety hazards; therefore, the impacts would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

- f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

See EIR Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to an emergency response plan and emergency evacuation plan.

- g) Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?**

See EIR Section 3.12, Wildfire, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to wildland fires.

- h) Would the project 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?**

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to 100-year flood hazards.

¹⁷ County of San Mateo. 2023a. Half Moon Bay Airport. Available at: <https://www.smcgov.org/publicworks/half-moon-bay-airport>. Accessed January 20, 2023.

¹⁸ C/CAG. 2014. *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of Half Moon Bay Airport*. <https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/HAF-ALUCP-Final.pdf>. Accessed January 20, 2023.

¹⁹ C/CAG, 2014.

²⁰ C/CAG, 2014.

i) Would the project place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to structures that may impede or redirect flood flows in a 100-year flood hazard area.

j) Would the project 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?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to flooding due to the failure of a levee or dam.

k) Would the project cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to inundation.

Cumulative Discussion

The proposed project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts on hazards and hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school or safety hazards and excessive noise within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport or for a project located within an airport land use plan is evaluated in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future development expected in San Mateo County. San Mateo County, in general, is subject to potential regional hazards and hazardous materials risks. The magnitude of this risk would be dependent on the site-specific conditions present at each future project site. Regardless of the potential risk, each cumulative project would be required to comply with hazardous materials regulations including storage, transport, and disposal practices intended to reduce and/or avoid hazardous materials risks.

The project is not located near a school and would not emit hazardous materials that would be considered cumulatively considerable. The project is within an airport land use plan, but the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working on the project site. In combination with the foreseeable projects, the cumulative impacts would be less than significant to hazardous materials with respect to schools and airports. Therefore, cumulative impacts on hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant. The proposed project would not substantially contribute to a significant cumulative impact. No mitigation is required.

2.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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 which would:				
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, provides a detailed analysis of hydrology and water quality impacts associated with the proposed project, including explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (g) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing hydrologic resources setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures.

a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?*

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to surface or ground water quality.

b) *Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to groundwater resources.

c) Would the project 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 which would:

c-i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to erosion.

c-ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to surface runoff and flooding.

c-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?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to surface runoff and stormwater drainage systems.

c-iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to flood flows.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to project inundation.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to the water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

f) Would the project significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to surface or groundwater water quality.

g) Would the project result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?

See EIR Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to impervious surface and runoff.

2.11 Land Use and Planning

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Physically divide an established community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas of increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.8, Land Use and Planning, provides a detailed analysis of land use and planning impacts associated with the proposed project, including an explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (c) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the land use planning and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures.

a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

See EIR Section 3.8, Land Use and Planning, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to physical division of an established community.

b) *Would the project 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?*

See EIR Section 3.8, Land Use and Planning, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation.

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

See EIR Section 3.8, Land Use and Planning, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to off-site development.

2.12 Mineral Resources

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

a) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

The project is zoned PUD-140/CD and is not located within an area designated by the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act Mineral Land Classification as a Mineral Resource Zone-2, which indicates the existence of a deposit that meets certain criteria for value and marketability.²¹ The classification for the project site is Mineral Resource Zone-3, which is defined as “Areas containing mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data.”²²

There are two areas designated Mineral Resource Zone-2 greater than 3 miles from the project site. However, neither the project site nor the surrounding area is identified as an area containing mineral deposits of local, statewide, or regional significance. No active mining operations are present on, or near, the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with the extraction of any known mineral resource. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources of local, regional, or statewide significance or a locally important mineral resource recovery site would occur, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

b) *Would the project 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?*

Please refer to analysis under checklist topic (a) above. No impacts to a locally important mineral resource recovery site would occur.

Cumulative Discussion

The project site does not contain any known mineral resources. Therefore, it would not make any contribution to a cumulative impact on these resources. There would be no cumulative impacts and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

²¹ CDOC. 1996. Designated Areas Update, Regionally Significant Construction Aggregate Resource Areas in the South San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region. Montara Mountain Quadrangle, Open-File Report 96-03, Plate 18 of 29.

²² CDOC. 1996. Page xi.

2.13 Noise

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project result in:</i>				
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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 two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.9, Noise, provides a detailed analysis of construction and operation noise and vibration impacts associated with the proposed project, including explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (c) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing noise setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project and its variants, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures. The project site is located within an area covered by an airport land use plan but would have less than significant impacts. Therefore, initial study checklist topic (c) is not addressed within EIR Section 3.9. The significance of the proposed project’s noise effects is based on detailed noise measurements, modeling, and calculations.

a) *Would the project result in 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?*

See EIR Section 3.9, Noise, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to ambient noise levels.

b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

See EIR Section 3.9, Noise, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to groundborne vibration or noise levels.

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 two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

As discussed under Section 2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials in this Initial Study, the Half Moon Bay Airport, is located approximately 0.9 mile south of the proposed project site.²³ The ALUCP outlines the airport noise exposure contours, which are graphical representations of projected noise exposure levels associated with aircraft operations in areas adjacent to an airport. The project site is not located within the 2012 or projected 2032 noise exposure contour limits of 60, 65, and 70 Community Noise Equivalent Level.²⁴ Given the intervening topography and distance, the project would not expose people residing or working on the project site to excessive noise levels. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Cumulative Discussion

The proposed project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts on excessive noise impacts within 2 miles of an area covered by an airport land use plan is evaluated in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future development expected in San Mateo County. Noise impacts are dependent upon the location of noise, the wind conditions, and intensity of the noise source. The County evaluates noise impacts in comparison to the existing noise environment and Zoning Ordinance provisions. The project site is in a residential area within the ALUCP of Half Moon Bay, however, it is not located within the 2012 or projected 2032 noise exposure contour limits of 60, 65, and 70 Community Noise Equivalent Level.

The nearest cumulative project is located 0.05 mile to the southeast. Given the intervening topography and distance, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels. None of the cumulative projects would contribute to excessive noise impacts within the Half Moon Bay Airport; therefore, the proposed project would not cumulatively contribute to localized cumulative impacts on the existing noise environment. Therefore, cumulative impacts on excessive noise impacts would be less than significant. The proposed project would not substantially contribute to a significant cumulative impact. No mitigation is required.

2.14 Population and Housing

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

²³ County of San Mateo, 2023a.

²⁴ C/CAG, 2014.

Environmental Evaluation

- a) *Would the project 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)?***

Construction

Project construction is anticipated to occur over a period of 18 months, beginning in December 2024. On any given day, there would be an average of 30 construction workers on-site per day, and up to 60 workers at peak times.²⁵ It is anticipated that construction workers would commute from their residences, and workers who live outside of San Mateo County would be expected to commute rather than permanently relocate from more distant locations, which is typical of the construction trades. Once construction activities begin, construction workers would typically seek employment at other job sites in the region. Thus, construction of the proposed project would not result in substantial, unplanned employment-generated growth in San Mateo County or the region.

While there would be some increase in employment both during the construction phase and during project operation, the number of employees would be small in relation to the overall workforce in San Mateo County.

Operation

In 2021, the California Coastal Commission (CCC) approved the amendment to the County Local Coastal Program (LCP) which changed the site's land use designation from Medium-High Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. This land use designation allows for development at densities from 6.1 to 8.7 units per acre. In 2022, the County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution rezoning the site from PUD-124/CD to PUD-140/CD, decreasing the allowed density of residential units on-site from 148 to 71.

The project is expected to house approximately 213 residents, based on occupancy rates at other properties owned or managed by MidPen Housing Corporation (MidPen). This number represents a nominal increase relative to the County's 2021 estimated population of 737,888 residents. This number of residents would be a significant increase compared to Moss Beach's population of 3,436 residents²⁶ and Montara's population of 2,833 residents.²⁷ However, the population increase associated with implementation of the project would be lower than originally expected (under the previous land use designation) and would be considered planned growth.

The project site is surrounded by urban land uses and served by existing utilities (roadways, potable water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, etc.). The project proposes the extension of existing utilities, including water lines to new project facilities for potable water and fire water supply, as well as irrigation for landscaping. The project includes the installation of a new connection to the existing storm drain main on Carlos Street, which ultimately outfalls to Montara Creek. Stormwater runoff on the project would be collected by overland flow to three stormwater bioretention basins in the western portion of the project site. Vehicular ingress/egress to and from the project site would be provided by a new 28-foot-wide single driveway on Carlos Street on the western boundary of the site.

An agreement between the County Department of Housing and the project applicant states that 52 of the 71 residential units shall include a preference for individuals who live and/or work in the region. Eligible

²⁵ MidPen Housing. 2023. 23_0504 SWCA Cypress Point EIR Data Request – additional responses. MidPen Housing.

²⁶ Data USA. 2023. Moss Beach, California. Available at: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/moss-beach-ca>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

²⁷ Data USA. 2023. Montara, California. Available at: <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/montara-ca>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

households are those that include at least one member who lives or works in the city of Pacifica, the city of Half Moon Bay, and/or the unincorporated San Mateo County region between the city of Pacifica and the city of Half Moon Bay. This preference structure increases chances for individuals who meet these criteria to live in this development, although it does not restrict individuals who do not live and/or work in the area from being accepted. Therefore, this requirement would draw individuals who already live and/or work in the Greater Moss Beach region.

Although the project would introduce new residents to the area, development of the project site was planned for in the County LCP and the implementation of the project would not induce substantial population growth within San Mateo County. The project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant, and this topic is not discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed project would be situated on a vacant parcel. There are no housing units or any other developed uses on the project site. As the site is undeveloped and has no existing housing units, there would be no displacement of housing units or substantial numbers of people; replacement housing in another location would not be required. There would be no impact and this topic is not discussed further in the EIR.

Cumulative Discussion

The proposed project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts on population and housing is evaluated in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future development expected in San Mateo County. The project would not induce unplanned population growth and would not displace residents. Because the housing has a local preference, it is anticipated that a large percentage of future residents of the project already live in the Greater Moss Beach region. In combination with the foreseeable projects, the cumulative impacts would be less than significant compared to population growth throughout San Mateo County. Therefore, cumulative impacts on population and housing would be less than significant. The proposed project would not substantially contribute to a significant cumulative impact. No mitigation is required.

2.15 Public Services

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Fire Protection

The Coastside Fire Protection District (District) would provide fire protection services for the project site. The District also serves the city of Half Moon Bay; the communities of Montara, Moss Beach, Princeton, El Granada, and Miramar; and the surrounding unincorporated areas. The District service area covers approximately 50 square miles and serves a population of approximately 30,000 residents.

In addition to traditional fire service, the District provides advanced life support, cliff rescue, water rescue, confined space rescue, and vehicle and residential lock-out services. The District responds to approximately 2,600 calls for service each year.²⁸ These incidents include medical aid, fires and fire alarms, water rescue, cliff rescue, traffic accidents, odor investigations, hazardous materials, and public service assists.²⁹

Three fire stations operate within the District: Fire Station 44, located on Stetson Street in Moss Beach one block (approximately 300 feet) from the project site; Fire Station 40, located within the downtown area of the city of Half Moon Bay; Fire Station 41, located within the unincorporated area of El Granada. Fire Station 40 serves as the District headquarters. The District opened a new 12,425-square-foot Fire Station 41 in 2018.³⁰ Station 44 (Moss Beach) would provide initial fire and emergency medical service response to the project site, and Stations 41 (El Granada) and 40 (Half Moon Bay) would support the initial response, if needed.

As noted above, depending on the type of emergency, the proposed project would primarily be served by Station 44 (Moss Beach), located less than $\frac{1}{10}$ mile southeast of the project site on Stetson Street. The District's response time goal is to respond within 6 minutes 59 seconds of receiving the call. In an email on May 11, 2023, the District Chief confirmed that response times are currently met throughout the district.³¹ The proximity of Fire Station 44 to the project site indicates that the response times would meet established District response time goals.

The District has 32 paid positions, along with 11 volunteer firefighter positions. Paid positions include one assistant fire chief, one fire marshal, one deputy fire marshal, four battalion chiefs, and two administrative support positions. All stations are staffed with one fire captain and two fire apparatus engineers, one of which is a paramedic to provide advanced life support service. Shift personnel work a scheduled 3-day/72-hour workweek.³²

²⁸ Coastside Fire Protection District. 2020. 2020 Annual Report. Available at: <https://www.coastsidefire.org/files/2f82a78c4/032421+tab+3+b.+2020+Coastside+Annual+Report.pdf>. Accessed January 30, 2023.

²⁹ Coastside Fire Protection District, 2020.

³⁰ Coastside Fire Protection District. 2023a. New Fire Station 41. Available at: <https://www.coastsidefire.org/new-fire-station-41>. Accessed January 30, 2023.

³¹ Personal communication between Coastside Fire Department Chief and Erica Rippe, dated May 11, 2023.

³² Coastside Fire Protection District, 2020.

The Half Moon Bay Volunteer Fire Department (Volunteer Fire Department) is a Volunteer Division of the District. The Volunteer Fire Department consists of approximately 15 members and is under the direction of the Fire Chief. The number of volunteers reflects the current needs of the Volunteer Fire Department and is determined by the Chief of the Volunteer Division. The objectives of the Volunteer Fire Department are to operate within the boundaries of the district as a supplemental force to the regular paid department, and to operate as a trained unit for both fire suppression and non-suppression situations.³³

Police Protection

The County of San Mateo Sheriff's Department (Sheriff's Department) would provide police protection services for the project site. The Sheriff's Department also serves the cities of Half Moon Bay, Millbrae, San Carlos, Eichler Highlands, the towns of Portola Valley and Woodside, as well as the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and the San Mateo County Transit District. The Sheriff's Department handled 116,335 service calls in 2021.³⁴

The Sheriff's Department is divided into seven separate divisions—Administration, Homeland Security, Support Services, Patrol Services, Investigations Bureau, Multi-Jurisdictional, and Corrections—that are staffed by 800 employees (including both sworn and civilian employees). Patrol Services in the vicinity of the proposed project would be provided by the Coastside Patrol Bureau, based at the Moss Beach Substation in Moss Beach, approximately 0.5 mile southeast of the project site. A second substation, the Half Moon Bay Substation, serves the southern coastal portion of the County. The Coastside Patrol Bureau is staffed with 27 full-time deputy sheriffs, four sergeants, and one lieutenant. The Bureau is staffed with sufficient resources to respond on a 24-hour basis for any emergency. Additionally, two full-time community policing deputies are assigned to address the needs of the community, including both law enforcement and quality-of-life issues.³⁵ The Moss Beach Station's staffing and equipment inventory are adequate to meet the current demand for police protection services on the project site, and would be considered adequate to serve the future needs of the project.³⁶

Schools

The Cabrillo Unified School District (CUSD) provides public education services in the Moss Beach area and encompasses an area of approximately 135 square miles. CUSD currently operates one comprehensive high school, one alternative school, one middle school, four elementary schools, one preschool, and one adult school.³⁷ Approximately 2,800 students were enrolled in CUSD schools for the 2021 to 2022 school year, a significant decrease from an enrollment of 3,200 students in 2017 to 2018.^{38,39} CUSD implements an open enrollment policy, which allows students to apply to transfer to any of the District's elementary schools.

The following schools currently serve the project site and would serve residents of the project:

³³ Coastside Fire Protection District, 2023b. Coastside Volunteer Firefighters. Available at: <https://www.coastsidefire.org/coastside-volunteer-firefighters>. Accessed January 30, 2023.

³⁴ San Mateo County Sheriff's Office. 2023a. Administration. Available at: <https://www.smcsheriff.com/index.php/administration>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

³⁵ San Mateo County Sheriff's Office. 2023b. Coastside Patrol Bureau. Available at: <https://www.smcsheriff.com/patrol-services/coastside-patrol-bureau>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

³⁶ Stevens Consulting, 2018. Public Services and Utilities – County Review Draft.

³⁷ CUSD. 2022. LCFE Budget Overview for Parents - 2022-2023 School Year. Available at: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1TyW9RwAKmsDta39dbSIu7zHwcAAY3GNF/view?usp=sharing>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

³⁸ CUSD, 2022.

³⁹ Education Data Partnership. 2023. Ed-Data: Cabrillo Unified. Available at: <http://www.ed-data.org/district/San-Mateo/Cabrillo-Unified>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

- Farallone View Elementary School, located at 1100 LeConte Avenue in Montara (approximately 1 mile northeast of the project site), includes grades K through 5.
- Manual F. Cunha Intermediate School, located at 600 Church Street in Half Moon Bay (approximately 7 miles southeast of the project site), includes grades 6 through 8.
- Half Moon Bay High School, located at 498 Kelly Avenue in Half Moon Bay (approximately 7 miles southeast of the project site), includes grades 9 through 12.

Pursuant to Section 17620(a)(1) of the California Education Code, the governing board at any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement against any construction within the boundaries of the district, for the purpose of funding the construction or reconstruction of school facilities. Effective May 10, 2012, CUSD school impact fee rates are \$3.20 per square foot of residential development and \$0.51 per square foot of commercial development.⁴⁰ Fees are used only for construction and reconstruction of school facilities. As provided in Section 65996 of the California Government Code, the payment of such fees is deemed to fully mitigate the impacts of new development on school services.

Parks

The California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) owns and operates 8,353 acres of recreational facilities in San Mateo County, in the form of parks, beaches, and marine reserves.⁴¹ These facilities are located along the coast and in the southern portion of San Mateo County. The DPR recreational facilities nearest to the project site include the Gray Whale Cove and Montara State Beaches. The DPR operates the following 16 parks and recreational areas in San Mateo County:

- Año Nuevo State Park
- Bean Hollow State Beach
- Burleigh H. Murray Ranch
- Butano State Park
- Gray Whale Cove State Beach
- Half Moon Bay State Beach
- Montara State Beach
- Pacifica State Beach
- Pescadero State Beach
- Pigeon Point Light Station State Historic Park
- Pomponio State Beach
- Portola Redwoods State Park
- San Bruno Mountain State Park
- San Gregorio State Beach
- Thornton State Beach

The County of San Mateo Department of Parks (County Parks Department) operates 24 parks that encompass over 17,000 acres. It features approximately 190 miles of county and local trails, including three regional trails.⁴² James Fitzgerald Marine Reserve and Pillar Point Bluff are the county parks nearest the project site. Moss Beach Park is a playground facility located approximately 1 mile south of the project site. The parks, trails, and facilities are located throughout San Mateo County and represent a wide variety of natural settings, including a marine reserve, a bayside recreational area, coastal mountain woodland areas, and urban sites. Camping, hiking, swimming, windsurfing, and horseback riding are some of the recreational activities offered at the following county parks:

- Coyote Point Recreation Area and Marina
- Crystal Springs Regional Trail
- Devil's Slide Trail
- Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve
- Fitzgerald Marine Reserve
- Flood Park
- Friendship Park
- Huddart Park
- Junipero Serra Park
- Memorial Park

⁴⁰ CUSD. 2023a. Developer Fees. Available at: https://www.cabrillo.k12.ca.us/our_departments/business_services/developer_fees. Accessed April 7, 2023.

⁴¹ DPR. 2023. Find a California State Park. Available at: <https://www.parks.ca.gov/ParkIndex>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

⁴² County of San Mateo. 2023b. About the San Mateo County Parks Department. Available at: <https://www.smcgov.org/parks/about-san-mateo-county-parks-department>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

- Mirada Surf
- Moss Beach Park
- Pescadero Creek Park
- Pillar Point Bluff
- Quarry Park
- Sam McDonald Park
- San Bruno Mountain State and County Park
- San Pedro Valley Park
- Sanchez Adobe
- Tunitas Creek Beach
- Woodside Store
- Wunderlich Park

The County Parks Department has 18 infrastructure projects outlined in their Five Year Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 to 2026 with a total cost of \$65,265,849 over the 5 years.⁴³ These projects will address deferred maintenance, expand visitor amenities, and expand recreational facilities. These projects include the Coyote Point Eastern Promenade Rejuvenation Project, Tunitas Creek Beach Improvement Project, Reimagine Flood Park Project, Memorial Park Facilities Improvement Project, and Homestead Trail Bridge Replacement Project.

The County Parks Department budget is augmented by Ordinance Code 2.64.070(a), the Park and Recreation Development Fees Ordinance, which established mitigation fees for new residential development and for residential reconstruction or remodeling projects that increase the size of an existing residence. Additionally, the San Mateo County Sales Tax Increase, Measure A, was approved by voters in San Mateo County in November 2012. Measure K, passed in November 2016, replaced the sales tax increase. Measure K increased the sales tax paid on the purchase of goods and services in San Mateo County by ½ cent for 10 years. In fiscal year (FY) 2020 to 2021, Measure A funds provided \$5,849,702, or approximately 26% of the County’s total budget for parks.^{44,45}

Libraries

The San Mateo County Libraries (SMCL) is a joint powers authority composed of the cities of Atherton, Belmont, Brisbane, East Palo Alto, Foster City, Half Moon Bay, Millbrae, North Fair Oaks, Pacifica, Portola Valley, San Carlos, and Woodside, as well as unincorporated areas of San Mateo County. The SMCL has a rich history of providing library services to the residents of San Mateo County.⁴⁶ The 13 community libraries, bookmobile, and eBranch provide books, magazines, newspapers, and information in multiple languages to residents.

The Half Moon Bay Library is the branch closest to the project site. The Half Moon Bay Library serves a 270-square-mile area, including the city of Half Moon Bay and the nearby unincorporated Coastside area. The new library building opened in 2018. In the Half Moon Bay Library FY 2016 to 2017, the total circulation was 195,433, there were 154,261 library visitors, and 21,254 area residents attended programs at the library.⁴⁷

⁴³ County of San Mateo. 2023c. County Executive Office: Five Year Capital Improvement Plan: Parks Department. Available at: <https://www.smcgov.org/ceo/five-year-capital-improvement-plan-parks-department>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

⁴⁴ County of San Mateo. 2023d. County Executive Office: Financial Summary. Available at: <https://www.smcgov.org/ceo/financial-summary>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

⁴⁵ County of San Mateo. 2022. Fiscal Year 2022–2023 Recommended Budget. Available at: <https://www.smcgov.org/sites/default/files/2022-05/FY%202022-23%20Recommended%20Budget.pdf>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

⁴⁶ San Mateo County Libraries. 2023. Locations. Available at: <https://smcl.bibliocommons.com/locations/list>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

⁴⁷ County of San Mateo Performance. San Mateo County will Fund New Library Facilities and Existing Library Remodels. Available at: <https://performance.smcgov.org/>. Accessed April 7, 2023.

Environmental Evaluation

- a) **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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:**

Fire protection?

Construction

Construction of the proposed project would increase the potential for accidental on-site fires from sources such as the operation of mechanical equipment and use of flammable construction materials. In most cases, compliance with building and fire codes, including implementation of basic housekeeping procedures by the construction contractors and work crews, would minimize these hazards.

Construction activities also have the potential to affect fire protection, such as emergency vehicle response times, by adding construction traffic to the street network and potentially by requiring partial lane closures during street improvements and utility installation.

The Coastside Fire Protection District Station 44 is located on Stetson Street in Moss Beach, approximately one block from the southern boundary of the proposed project site. Construction impacts would be temporary in nature, and partial lane closures, if necessary, would not significantly impact emergency vehicle response times. For more information related to response times, please see EIR Section 3.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 3.12 Wildfire. Based on the above information, construction of the proposed project would not be expected to substantially increase fire risks or increase emergency service response times. Therefore, potential impacts to fire services during construction would be less than significant.

Operation

The project would develop 71 residential units on a 11.02-acre project site. Project implementation would result in a population increase of approximately 213 residents, resulting in an increase in demand for fire protection services relative to the population of the project vicinity. Although there is not a direct proportional relationship between increases in land use activity and increases in demand for fire and emergency services, it is anticipated that the number of calls for fire and emergency services would increase with implementation of the proposed project.

The project site is not located within a mapped Fire Hazard Severity Zone, however, per the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Hazard Viewer, the site is surrounded by high and very high fire hazard severity zones.⁴⁸ Additionally, while the project site is not within a hazardous fire area, there are open space areas approximately 0.5 mile to the southeast of the project site that extend to the foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains. These areas are within the high and very high fire hazard severity zones. The project site could be vulnerable to these wildland fires, should they occur. See EIR Section 3.12 Wildfire, for a discussion of wildfire impacts.

The project would conform to the 2022 California Building Standards Code (Cal. Code Regs., Title 24), which includes the California Fire Code. Furthermore, the project would comply with County Code

⁴⁸ MTC/ABAG. 2023. MTC/ABAG Hazard Viewer GIS Map. Available at: <https://mtc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=4a6f3f1259df42eab29b35dfcd086fc8>. Accessed May 10, 2023.

Section 9135, Automatic Sprinkler Systems, which requires the installation and maintenance of an automatic fire sprinkler system in all newly constructed buildings, including each multifamily dwelling unit.⁴⁹ The project would also comply with all applicable Fire Code requirements associated with adequate fire access, fire flows, and number of hydrants. The likelihood that a structural fire would expand into a wildland fire before it can be brought under control is therefore significantly reduced. Similarly, wildfires would be less able to burn these buildings because of the preventative measures in place.

Project implementation has the potential to increase the County's response times to the project site or surrounding vicinity; however, no additional fire personnel or equipment would be necessary to serve the project. The project would not physically alter existing fire protection facilities, nor require the construction of new facilities. In addition, the project site is located within an urban, built-up area of San Mateo County with adequate response times and infrastructure; thus, the project would not significantly increase the demand for fire protection services. Therefore, buildout of the project site is not expected to increase exposure and vulnerability to wildfire hazard, and the impacts would be less than significant. See EIR Section 3.12 Wildfire, for a discussion of wildfire impacts.

Based on the above information, implementation of the project would not be expected to overload firefighting and emergency services to the extent that there would be a need for new, expanded, consolidated, or relocated fire facilities. Therefore, potential impacts to fire services would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Police protection?

The construction of 71 new housing units would provide housing for approximately 213 people. There would be an increased demand for police services on the project site. There is not a direct proportional relationship between increases in land use activity and increases in demand for police protection, and it is logical, to some extent, to anticipate that the number of calls for police response to home burglaries, vehicle burglaries, damage to vehicles, traffic-related incidents, and crimes against persons would increase with the increase in on-site activity, population, and increased traffic on adjacent streets and arterials. However, because a number of other factors also contribute to crime rates, such as police presence, crime prevention measures, and ongoing legislation and funding, the potential for increased crime rates is not necessarily directly proportional to increases in land use activity.

Although the project would increase the number of persons and level of activity on the project site, given the type of use and its similarity to the surrounding area, there is no indication that implementation of the proposed project would result in increased crime in surrounding neighborhoods, or that the design of the project would increase calls for service beyond that considered normal and appropriate within the area. The project would not require new or altered public safety facilities.⁵⁰ Therefore, project impacts on police services would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Schools?

The proposed 71 new housing units would provide housing to approximately 213 people. Per the U.S. Census Bureau, the population of student-age children between ages 6 and 18 years old in San Mateo County is approximately 14.5% of the total population.⁵¹ Given the anticipated Cypress Point population

⁴⁹ San Mateo County. 2016. Municipal Code Section 9135. Automatic Sprinkler Systems. Available at: <https://www.cfsfire.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Fire-Sprinklers.pdf>. Accessed May 22, 2023.

⁵⁰ Stevens Consulting. 2018. Public Services and Utilities – County Review Draft. Stevens Consulting.

⁵¹ U.S. Census Bureau. 2023. QuickFacts – San Mateo County, California. Available at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/sanmateocountycalifornia,CA/HSD410221#HSD410221>. Accessed May 10, 2023.

and County housing data, the project would introduce approximately 31 additional students in grades kindergarten through high school who would need to be accommodated in public schools. Students residing in the project would attend Farallone View Elementary School, Manual F. Cunha Intermediate School, and Half Moon Bay High School. As discussed, these schools have adequate capacity to accommodate the increase in students expected from the project.⁵² Given that CUSD enrollment has significantly decreased, the addition of 31 new students would not exceed the CUSD's capacity.

As described above, CUSD instituted development fees to assist in paying for the costs of construction or reconstruction of facilities. Additionally, the voters in the CUSD passed the Measure M Bond Building Fund in 2018 to fund school updates, repairs, equipment, and construction.⁵³ Measure I, an annual education parcel tax of \$150 per parcel is also in effect until FY 2027–2028.⁵⁴ Thus, the CUSD has anticipated the need for adequate school facilities within the attendance area of the project and has developed funding sources to address these needs. Therefore, with the payment of school impact fees, impacts related to schools would be less than significant.

Parks?

The addition of 71 housing units for 213 residents on the project site represent an increase of approximately 0.03% in population in relation to the County's 2021 estimated population of 737,888 residents. The project would not result in a substantial increase in the use or demand for neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities beyond the uses and demands contemplated by the County's General Plan.

As described above, the County also charges impact fees to all new residential developments to mitigate a project's impacts on park and recreation facilities. These impact fees are used to address the identified future needs for the County's park system. The impact fees and the voter-approved tax measures to fund the County's budget for parks would ensure any impacts from this project would be less than significant.

Other public facilities?

Residential development in this area was anticipated in the County's General Plan. There are no unique aspects of the project that would increase service demands beyond those anticipated in the General Plan, or that would render the current service levels to be inadequate. No new library facilities to accommodate the project's service demands would be necessary. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Cumulative Discussion

The proposed project's potential contribution to cumulative impacts on public services is evaluated in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future development expected in San Mateo County.

FIRE PROTECTION: Construction of the project, along with cumulative development of projects within the Coastside Fire Protection District jurisdiction, would increase population and demand for fire services. The project and cumulative development projects are currently served by the District. The District operates on a regional aid approach where emergency response units are dispatched as needed based on unit availability, rather than municipal or determined service boundaries. Since cumulative development would occur in the District response area, cumulative development is not anticipated to

⁵² Stevens Consulting, 2018.

⁵³ CUSD. 2023b. Bond Measures. Available at: https://www.cabrillo.k12.ca.us/about_us/parcel_tax_bonds/bond_measures. Accessed March 12, 2023.

⁵⁴ CUSD, 2023b.

result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new/physically altered fire protection facilities. Therefore, the impact on fire protection would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is necessary.

POLICE PROTECTION: Construction of the project, along with cumulative development of projects within the Sheriff's Department jurisdiction, would increase population and demand for police services. Through the County's design review process, the Sheriff's Department and Planning Department would review the cumulative development projects on a project-by-project basis concerning safety measures. Cumulative development would occur in suburban areas where services and facilities are already provided. Cumulative development is not anticipated to result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new/physically altered police facilities, as no additional police services are required to serve the project. Combined with other cumulative development, the project would result in less than significant cumulative environmental impacts concerning police protection. Therefore, the impact on police protection would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is necessary.

SCHOOLS: Construction of the project, along with cumulative development of projects within CUSD jurisdiction, would incrementally increase student population and demand for CUSD facilities. The project and cumulative development projects are all located within the CUSD. The potential growth associated with cumulative development within the CUSD is not anticipated to require new or physically altered school facilities, as capacity for growth currently exists in the CUSD. Therefore, the project, combined with other cumulative development, would not result in significant cumulative environmental impacts concerning schools. Therefore, the project's impact on schools would not be cumulatively considerable.

PARKS: Development of the proposed project, combined with other cumulative development, would create additional demand on the existing city parks and recreational facilities due to population growth. Through the development review process, cumulative developments would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to determine their parkland demands and the conditions for their establishment and operation. Payment of impact fees for the cumulative projects would mitigate the impacts from cumulative demands for parkland to less than significant levels. The project, combined with other cumulative development, would not result in significant cumulative environmental impacts concerning parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, the project's impact on parks and recreational facilities would not be cumulatively considerable.

OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES: Development of the proposed project, combined with other cumulative development, would create additional demand on the existing facilities due to population growth. The proposed cumulative development projects would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to determine their library demands and the conditions for their establishment and operation. The cumulative projects would occur in suburban areas where services and facilities are already provided, and cumulative development is not anticipated to result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new/physically altered library facilities. The project would not result in significant cumulative environmental impacts concerning libraries. Therefore, the project's impact on other public facilities would not be cumulatively considerable.

2.16 Recreation

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

As discussed above in Section 2.15 Public Services, the County Parks Department operates 24 parks that encompass over 17,000 acres. It features approximately 190 miles of county and local trails, including three regional trails.⁵⁵ James Fitzgerald Marine Reserve and Pillar Point Bluff are the county parks nearest the project site.

The project would provide recreational opportunities for Cypress Point residents by building an informal trail on undeveloped portions of the site. The pathways would be privately maintained public open space, and the accessible path would end in a trellis-covered area with barbecue equipment, picnic tables, and benches. Other outdoor areas would include a basketball half court and a paved overlook with seating. In addition, the central outdoor space adjacent to the community building would include two play structures and open grassy terraces with flowering trees and planting. These on-site recreational facilities would create opportunities for residents and would lessen the use and demand of off-site parks or recreational facilities. The County charges impact fees to all new residential development to mitigate a project's impact on park and recreation facilities. These impact fees are used to address the identified future needs for the County's park system. Impacts would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

The proposed project includes privately maintained, on-site recreational amenities including accessible walking paths, a basketball half court, and two play structures. The project does not propose off-site recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

⁵⁵ County of San Mateo, 2023b.

Cumulative Discussion

The proposed project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts on recreation is evaluated in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future development expected in San Mateo County. The project would result in less than significant adverse physical impacts associated with park facilities. The proposed project, combined with cumulative development projects, would result in an incremental increase in regional parks and recreational facilities, as residential and non-residential use would increase. However, project and cumulative projects would be charged impact fees for all new residential development to mitigate a project’s impact on park and recreation facilities. These impact fees are used to address the identified future needs for the County’s park system; therefore, the project’s cumulative impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

2.17 Transportation

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and parking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.10, Transportation, provides a detailed analysis of construction and operation transportation and emergency access impacts associated with the proposed project, including an explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (d) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing transportation setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures.

a) *Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and parking?*

See EIR Section 3.10, Transportation, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to the circulation system.

b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

See EIR Section 3.10, Transportation, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to vehicle-miles traveled.

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

See EIR Section 3.10, Transportation, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to design hazards or incompatible uses.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

See EIR Section 3.10, Transportation, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to emergency access.

2.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a) Would the project 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, 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), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

a) Would the project 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, 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:

a-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)?

The proposed project is located on the ancestral lands of the Ohlone and Costanoan Indian Tribes. A combined cultural resources evaluation was completed for the Cypress Point Project on June 1, 2018, by

ARM.⁵⁶ In preparation of the report, ARM contacted the NAHC and requested a Sacred Lands File search of the project site. The NAHC responded on December 11, 2017 that the search returned negative results for the project site and provided a list of Native American contacts. The County distributed letters to the list of Native American contacts on December 21, 2017, requesting information on Tribal cultural resources in or near the project site.

As the lead agency, the County has not received notification requests from any Native American tribes per the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52. Therefore, no notices were provided under AB 52 related to Tribal cultural resources. No responses were received from the following contacts:

- Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista: Irene Zwierlein, Chairperson
 - As part of the archaeological testing program,⁵⁷ Irene Zwierlein of the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista was contacted, and a Native American monitor was present during the archaeological testing within CA-SMA-431.
- Coastanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe: Tony Cera, Chairperson
- Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan: Ann Marie Savers, Chairperson
- Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area: Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson
- Ohlone Indian Tribe: Andrew Galvan, Representative

With implementation of MM-CR-1: Additional Site Excavation; MM-CR-2: Archaeological Monitoring; MM-CR-3: Unanticipated Findings during Construction; and MM-CR-4: Procedures for Discovery and Treatment of Human Remains, impacts with regards to accidental discovery of Tribal cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

a-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.

Background research, survey results, and Native American coordination identified a shell mound (CA-SMA-55: Referred to as Nelson 405), within the area of potential effect. Based upon the lack of other artifacts in the deposit, and the site's heavily disturbed nature, CA-SMA-55 is not eligible for the NRHP or CRHR. If appropriate, the archaeologist and Tribal Historic Preservation Officer may introduce archaeological and Tribal cultural monitoring on-site, and an archaeological report should be written detailing all archaeological finds and submitted to the County in consultation with the Tribe's Tribal Historic Preservation Officer.

With implementation of MM-CR-4: Procedures for Discovery and Treatment of Human Remains, impacts to Tribal cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

Cumulative Discussion

The proposed project's potential contribution to cumulative impacts on Tribal cultural resources is evaluated in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future development expected in San Mateo County. Impacts to Tribal cultural resources are site-specific and are assessed on a

⁵⁶ ARM, 2018a.

⁵⁷ ARM, 2018b.

site-by-site basis. The extent of Tribal cultural resources (if any) that occur at the sites of the potential future projects is unknown; therefore, it is not known whether any of the potential projects would result in significant impacts to Tribal cultural resources. A determination of project-specific impacts would be made on a case-by-case basis and, if necessary, the applicants of each reasonably foreseeable project would be required to implement the appropriate mitigation measures. Therefore, implementation of the cumulative projects, together with the proposed project, would result in impacts that would be considered less than significant with mitigation. However, with implementation of MM-CR-4, potential impacts to these resources would not be cumulatively considerable, and the project’s cumulative impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

2.19 Utilities and Service Systems

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, provides a detailed analysis of construction and operation impacts to utilities and service systems associated with the proposed project, including explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (e) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing utilities conditions, regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures.

- a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

See EIR Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to utility facilities.

- b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

See EIR Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to water supplies.

- c) Would the project 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?**

See EIR Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to wastewater capacity.

- d) Would the project 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?**

See EIR Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to solid waste generation.

- e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

See EIR Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to solid waste statutes and regulations.

2.20 Wildfire

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>				
(a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

EIR Section 3.12, Wildfire, provides a detailed analysis of wildfire impacts associated with the proposed project, including explanation of initial study checklist topics (a) through (d) indicated above. The EIR includes a complete description of the existing wildfire setting and regulatory framework, the approach to the analysis, an impact evaluation of the proposed project and its variants, and cumulative impacts, and, if appropriate, identification of mitigation measures.

a) *If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

See EIR Section 3.12, Wildfire, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to fire hazard severity zones and emergency response and evacuation plans.

b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, if located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

See EIR Section 3.12, Wildfire, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to pollutant concentrations and uncontrolled spread of wildfire.

c) *If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project 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?*

See EIR Section 3.12, Wildfire, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to fire hazard severity zones and the installation of infrastructure.

d) *If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project 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?*

See EIR Section 3.12, Wildfire, for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to post-fire slope instability.

2.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Evaluation

- 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?**

See EIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources for the project-specific and cumulative analysis related to endangered species, plant and animal communities, fish and wildlife habit, and other biological resources impacts.

The project site is not known to have any association with an important example of California’s history or prehistory. Testing on-site determined that the proposed earthmoving activities have the potential to impact cultural materials. A treatment plan designed to mitigate the destruction of cultural materials would be implemented during project construction. MM-CR-1 through MM-CR-4 would ensure that impacts related to cultural, Tribal, and paleontological resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

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

The project’s contributions to cumulative impacts are individually evaluated by topic in this Initial Study. The project would have less than significant impacts or no impacts on agriculture, cultural and Tribal cultural resources (with MM-CR-1 through MM-CR-4), energy, minerals, population and housing, public

services, and recreation. For the topic areas covered in this Initial Study, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts. Potentially significant impacts are analyzed in EIR Chapter 3, Environmental Impact Analysis.

The project is required to implement the required mitigation measures, and the project is consistent with General Plan goals and policies as well as County development standards. Given implementation of mitigation measures to reduce all potential impacts, the incremental construction effects of the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

The new housing development would provide affordable housing options for residents of the mid-coast region. The project lessens the use of fossil fuels through infill development and improves community health by offering affordable housing options. There would be no substantial, adverse impacts on human beings, directly or indirectly, and impacts would be less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank.