

San Mateo
Coastal Annexation

Draft
Environmental Impact Report

June 2002

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

330 Distel Circle
Los Altos, CA 94022-1404
(650) 691-1200, *fax* (650) 691-0485

coast-eir@openspace.org
www.openspace.org

Table of Contents

S.	Summary	
I.	Introduction	I-1
A.	Actions pending before the District as Lead Agency and Santa Clara LAFCo and San Mateo LAFCo as Responsible Agencies	I-2
B.	District Adoption of the Resolution of Application to LAFCo for the Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation of the Coastal Area	I-2
C.	Environmental Issues	I-3
D.	Issues Found not to have Environmental Impacts	I-3
E.	Program EIR Methodology	I-3
	1. Definition of Program EIR	I-3
	2. Description of Further Environmental Review for Individual Acquisition and Management of Open Space Lands	I-4
II.	Project Description	II-1
	OVERVIEW	II-1
A.	Project Objectives	II-2
B.	The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	II-3
	District Master Plan	II-4
C.	Area Proposed for Annexation	II-5
D.	Project Characteristics	II-6
	1. Planning	II-6
	2. Funding	II-8
	3. Land Acquisition	II-9
	4. Land Management	II-10
	5. Improvements	II-12
III.	Plan Consistency	III-1
A.	Consistency with Local Plans and Policies	III-1
	1. San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) Policies	III-1
	2. San Mateo County General Plan	III-2
	a. Skyline Area Plan	III-4
	b. San Mateo Local Coastal Program	III-4
	c. San Mateo County Trails Plan	III-6
	3. City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (1993)	III-7
B.	Consistency with other Parks and Open Space Providers	III-8
	1. San Mateo County	III-9
	2. City of Half Moon Bay	III-10
	3. State of California	III-10
	4. National Park Service - Golden Gate National Recreation Area	III-11
IV.	Environmental Assessment Introduction	IV-1
A.	Land Use	IV-A-1
	1. Existing Setting	IV-A-1
	a. Geography of the Coastal Annexation Area	IV-A-1
	b. Current Land Uses Within the Coastal Annexation Area	IV-A-2
	c. Description of Rural Service Centers	IV-A-3
	1) San Gregorio	IV-A-3

	2)	Pescadero	IV-A-3
	3)	La Honda	IV-A-4
	d.	Land Use Patterns in the Rural Lands of the Coastal Annexation Area	IV-A-4
2.		Applicable Land Use and Recreation Policies and Regulations ...	IV-A-5
	a.	City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program and Use Plan (1993)	IV-A-6
	b.	San Mateo County General Plan	IV-A-6
	c.	San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP)	IV-A-8
3.		Significance Criteria	IV-A-8
4.		Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-A-8
B.		Agricultural Resources	IV-B-1
	1.	Existing Agricultural Setting	IV-B-1
	a.	Important Farmlands	IV-B-1
	b.	Cultivation of Crops	IV-B-2
	c.	Livestock Grazing	IV-B-3
	d.	Timber	IV-B-3
	e.	Agricultural Preserves	IV-B-3
	f.	Agricultural Challenges in the Coastal Annexation Area ...	IV-B-4
	2.	Applicable Agricultural Policies and Regulations	IV-B-4
	a.	San Mateo County General Plan	IV-B-4
	b.	San Mateo County Local Coastal Program	IV-B-5
	c.	San Mateo County Zoning Regulations	IV-B-5
	d.	State of California–Williamson Act	IV-B-6
	3.	Significance Criteria	IV-B-6
	4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-B-6
C.		Public Services & Infrastructure	IV-C-1
	1.	Existing Setting	IV-C-1
	2.	Applicable Policies and Regulations	IV-C-2
	a.	City of Half Moon Bay	IV-C-3
		1) Half Moon Bay General Plan Circulation Element ..	IV-C-3
		2) Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan ...	IV-C-3
	b.	San Mateo County	IV-C-3
		1) San Mateo County General Plan	IV-C-3
		2) San Mateo County Local Coastal Program	IV-C-4
	3.	Significance Criteria	IV-C-4
	4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-C-5
D.		Hazards and Hazardous Materials	IV-D-1
	1.	Existing Setting	IV-D-1
	2.	Applicable Policies and Regulations	IV-D-2
	a.	Regulatory Definition	IV-D-2
	b.	Regulations from Other Agencies and Jurisdictions	IV-D-2
		1) Half Moon Bay General Plan	IV-D-3
		2) San Mateo County General Plan	IV-D-3
	3.	Significance Criteria	IV-D-3
	4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-D-4
E.		Noise	IV-E-1
	1.	Existing Setting	IV-E-1
	2.	Applicable Policies and Regulations	IV-E-1

	a.	Half Moon Bay General Plan	IV-E-1
	b.	San Mateo County General Plan	IV-E-2
	3.	Significance Criteria	IV-E-2
	4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-E-2
F.		Air Quality	IV-F-1
	1.	Existing Setting	IV-F-1
	2.	Applicable Policies and Regulations	IV-F-2
	a.	Bay Area Air Quality Management District	IV-F-2
	b.	Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan	IV-F-2
	3.	Significance Criteria	IV-F-2
	4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-F-3
G.		Aesthetics	IV-G-1
	1.	Existing Setting	IV-G-1
	2.	Applicable Policies and Regulations	IV-G-2
	a.	Half Moon Bay General Plan	IV-G-2
	b.	San Mateo County General Plan	IV-G-2
	c.	San Mateo County Local Coastal Plan	IV-G-3
	d.	San Mateo County Grading Ordinance	IV-G-3
	e.	Scenic Easements	IV-G-3
	3.	Significance Criteria	IV-G-3
	4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-G-4
H.		Hydrology and Water Quality	IV-H-1
	1.	Existing Setting	IV-H-1
	2.	Applicable Policies and Regulations	IV-H-1
	a.	Half Moon Bay General Plan	IV-H-1
	b.	San Mateo County General Plan	IV-H-2
	c.	San Mateo County Local Coastal Plan	IV-H-2
	d.	Surface Runoff Management Plan	IV-H-2
	e.	San Mateo County Excavating, Grading, Filling and Clearing Regulations	IV-H-3
	f.	San Mateo County Topsoil Ordinance	IV-H-3
	g.	Water Quality Control Plan, San Francisco Bay Basin	IV-H-3
	h.	General Construction Activity Storm water Permit	IV-H-3
	3.	Significance Criteria	IV-H-4
	4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-H-5
I.		Biological Resources	IV-I-1
	1.	Biological Setting	IV-I-1
	a.	Background	IV-I-2
	b.	Biotic Communities	IV-I-2
	1)	Agricultural Land	IV-I-3
	2)	Chaparral	IV-I-3
	3)	Scrub	IV-I-3
	4)	Coastal Prairie	IV-I-4
	5)	Non-native Grassland	IV-I-4
	6)	Redwood Forest	IV-I-4
	7)	Non-redwood Forest	IV-I-5
	8)	Urban/Built-up	IV-I-5
	c.	Sensitive Communities/Habitats	IV-I-5
	d.	Special-status Species	IV-I-6
	2.	Applicable Policies and Regulations	IV-I-14

a.	Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan	IV-I-14
b.	San Mateo County General Plan	IV-I-14
c.	San Mateo County Local Coastal Program	IV-I-15
d.	California Coastal Commission	IV-I-15
e.	San Francisco and Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Boards	IV-I-16
f.	California Department of Fish and Game	IV-I-16
g.	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/National Marine Fisheries Service	IV-I-17
h.	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	IV-I-17
3.	Significance Criteria	IV-I-17
4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-I-18
J.	Cultural Resources	IV-J-1
1.	Existing Setting	IV-J-1
2.	Applicable Policies and Regulations	IV-J-8
3.	Significance Criteria	IV-J-10
4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-J-10
K.	Geology	IV-K-1
1.	Environmental Setting	IV-K-1
2.	Applicable Policies and Regulations	IV-K-1
a.	Half Moon Bay General Plan	IV-K-1
b.	San Mateo County General Plan	IV-K-1
3.	Thresholds of Significance	IV-K-2
4.	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	IV-K-2
V.	Alternatives	V-1
A.	No Project	V-2
1.	No Action	V-2
2.	Alternative Service Providers	V-2
a.	Public Agencies	V-2
b.	Private Non-Profit Land Trust	V-3
B.	Alternate Geographic Annexation Areas	V-4
1.	Northern Watersheds	V-5
2.	Skyline Upper Watersheds	V-6
3.	Skyline Upper and Northern Watersheds	V-7
4.	Skyline Upper and Southern Watersheds	V-7
C.	Other Alternatives	V-8
1.	District expansion on a parcel by parcel basis	V-8
2.	Extending District Sphere of Influence Only	V-9
3.	Purchasing Conservation and Agricultural Easements Only	V-9
4.	Management of Open Space Lands Only	V-10
VI.	CEQA Issues	VI-1
A.	Significant Irreversible Environmental Impacts	VI-1
B.	Growth-Inducing Impacts	VI-1
C.	Effects Not Found to be Significant	VI-2
D.	Cumulative Impacts	VI-2
1.	Future Projects Producing Related or Cumulative Impacts	VI-3
a.	Possible Future Actions by MROSD	VI-3

1)	Optional Service Plan Scenario #1	VI-3
2)	Optional Service Plan Scenario #2	VI-3
b.	Possible Future Actions by Other Open Space and Recreation	
	Agencies	VI-3
1)	Public Agencies	VI-4
2)	Private Agencies	VI-4
c.	Regional Growth	VI-5
2.	Potential Cumulative Impact	VI-5
a.	Land Use	VI-5
b.	Agriculture	VI-5
c.	Public Services & Infrastructure	VI-6
d.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	VI-6
e.	Noise	VI-7
f.	Air Quality	VI-7
g.	Aesthetics	VI-7
h.	Hydrology	VI-7
i.	Biology	VI-7
j.	Cultural Resources	VI-7
k.	Geology	VI-7
VII.	References	VII-1
A.	Personal Communication	VII-1
B.	Bibliography	VII-1
C.	Document Preparers	VII-4

Appendices

Appendix A. Relevant Policies from Other Agencies
 Appendix B. Traffic Study from Hexagon Transportation Consultants
 Appendix C. Draft Service Plan
 Appendix D. Fiscal Analysis
 Appendix E. Proposed Willing Seller Ordinance
 Appendix F. Open Space Acquisition Policies as Lands Relate to Sphere of Influence and Annexation Policies

Tables

Table S-1 - Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures S-5
 Table II-1 – Basic Service Plan II-14
 Table IV-A-1 – Land Use Summary IV-A-2
 Table IV-A-2 – Existing Rural Land Use Categories IV-A-4
 Table IV-A-3 – Ownership Status IV-A-5
 Table IV-A-4 – Recommended trail setbacks from occupied dwellings IV-A-10
 Table IV-B-1 – Important Farmland Acreage IV-B-3
 Table IV-C-1 – Summary of Saturday Peak Hour Traffic Counts IV-C-8
 Table IV-C-1 – Summary of Saturday Peak Hour Traffic IV-C-8
 Table IV-I-1 – Biotic Communities in the Coastal Annexation Area IV-I-2
 Table IV-I-2 – Special-status species and other sensitive resources potentially occurring within the Coastal Annexation Area IV-I-7
 Table VI-1 – Optional Service Plan Funding Scenarios VI-9

S. Summary

The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District is a public agency that acquires and manages open space resources in Santa Cruz, Santa Clara and San Mateo counties. The District proposes to extend its boundaries to include the majority of the San Mateo County coastside, approximately 140,000 acres, in order to acquire and manage land and easements for the preservation of open space and agriculture, and the protection of sensitive resources. The proposed annexation to the District is subject to approval by the San Mateo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

As a special district formed under the provisions of state legislation, the Midpeninsula Open Space District has the power of eminent domain. However, the properties or easements within the Coastal Annexation Area will be purchased by the District from willing sellers only. The District will not exercise its power of eminent domain in the coastal area. This policy is set out in the Service Plan, in this EIR, and will be adopted as an ordinance of the District. It will therefore be an integral part of the District's Service Plan and annexation application presented to LAFCO for approval.

As stated in Chapter I, Introduction, if the Coastal Annexation Area project is approved, future District actions will be subject to subsequent planning processes. Prior to making lands that it acquires or manages open to public access, the District will prepare a use and management plan for these lands, and will prepare CEQA documentation for each use and management plan.

Specific lands to be acquired by the District have not been identified. The District would focus its preservation and management in part on lands that contain sensitive resources. These sensitive resources include lands that are critical to protecting watershed integrity, water quality, and special-status species such as steelhead. Some acquired lands would thus likely contain sensitive natural communities, such as riparian habitat and wetlands.

All properties acquired by the District in the Coastal Annexation Area would remain subject to existing Federal, State, County, and City laws, including local land use regulations and zoning designations. Approximately three-fifths of the Coastal Annexation Area is within the Coastal Zone and therefore subject to local coastal policies adopted by San Mateo County pursuant to the California Coastal Act. No changes in existing land use designations or land use controls are associated with the proposed annexation or the resulting District activities.

The following District activities will be introduced into the Coastal Annexation Area as a result of the proposed expansion of District boundaries.

- Acquisition of lands and easements subject to the availability of funding,
- Management of lands acquired by the District and management of lands through contract with other public and private property owners (e.g., Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST), State of California) involving stewardship programs and visitor-serving low-intensity recreation access. Contracts for ranger patrol, maintenance, and construction of improvements in managing other property owner's lands would be subject to available District resources such that no significant negative effect to existing District services would result.

- Development and approval by the District Board of long-range plans to guide District programs. These plans will be in the form of: 1) revision of the District Master Plan to include the Coastal Annexation Areas; and 2) revision of the Regional Open Space Study to include the Coastal Annexation Area.
- Potential sale or lease of District-owned lands for: 1) agricultural uses after conservation or public access easements or easement conditions are applied to the property based on the site-specific resource characteristics of the property; and 2) appropriate recreation uses sponsored by public agencies, such as San Mateo County Department of Parks and Recreation, that would be consistent with applicable general plan and zoning regulations.
- Preparation of site assessments or use and management plans for individual properties that are either acquired by the District or managed by the District for other public or non-profit landowners.

If the Coastal Annexation Area is included within the District, District resources will be used to more formally involve residents of the Coastal Annexation Area in decision-making and the opportunity for a local resident or residents to be elected to the District Board of Directors will be provided.

As stated in Chapter I, Introduction, the annexation of the Coastal Area, adoption of the guidelines and policies set out in the Service Plan, adoption of an annexation policy for the Coastal Annexation Area, and adoption of an ordinance prohibiting the use of eminent domain in the Coastal Annexation Area is the proposed project which is the subject of this EIR. After this annexation project is approved by LAFCo, the District will conduct hearings in the Coastal Annexation Area to develop Basic Policies for the CAA consistent with the Service Plan. These hearings will address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agriculture and timber production; inter-agency relationships; and public information. These proposed project characteristics are outlined below and in the Draft Service Plan.

The District's Draft Service Plan emphasizes working in partnership with other land conservation interests in preserving open space lands, both public and private. Due to fiscal constraints, annexation will not result in the District preserving a significant area of land without partnerships. The Draft Service Plan emphasizes the District taking a leading role in land stewardship programs and, where appropriate, providing limited visitor-serving facilities that would generally be in the form of staging areas and trails.

As is stated in Chapter II, Project Description, the District's services of low intensity recreation, land stewardship and management programs will be extended to properties within the Coastal Annexation Area following final approval of annexation by the San Mateo County LAFCo. The characteristics of Program and Land Planning, Funding, Land Acquisition, Land Management, and Improvements within this 15-year program are described in the Project Description. As noted in Chapter I, Introduction, the Draft Service Plan and EIR use a 15-year planning time frame to develop an implementation scenario for environmental analysis.

A. Environmental Assessment

The act of annexation is a legal and administrative change and does not itself produce an environmental effect. The District's purpose in pursuing the annexation is to be able to acquire and manage open space lands on the San Mateo Coastside. The locations of subsequent land acquisitions and facilities are not known at the present time. The EIR considers the environmental setting of the proposed coastal annexation area and the kinds of activities that may follow annexation. The potential for environmental impact is appraised by taking into account the guiding principles of the Draft Service Plan that would govern site-specific planning and implementation. These policies and principles, along with the mitigation measures in this EIR, would avoid or minimize the environmental effects associated with future implementation under the annexation.

The analysis of the EIR finds that all potential environmental effects are less than significant or can be mitigated to less than significant by application of mitigation measures. The measures include practical specific measures that would be implemented at the time of planning, design, or construction of facilities that the District is likely to develop in the Coastal Annexation Area.

1. Plan Conformance

The plan conformance section of this EIR evaluates the consistency of the District's proposed Service Plan for the Coastal Annexation Area with the plans and policies of government agencies regulating land use in the project area. The relevant plans and policies include:

San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) Policies,
San Mateo County General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Trails Plan, and
City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program.

The plan conformance section also evaluates the consistency of District's Service Plan for the Coastal Annexation Area with the plans and policies of the recreation agencies which presently provide park and open space resources in the project area. These agencies include:

City of Half Moon Bay Department of Parks and Recreation,
San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division,
State Department of Parks and Recreation, and
National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

To determine project consistency, the policies in the Draft Service Plan are compared to the adopted plans and policies of the land use agencies and the missions of the park and open space agencies. The project was found to be generally consistent with the plans, policies and missions of the above listed agencies.

2. Impacts Mitigated to Less than Significant Levels

Table S-1 starting on page S-5 shows where impacts were found to be potentially significant and warranted mitigation. Impacts in other areas were found to be less than significant.

The Coastal Annexation Area has extensive agricultural, biological, scenic, recreational values that depend on and contribute to open space. The General Plans and Local Coastal

Programs of the City of Half Moon Bay and the County of San Mateo include extensive policies governing protection of the environment in the annexation area. When the District's annexation objectives are compared with these policies, it is clear that the effect of the annexation and subsequent District actions in the Coastal Annexation Area will be to assist in protecting the environmental values and in minimizing the cumulative effects of land use change in the area. For this reason, the proposed program will produce a net environmental benefit.

The proposed annexation would probably be followed by similar future actions either by the District or by other open space and recreation agencies in the Coastal Annexation Area. The analysis of possible future actions shows that the mitigation described for the proposed project would mitigate potential cumulative impacts. The environmental benefit of the proposed program would be cumulatively greater with a greater level of open space and agriculture protection.

B. Alternatives to the Proposed Action

The alternatives analysis includes three classes of alternatives:

- 1) No Project, including No Action and action by alternative service providers,
- 2) Alternative geographic annexation areas, and
- 3) Other Alternatives, including parcel-by-parcel annexation, extending the Sphere of Influence only, purchase of conservation and agricultural easements only, and management only.

Alternatives which exclude future District acquisition action or future provision of visitor serving facilities would avoid or reduce the potential environmental impact from those aspects of the proposed project. However, the environmental effects of actions pursuant to the proposed annexation are found to be Less than Significant or No Impact, or Mitigated to Less than Significant Impact by feasible measures directed by existing and proposed policies and applied at the time of specific actions in the area. For this reason, there is no need for the District to adopt an alternative on environmental grounds alone.

The No Project alternative, leaving open space protection to others, would likely diminish the long term protection of coastal environmental resources. Alternate annexation boundaries, eliminating, for example, the Skyline area, the Southern Watersheds area, or the Northern Watersheds area, shifts the emphasis on certain environmental issues, such as cultivated agriculture or forestry. Reducing the annexation area does not produce a favorable reduction in environmental impact and would result in foregoing some of the environmental benefits of the project.

Extending the Sphere of Influence only would have the same level of impact as the proposed project to the degree that the District was able to move forward with implementation. Purchase of Conservation Easements only or Management of Lands only reduces the net environmental benefit from the proposed project by limiting the amount of land that can be purchased, managed and preserved as open space by the District.

**Table S-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
A. Land Use		
<p>Impact LU-1 Land uses and users adjacent to any property that the District may acquire within the Coastal Annexation Area could pose significant health hazards to future preserve users. For example, timber harvesting could occur adjacent to future preserves, thereby causing potential hazards from falling trees, limbs and/or debris.</p>	<p>Mitigation LU-1a In areas where trails would pass potentially hazardous adjacent land uses (e.g., timber operations), trail structures such as fences, barriers, and signs shall be used to deter trail users from leaving the trail and encountering unsafe conditions. Temporary trail closures shall be employed during intermittent operations, such as agricultural spraying, that would jeopardize the safety of an otherwise safe trail.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact LU-1 Land uses and users adjacent to any property that the District may acquire within the Coastal Annexation Area could pose significant health hazards to future preserve users. For example, timber harvesting could occur adjacent to future preserves, thereby causing potential hazards from falling trees, limbs and/or debris.</p>	<p>Mitigation LU-1b: The following measures will be included in every future Use and Management Plan for parcels within the Coastal Annexation Area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In areas where trail routes are immediately adjacent to private property, fencing shall be employed as necessary to deter users from leaving the trail. Specific fence, gate, and crossing designs will be determined in consultations with adjacent affected property owner(s) at the Use and Management Plan stage. 2. All new trails/facilities will be sited away from the edges of new preserves. 3. All new trails/facilities will be designed to preserve existing vegetation within new preserves and at the property lines so that preserve users will not be able to view land uses in adjacent properties. 4. Trail uses will be consolidated where safe within the same trail way, depending on the steepness, available right-of-way, safety, user frequencies, and other conditions. A type of use on a trail may be prohibited for safety or environmental reasons, such as erosion and water quality. Where a trail is restricted to a particular type of user, the trail shall be clearly designated as such and shall be equipped with use signs and appropriate barriers to discourage unauthorized use. 5. Trails shall be sited as far away from occupied dwellings as practical. Trails not within planned road rights-of-way shall be set back a minimum distance from occupied dwellings in accordance with Table IV-A-4 (below). Where setbacks specified in Table IV-A-4 are not feasible, potential noise and privacy impacts must be evaluated for any subsequent District action and shall be reduced by use of berms, fencing, landscaping, and other feasible and compatible means, if necessary. 	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact LU-2 Permanent Policy 2 from the Draft Service Plan contains provisions for only the Coastal Area and does not include the Skyline Area.</p>	<p>Mitigation LU-2 Permanent Policy 2 in the Draft Service Plan shall be modified to state: “Within the <u>Coastal Annexation Area</u>, Coastal Zone, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.”</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>B. Agriculture</p>		
<p>Impact AGR-1 The Coastal Annexation Area contains Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance. Some parcels acquired by the District would likely contain lands with one or more of these designations. Acquisition of these lands by the District would not in and of itself convert the lands to non-agriculture use.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-1a No new buildings or staging areas shall be located on prime agricultural lands as defined in the Draft Service Plan that are being used for agricultural purposes. In order to avoid conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, the Draft Service Plan should be revised to provide that the ranger office/maintenance facility and the staging areas may not be located on Farmland in agricultural use.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact AGR-1 The Coastal Annexation Area contains Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance. Some parcels acquired by the District would likely contain lands with one or more of these designations. Acquisition of these lands by the District would not in and itself convert the lands to non-agriculture use.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-1b Trails and habitat preservation areas shall either be located to avoid prime agricultural lands or traverse such lands in a manner that does not result in interference with agricultural activities or substantially reduce the agricultural potential of those lands. Operators of active agricultural activities shall be consulted to identify appropriate routes on lands they cultivate. The agricultural activities and the agricultural potential of traversed lands shall be protected and buffered from trail user impacts by means of distance, physical barriers (i.e., sturdy fences), or other non-disruptive methods.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact AGR-1 The Coastal Annexation Area contains Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance. Some parcels acquired by the District would likely contain lands with one or more of these designations. Acquisition of these lands by the District would not in and itself convert the lands to non-agriculture use.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-1c The District shall adopt Draft Service Plan Policy P.1 by ordinance. This policy reads as follows: "Within the Coastal Annexation Area, the District shall only acquire lands or interests in lands from willing sellers. The power of eminent domain will not be exercised by the District within the Coastal Annexation Area. This policy is a Basic Policy for the Coastal Annexation Area."</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact AGR-2 Subsequent to annexation, the District would likely acquire some parcels subject to Williamson Act contracts. Under the Williamson Act, recreational and open space uses are allowable uses on lands subject to contract. District acquisition of Williamson Act lands for such uses would thus not conflict with the contract or related agricultural preserve designation.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-2 Policy P.2 as currently drafted does not apply outside of the Coastal Zone. Mitigation LU-2 ensures that Policy P.2 would apply outside of the Coastal Zone. This modification would further ensure that the District would not initiate any activities that would conflict with applicable zoning. Implementation of the policies proposed in the Draft Service Plan, as modified by Mitigation LU-2, would ensure that District actions within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area would not conflict with Williamson Act contracts or existing zoning for agricultural uses. No additional mitigation would be necessary.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact AGR-3 Notwithstanding the foregoing policies that are a part of the project, future public recreation at new preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area may conflict with existing agricultural and timber uses on and adjacent to District lands if trails and other recreation areas are not designed and managed in a manner that avoids such conflicts whenever feasible.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-3a Guideline 3.2 in the Draft Service Plan should be modified to state: "Improvements or public uses located upon open space lands other than agriculture...shall be located away from existing prime agricultural lands toward areas containing non-prime agricultural lands, unless such location would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient use of an area. <u>To the extent feasible, all trails and other public facilities should be located so as not to fragment agricultural operations. While trails that bisect grazing lands would not be likely to fragment grazing operations, trails that bisect cultivated crops could adversely affect the vitality of agricultural operations and should be avoided where feasible. If trails must traverse cultivated lands then adequate buffers, signs, and other measures necessary to ensure that trail use does not interfere with the agricultural operations shall be implemented.</u>"</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact AGR-3 Notwithstanding the foregoing policies that are a part of the project, future public recreation at new preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area may conflict with existing agricultural and timber uses on and adjacent to District lands if trails and other recreation areas are not designed and managed in a manner that avoids such conflicts whenever feasible.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-3b The District shall provide private property signs where appropriate and provide trail users information regarding private property rights to minimize public/private use conflicts and trespassing. The District shall clearly sign trails adjacent to active agriculture and provide trail users with information regarding property rights to minimize trespassing and conflicts with agricultural users.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact AGR-3 Notwithstanding the foregoing policies that are a part of the project, future public recreation at new preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area may conflict with existing agricultural and timber uses on and adjacent to District lands if trails and other recreation areas are not designed and managed in a manner that avoids such conflicts whenever feasible.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-3c Trails shall either be located to avoid prime agricultural lands or traverse such lands in a manner that does not result in interference with agricultural activities or substantially reduce the agricultural potential of those lands. Operators of active agricultural activities on lands owned by or under easement to the District shall be consulted to identify appropriate routes on lands they cultivate. Operators of active agricultural activities on lands adjacent to District lands used for non-agricultural purposes shall be consulted to identify routes that will avoid adverse effects on agricultural operations. The agricultural activities and the agricultural potential of traversed lands shall be protected and buffered from trail user impacts by means of distance, physical barriers (i.e., sturdy fences), or other non-disruptive methods.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact AGR-3 Notwithstanding the foregoing policies that are a part of the project, future public recreation at new preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area may conflict with existing agricultural and timber uses on and adjacent to District lands if trails and other recreation areas are not designed and managed in a manner that avoids such conflicts whenever feasible.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-3d The District lands or easements that comprise the trail setting shall provide width sufficient for management and/or buffer space from adjacent uses so as not to preclude the viability of those uses. In addition, implementation of Mitigation LU-2 will ensure that the proposed project and subsequent actions will not preclude the viability of adjacent uses.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact AGR-3 Notwithstanding the foregoing policies that are a part of the project, future public recreation at new preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area may conflict with existing agricultural and timber uses on and adjacent to District lands if trails and other recreation areas are not designed and managed in a manner that avoids such conflicts whenever feasible.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-3e Where herbicides are used for vegetation control, including control of noxious weeds, they must be handled, applied, and disposed of in such a manner that they do not adversely affect adjacent agriculture. Herbicide use shall be guided by label restrictions and any advisories published by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR) or the County Agricultural Commission. These chemicals shall only be applied by a person who is properly trained in their application.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact AGR-3 Notwithstanding the foregoing policies that are a part of the project, future public recreation at new preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area may conflict with existing agricultural and timber uses on and adjacent to District lands if trails and other recreation areas are not designed and managed in a manner that avoids such conflicts whenever feasible.</p>	<p>Mitigation AGR-3f The District shall conduct its land management practices such that they do not have an adverse significant impact on the physical and economic integrity of timberland preserves on or contiguous to properties owned or managed by the District and so that the safety of visitors to District preserves is not compromised by timber harvesting (e.g., establishing appropriate buffers on District lands).</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>C. Public Services & Infrastructure</p>		
<p>Impact PSI-1 Annexation and subsequent acquisition of land, absent further land use changes, would not affect traffic safety. Access to preserves eventually acquired after annexation could slightly increase use of winding, steep roads that could become hazardous depending on the amount and type (trucks, cars, motorcycles, etc.) of traffic.</p>	<p>Mitigation PSI-1a The District will not permit access in places where the access would create a hazard due to a design feature such as a sharp curve or dangerous intersection.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact PSI-1 Significant hazards to pedestrians and equestrians could occur as a result of excessive speed of cyclists on trails.</p>	<p>Mitigation PSI-1b A maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be placed on all trails that permit cyclists and other trail users (e.g., pedestrian, equestrian). Signs shall be located at trail entrances that indicate that a speed limit is in effect.</p> <p><i>In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-2 will further ensure that the proposed project and subsequent actions will not substantially increase hazards to trail users.</i></p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact PSI-2 The lack of adequate emergency access would be a significant impact because it may preclude adequate response time by public safety agencies.</p>	<p>Mitigation PSI-2 The Implementation Action G.6.E(i) shall be added to the Draft Service Plan to ensure adequate emergency access.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>D. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p>		
<p>Impact HAZ-1 Acquired lands may contain hazardous materials, such as leaking fuel storage tanks, agricultural chemicals, asbestos, or abandoned oil or gas wells. If such a site is not properly remediated, the public, including students at nearby schools, and the environment could be exposed to hazardous materials. Under certain circumstances, this exposure would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation HAZ-1 The District shall also review local, state, or federal government hazardous sites lists prior to acquiring a property to determine if the area is a hazardous materials site. The following resources and agencies can be consulted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Federal and state database information 7. Water Quality Control Board (San Francisco Bay Region) 8. San Mateo County Health Services Agency <p>If a parcel is found to contain a hazardous materials site, trails, staging areas, or other facilities will not be constructed on the parcel until plans can be developed and implemented to either remediate the hazard or ensure that the public will not have access to hazardous areas.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact HAZ-2 When open space areas are opened to the public, users could potentially be exposed to the risk of a wildland fire. There is also the concern that allowing public recreation access to an area carries an increased likelihood of human caused fire and hence increases the risk of wildland fire in the area as a whole.</p>	<p>Mitigation HAZ-2a During preparation of plans for specific facilities, the District shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review, in conjunction with the local fire protection services, available water sources. 2. Select indigenous plant materials and/or seed mixes utilized at staging areas or along trails for their low maintenance and drought and fire resistant characteristics to minimize additional fuel available to wildland fires to the extent feasible. 	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact HAZ-2 When open space areas are opened to the public, users could potentially be exposed to the risk of a wildland fire. There is also the concern that allowing public recreation access to an area carries an increased likelihood of human caused fire and hence increases the risk of wildland fire in the area as a whole.</p>	<p>Mitigation HAZ-2b Where compatible with other trail characteristics, planners shall locate trail alignments and access points to allow trails to also serve as emergency access routes for patrol or emergency medical transport. Where feasible for more remote areas, emergency helicopter landing sites shall be provided.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact HAZ-2 When open space areas are opened to the public, users could potentially be exposed to the risk of a wildland fire. There is also the concern that allowing public recreation access to an area carries an increased likelihood of human caused fire and hence increases the risk of wildland fire in the area as a whole.</p>	<p>Mitigation HAZ-2c The District shall coordinate with appropriate agencies, such as the County and CDPR, with respect to implementing regulations and formalization of mutual aid agreements.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact HAZ-3 District acquisition or management of land alone would not increase public exposure to other significant health or safety hazards. However, use of future District facilities, including trails, could adversely affect trail users.</p>	<p>Mitigation HAZ-3a The District shall routinely monitor trails and provide regular maintenance to avoid public exposure to hazardous conditions. Trails or other facilities shall be closed for construction or repair, or when another hazardous condition exists (e.g. landslide during flooding or extremely wet weather) that renders trail use especially hazardous, or where adjacent land uses may present unsafe conditions that could affect open space users. Where use limitations or closures are in place, the area shall be clearly designated and shall be equipped with use signs and appropriate barriers to discourage unauthorized use. Missing or damaged signs, gates, fences, and barriers shall be repaired or replaced as soon as possible. Closure notices shall include the reason(s) for the closure, an estimate of how long the facility will be closed, and a telephone number to call for further information.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact HAZ-3 District acquisition or management of land alone would not increase public exposure to other significant health or safety hazards. However, use of future District facilities, including trails, could adversely affect trail users.</p>	<p>Mitigation HAZ-3b District preserve maps for the public shall be kept up-to-date to the extent feasible. Trail maps shall also provide trail use rules, emergency information, trail accessibility, other pertinent safety information and shall be available at all staging areas.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>E. Noise</p>		
<p><i>no significant noise impacts</i></p>		

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
F. Air Quality		
<p>Impact AIR-1 Any future project within the Coastal Annexation Area could produce significant localized air emissions, both during project construction and operation. These projects could generate fugitive dust, including PM10.</p>	<p>Mitigation AIR-1 The District shall insure that the following measures are included in all future construction contracts to control fugitive dust emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to existing land uses shall be kept damp at all times, or shall be treated with non-toxic stabilizers or dust palliatives; • Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials and/or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard; • Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas for construction sites; • Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites; • Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets; • Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas; • Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to any exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.); • Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.; • Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; • Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible; • Suspend excavation and grading activity whenever the wind is so high that it results in visible dust plumes despite control efforts. 	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
G. Aesthetics		
<p>Impact AES-1 Limited improvement of open space areas for recreational use after the proposed annexation project is approved could include trails, parking areas, portable sanitary facilities, fencing, signs, and access roads. The District may also develop a field office and maintenance facilities. These developments could create a significant effect on scenic vistas.</p>	<p>Mitigation AES-1a Trail alignments and their associated facilities shall be sited and designed to be in harmony with surrounding natural and cultural settings and to retain natural appearances and values.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact AES-1 Limited improvement of open space areas for recreational use after the proposed annexation project is approved could include trails, parking areas, portable sanitary facilities, fencing, signs, and access roads. The District may also develop a field office and maintenance facilities. These developments could create a significant effect on scenic vistas.</p>	<p>Mitigation AES-1b Trail alignments across the face of open hillsides and near the top of ridge lines shall be sited to avoid creating new, permanent, noticeably visible lines on the existing landscape when viewed from points looking up at or perpendicular to the trail. Conditions to be considered when siting trails include, but are not limited to, avoiding excessive cuts in slopes that could not be effectively revegetated, and presence of native soil to support revegetation.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact AES-1 Limited improvement of open space areas for recreational use after the proposed annexation project is approved could include trails, parking areas, portable sanitary facilities, fencing, signs, and access roads. The District may also develop a field office and maintenance facilities. These developments could create a significant effect on scenic vistas.</p>	<p>Mitigation AES-1c Screening berms, perimeter planting, and parking area trees that provide a canopy shall be used at major staging areas to visually buffer views into the staging area from sensitive view points.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact AES-1 Limited improvement of open space areas for recreational use after the proposed annexation project is approved could include trails, parking areas, portable sanitary facilities, fencing, signs, and access roads. The District may also develop a field office and maintenance facilities. These developments could create a significant effect on scenic vistas.</p>	<p>Mitigation AES-1d All structures proposed that are located in scenic corridors shall be screened using native landscaping with plants indigenous to the localized area.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact AES-1 Limited improvement of open space areas for recreational use after the proposed annexation project is approved could include trails, parking areas, portable sanitary facilities, fencing, signs, and access roads. The District may also develop a field office and maintenance facilities. These developments could create a significant effect on scenic vistas.</p>	<p>Mitigation AES-1e Any utilities constructed within a State scenic corridor for District facilities shall be underground.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact AES-2 The field office or maintenance facilities may require lighting for security or safety. Lights from these facilities could affect nighttime views in the area.</p>	<p>Mitigation AES-2 Any new lighting as part of the proposed project will have light shields and other devices to ensure that no new light or glare will impact sensitive receptors.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
H. Hydrology		
<p>Impact HYD-1 The Santa Cruz Mountains are known for intense rainfall with large volume flows through creeks and drainages. The annexation area is windward of incoming storms and would receive intense rainfall capable of eroding and destabilizing project area trails. No effluent waste would be discharged due to the proposed annexation project. Future toilet facilities would be self-contained at preserves, or connected to existing sewer systems, as in the case of the District developing a field office and maintenance facilities in the Coastal Annexation Area. Overall, the project should be beneficial due to protection of watersheds and associated water quality.</p>	<p>Mitigation HYD-1a Trails shall be sited to minimize potential water pollution and stream bank erosion. Equestrian trails shall not be sited parallel to “blue line” streams (as mapped on USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle maps) and major drainage (determined during the preparation of individual trail design) within 150 feet of the streambanks in such watersheds. Where equestrian trails must cross streams or major drainage in water supply watersheds, the trail shall be sited perpendicular to the stream (to the extent allowed by topography and vegetation) through the 300-foot buffer zone (150 feet on each side). Equestrian trails shall not be located within 150 feet of the high water line of a drinking water reservoir. These measures may be modified on a case-by-case basis upon the advice of a qualified biologist or water quality specialist and the concurrence of the applicable water agency.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact HYD-1 The Santa Cruz Mountains are known for intense rainfall with large volume flows through creeks and drainage. The annexation area is windward of incoming storms and would receive intense rainfall capable of eroding and destabilizing project area trails. No effluent waste would be discharged due to the proposed annexation project. Future toilet facilities would be self-contained at preserves, or connected to existing sewer systems, as in the case of the District developing a field office and maintenance facilities in the Coastal Annexation Area. Overall, the project should be beneficial due to protection of watersheds and associated water quality.</p>	<p>Mitigation HYD-1b Storm water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) as listed in this section shall be implemented to reduce potential water quality impacts. BMPs include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flow of runoff from drainage structures will be directed to vegetated areas, away from creeks and drainage as is practical. 2. Conduct any trail maintenance work during low flow periods 3. Use erosion and sediment control measures to minimize water quality impacts and ensure no sediment at heavily traveled trails flows into creeks. These measures include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Silt Fences • Straw Bale Barriers • Brush or Rock Filters • Storm Drain Inlet Protection • Sediment Traps • Sediment Basins • Erosion Control Blankets and Mats • The District shall prevent erosion on steep slopes by using erosion control material according to manufacturer’s specifications. 4. If soil is to be stockpiled for any reason at creeksides, no run-off will be allowed to flow back to the creek. 	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact HYD-1 The Santa Cruz Mountains are known for intense rainfall with large volume flows through creeks and drainage. The annexation area is windward of incoming storms and would receive intense rainfall capable of eroding and destabilizing project area trails. No effluent waste would be discharged due to the proposed annexation project. Future toilet facilities would be self-contained at preserves, or connected to existing sewer systems, as in the case of the District developing a field office and maintenance facilities in the Coastal Annexation Area. Overall, the project should be beneficial due to protection of watersheds and associated water quality.</p>	<p>Mitigation HYD-1c When acquiring new property, the District shall carefully evaluate existing roads and trails before adopting a Preliminary Use and Management Plan and opening them to the public to ensure that their design is compatible with resource protection and recreational uses. In some cases, the District may close and restore poorly designed roads and trails to restore the land to its natural conditions. Where roads exist in area of geologic sensitivity (areas prone to landslides or earth movement), the District may conduct a roads assessment to identify corrective actions necessary to reduce sediment input into streams.</p> <p>Trail surfaces appropriate to intended use shall be selected so as to minimize runoff and erosion problems. Trail designs shall conform to the County Surface Runoff Management Plan, County Excavating, Grading, Filling, and Clearing Regulations Ordinance, and the County Topsoil Ordinance, as defined in this chapter. Surface water shall be diverted from trails by out sloping the trail tread 3% where feasible. Where necessary, shallow ditches or water bars shall be used to divert water on running slopes greater than 5%. Other trail drainage techniques may include rolling dips, culverts, or ditches on sides of trails. Erosion control plans shall comply with erosion control policies in the County General Plan and Local Coastal Program.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact HYD-1 The Santa Cruz Mountains are known for intense rainfall with large volume flows through creeks and drainage. The annexation area is windward of incoming storms and would receive intense rainfall capable of eroding and destabilizing project area trails. No effluent waste would be discharged due to the proposed annexation project. Future toilet facilities would be self-contained at preserves, or connected to existing sewer systems, as in the case of the District developing a field office and maintenance facilities in the Coastal Annexation Area. Overall, the project should be beneficial due to protection of watersheds and associated water quality.</p>	<p>Mitigation HYD-1d No large-scale grading shall be used for trail construction. The degree of cut allowed on a slope depends on the soil type, hardness, and surrounding natural resources. Ultimate cuts shall be contoured to blend with the natural slope. Steep areas shall be handled by limited terracing to avoid large-scale grading. Surface soil disturbance shall be kept to a minimum to reduce erosion and maintenance problems. Only those rocks, stumps, and roots that interfere with safe passage shall be removed.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact HYD-2 The annexation project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area.</p>	<p>Mitigation HYD-2 Culverts shall be designed so that they do not limit the ability of debris to pass. Structures over water courses shall be carefully placed to minimize disturbance and should be located 2 feet above the 100-year flood elevation or 2 feet above the Flood Hazard Flood Insurance Rate Map flood elevation. Maintenance of culverts and drainage structures shall be performed as needed to ensure proper functioning.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
I. Biology		
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1a Biological resource assessments shall be conducted during preparation of Use and Management Plans. Assessments shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and will include surveys for sensitive habitats and special-status species in the appropriate seasons. These assessments will include recommendations to align potential trails to avoid impacts to sensitive habitats, special-status species, and heritage and significant trees. If any trail alignment may affect such resources, the District will consult with the appropriate agencies (e.g., CDFG, USFWS, NMFS) to ensure that impacts will be avoided or mitigation is adequate.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1b The District shall protect sensitive habitat areas and other areas where special-status species may be adversely affected when planning trails and other facilities. To the maximum extent feasible, trail alignments and other improvements shall avoid impacts to sensitive habitats, including habitats for special-status plants and animals. All improvements shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by a qualified biologist to identify impact avoidance measures or mitigation measures for biotic impacts. Consideration shall be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocating trails or other improvements • Periodic closures • Revegetation prescriptions • Buffer plantings • Discrete barrier fencing that accommodates wildlife passage • Other appropriate measures <p>Removal of native vegetation shall be avoided as much as possible. The appropriate resource agencies shall be contacted regarding any trail alignments or other improvements that may impact sensitive habitats, special-status species, or their habitat. Plant replacement shall be native to the area and suitable for the site conditions.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1c In special-status species habitat areas, trail use levels shall be limited as appropriate to ensure protection of resources. Techniques for limiting use may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical access controls • Seasonal or intermittent closures 	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1d Existing access routes shall be used wherever suitable to minimize impacts of new construction in special-status species habitats. Realignment will be implemented where necessary to avoid adverse impacts on resources.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1e Trail design shall include barriers to control trail use and prevent environmental damage. Barriers may include fences, vegetation, stiles, and/or fallen trees or branches.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1f A particular trail or other facility may need to be closed during seasonal periods critical to special-status species, where overuse threatens resource values, or for other reasons to protect biological resources. Where a trail or surrounding habitat warrants special notice limiting trail use, the trail shall be clearly designated and should be equipped with use signs and appropriate barriers to discourage unauthorized use. Missing or damaged signs, gates, fences, and barriers shall be repaired or replaced as soon as possible. Closure notices shall include the reason(s) for the closure, an estimate of how long the facility will be closed, and a telephone number to call for further information.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1g When parallel to a stream or riparian zone, trails shall generally be set back from the top of bank or from the outside edge of the riparian zone, whichever is greater, except where topographic, resource management, or other constraints or management objectives make such a setback not feasible or undesirable. Riparian setbacks may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis based upon advice of a qualified biologist and with the concurrence of reviewing agencies, where applicable.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1h Trail crossings of streams and drainage shall be designed to minimize disturbance through the use of bridges, fords, or culverts, whichever is least environmentally damaging. Bridges and culverts shall be designed so that they visually and functionally blend with the environment and do not substantially interfere with the movement of native fish. Sufficient depth and velocity of water through the culvert shall exist in fish-bearing streams for passage of native fish and other native aquatic species during high and low flow conditions. Equestrian trail access shall be restricted at fish-bearing streams during critical times, such as during spawning, unless bridges and culverts are provided for horse use.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1i Trails and other improvements shall avoid wetlands and other jurisdictional waters, including seasonal wetlands, seeps, springs, and farm ponds, wherever possible. A wetlands biologist will conduct reconnaissance-level surveys of all improvements in areas with potential wetlands. Any improvements adjacent to wetland areas will be constructed so that fills avoid wetland impacts and minimum setbacks are allowed. Where feasible, setbacks from wetlands and other jurisdictional waters shall be a minimum of 25 feet for trails and 50 feet for staging areas and other improvements. A formal wetland delineation will be required for any improvements that may directly impact wetlands.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1j Revegetation and/or enhancement shall be undertaken where any sensitive habitat or special-status species habitat will be disturbed or destroyed by facility construction. Revegetation work shall be implemented prior to or concurrently with the development. The design of an appropriate revegetation program shall fully compensate for the lost habitat, with no net loss of habitat functions and values. Riparian and wetland habitat impacts will typically be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio for high quality habitat areas and at lower ratios where lower habitat quality justifies a lower ratio. A lower ratio may also be justified if habitat mitigation is implemented and verified as successful prior to the occurrence of impacts. Mitigation shall be based on in-kind replacement of impacted habitat with habitat of equal or better biotic value. The revegetation program shall be designed by a qualified biologist or ecologist and submitted to the appropriate regulatory or trustee agency for approval. At a minimum, the revegetation program shall include a description of project impacts, mitigation calculations, the mitigation site, revegetation techniques, maintenance measures, a long-term monitoring program, and contingency measures. Native plant materials suited to the site will be utilized in all mitigation work.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1k Periodic monitoring of known sensitive habitats adjacent to trails or other facilities shall be conducted to determine if unacceptable soil compaction or other adverse impacts are occurring. If monitoring reveals that undesirable soil compaction or impact to a sensitive habitat is occurring, barriers or other appropriate measures (such as trail rerouting) shall be employed as needed to discourage off-trail use. Brush or other aesthetically acceptable barriers can be used to cover illegal trails, abandoned trails, or shortcuts to discourage use until natural vegetation returns.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1l Should sensitive habitat be impacted such that it necessitates permanently closing a trail or staging area, a management program to rehabilitate the area will be developed. Such a program shall include discing and replanting or other techniques appropriate to the habitat type to return the site to a natural condition and sufficiently blocking the trail with barriers to effectively prohibit use. Management shall include monitoring the site to ensure that it returns to a natural condition without the intrusion of invasive exotic plants. Management shall also include design elements, maintenance, and monitoring to ensure that erosion is minimized.</p> <p>Construction and maintenance of trails will require the trimming and/or removal of vegetation along the trail route and staging areas.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1m Existing native vegetation shall only be removed as necessary to accommodate the trail clearing width. The minimum horizontal clearing width from physical obstructions varies based on the type of trail but should be no less than two feet from the outer limits of the trail tread and shall be determined on a case by case basis to protect special natural features. Maximum vertical distance from overhanging branches shall be 12 feet on trails open to equestrian or bicycle use. Maximum vertical distance from overhanging branches shall be eight feet on hiking trails. Clearing shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to protect special natural features.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact BIO-1 Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-1n Good pruning practices should be followed when vegetation growth must be cleared. Ground cover plants and low shrubs should not be cleared beyond the original construction stand. The construction stand shall be defined as the trail tread width plus 1-2 feet from each side of the edge of the trail tread. Noxious plants (e.g., yellow star-thistle) shall be controlled along trails and the edges of staging areas in a timely manner. Potential adverse impacts on biological resources would also be mitigated by Hyd-1 through Hyd-2.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-2 The construction of new fences on lands acquired or managed by the District could restrict wildlife movement within open space areas.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-2 The District shall minimize fragmentation of interior habitat, reduce barriers to wildlife movement within preserves, identify and protect established wildlife crossings to allow movement across existing roads, remove unnecessary fences and barbed wire from preserves, and seek to reduce barriers to wildlife movement on a more regional basis. The construction of new fences constructed on District owned or managed lands shall not restrict wildlife movement. Fence rails shall be designed with openings large enough for native mammals to pass through.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-3 Construction of District improvements on open space lands could result in the removal or trimming of heritage and/or significant trees in compliance with of the San Mateo County Ordinance.</p>	<p>Mitigation BIO-3: Guideline 6.3 in the Draft Service Plan should modified to the provision for unique biological resources including heritage and significant trees as follows. <u>Underline</u> text is new text to be added. Inherent in the preservation of open space resources is the protection of: rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species; ecological systems; water quality; visual resources; <u>unique biological resources, including heritage and significant trees</u>, and the unique cultural resources in the Coastal Annexation Area, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources. Therefore, prior to making any lands available to low-intensity public recreational access, the District shall prepare and adopt a site-specific resource management and public access plan for any lands acquired by the District or managed through contract for other public or private non-profit property owners. The development of plans will include opportunities for public involvement.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
J. Cultural Resources		
<p>Impact CUL-1 Specific lands to be acquired by the District have not been identified, but lands acquired may contain historical resources. Due to public safety concerns, historical structures may need to be removed. At a minimum, treatment of a building and/or structure to be affected should provide for mitigation options and procedures for both the building to be affected by the project and any adjacent buildings with the potential to be affected by either direct or indirect impacts. Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and 1b will mitigate all impacts to historic structures to less than significant levels.</p>	<p>Mitigation CUL-1a The protocol for determining if structures are of historic value is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The property and building types will be identified and evaluated by a qualified cultural consultant; 2. The cultural consultant will determine if the structures in question are currently included in a local register of historic resources, on the California Register of Historic Resources or on the National Register of Historic Places; 3. If it is determined that the structures in question are not currently included in a local register of historic resources, on the California Register of Historic Resources or on the National Register of Historic Places, a DPR 523 form issued by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) will be completed by the cultural consultant and the structural and building data sent to a qualified architectural historian; 4. If it is determined that the structures in question are there are two options that would mitigate any impact to the historic values: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Retain and rehabilitate the building according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (U.S. Department of Interior 1990). New construction near this building should be consistent with its historic character; or b) Move the building to a different location on its current parcel or to a different parcel appropriate to its historic character. 	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact CUL-1 Specific lands to be acquired by the District have not been identified, but lands acquired may contain historical resources. Due to public safety concerns, historical structures may need to be removed. At a minimum, treatment of a building and/or structure to be affected should provide for mitigation options and procedures for both the building to be affected by the project and any adjacent buildings with the potential to be affected by either direct or indirect impacts. Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and 1b will mitigate all impacts to historic structures to less than significant levels.</p>	<p>Mitigation Cul-1b Short-Term/Construction activities may impact nearby historic properties. These impacts may include dust accumulation on building facades, and increased noise and vibration from construction equipment. Construction period impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project specifications shall require the contractor(s) and any subcontractors to conform to the County’s noise control requirements. 2. Project specifications shall require the general contractor and any subcontractors to control dust and exhaust emissions of particulate through water sprinkling during demolition and excavation activities; covering of stockpiles of soil, sand and other such materials; covering trucks hauling debris, soil, sand and other such materials; street sweeping of the streets surrounding excavation and construction sites; equipment maintenance to reduce emissions; and, prohibitions on idling engines when not in use. 3. Cleaning of the adjacent historic buildings may be necessary after construction activities to prevent long-term damage to the building fabric. The need for cleaning shall be determined by a qualified Historic Architect, shall follow the standards set by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be completed in consultation with the Historic Architect. 4. A structural engineer shall inspect the buildings prior to construction to determine if the noise and vibration anticipated during construction will affect the buildings framework and fabric. The report, with any recommendations and mitigation measures, should be reviewed by a qualified Historic Architect. 	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact CUL-2 Removal or other substantial changes to not yet identified archaeological or paleontological resources may be significant.</p>	<p>Mitigation Cul-2 Application of the Standard Protocol for Unexpected Discovery of Archaeological and Paleontological Cultural Materials will be applied. See section for a complete description of this plan.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact CUL-3 Ground excavation or other ground disturbance during development of improvements, such as trails, could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p>	<p>Mitigation Cul-43 Application of the Native American Burial Plan (NABP) will be applied. See section for a complete description of this plan.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>K. Geology</p>		
<p>Impact GEO-1 Future District facilities such as a field office or maintenance building could be constructed in an area subject to geologic hazards such as seismic shaking or liquefaction. When open space areas are opened to the public, users could potentially be exposed to geologic hazards such as unstable slopes in landslide areas.</p>	<p>Mitigation GEO-1a Surveys shall be conducted as part of trail route site planning to identify the occurrence of any potentially hazardous geologic conditions such as unstable slopes in landslide areas. Such areas shall be avoided or necessary construction design measures shall be incorporated into the trail design to assure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Users will not be exposed to the identified hazard • Trails would not contribute to increasing the degree or extent of instability • Drainage from the trail would be routed away from the instability <p>In no event shall a trail be routed across an instability that is actively supplying sediment directly into a channel within a watershed known to support anadromous fish species, unless the instability is stabilized.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance of Impact After Mitigation has been applied
<p>Impact GEO-1 Future District facilities such as a field office or maintenance building could be constructed in an area subject to geologic hazards such as seismic shaking or liquefaction. When open space areas are opened to the public, users could potentially be exposed to geologic hazards such as unstable slopes in landslide areas.</p>	<p>Mitigation GEO-1b The District shall routinely monitor trails and provide regular maintenance to avoid public exposure to hazardous conditions.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact GEO-1 Future District facilities such as a field office or maintenance building could be constructed in an area subject to geologic hazards such as seismic shaking or liquefaction. When open space areas are opened to the public, users could potentially be exposed to geologic hazards such as unstable slopes in landslide areas.</p>	<p>Mitigation GEO-1c Where structures are proposed, a geotechnical evaluation shall be conducted to identify engineering methods to reduce the potential for structural failure due to geological hazards. All buildings shall be designed in a manner that reflects the geologic hazards on the site, and shall be consistent with local and Uniform Building Codes.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

I. Introduction

The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (the District) is a public agency that acquires and manages open space resources. Where appropriate, the District provides visitor-serving facilities for low-intensity recreation by the general public. The District was formed in 1972 and, with subsequent annexations, now encompasses the northwestern portion of Santa Clara County, the southern Bayside of San Mateo County and a portion of Santa Cruz County.

The District proposes to extend its boundaries to include the majority of the San Mateo County coastside. The Coastal Annexation Area (CAA) includes approximately 140,540 acres of western San Mateo County. This portion of the county includes the City of Half Moon Bay, urban areas to the north, relatively undeveloped lands in active agriculture and ranching, low density housing, and open space uses. This boundary expansion will allow the District to acquire lands and conservation easements from willing sellers without the use of eminent domain and to conduct stewardship programs to preserve and manage open space resources, to protect sensitive resources such as watersheds, and to provide opportunities for the preservation of agriculture in the Coastal Annexation Area. This Coastal Annexation Area is further defined in Chapter II, Project Description.

In order to proceed with this program, the District will apply to the San Mateo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) to expand the District's Boundary and Sphere of Influence to include the Coastal Annexation Area (see Map 1, Project Vicinity, in last section).

The District has prepared a Draft Service Plan (incorporated by reference) that outlines the project, its purposes and goals and provides a description of services that would be provided if the Coastal Area is annexed into the District's Boundary and Sphere. The Draft Service Plan contains guiding principles that specifically pertain to resource management, land acquisition and recreation management. The Draft Service Plan will allow the San Mateo County LAFCo to determine if annexation of the Coastal Annexation Area to the District would be consistent with the goals of the State to encourage orderly growth and development as set forth in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000.

The Draft Service Plan is intended to be used as the ongoing District program for the Coastal Annexation Area. After annexation approval by the San Mateo County LAFCo, the District will conduct hearings in the Coastal Annexation Area to develop Basic Policies for the CAA consistent with the Service Plan. These hearings will address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agriculture and timber production; inter-agency relationships; and public information. These project characteristics of the Coastal Annexation are outlined in Chapter II, Project Description and in the Draft Service Plan.

The Draft Service Plan and EIR use a 15-year planning time frame to forecast implementation actions after annexation for environmental analysis. Table II-1 in the Project Description shows the level and range of services expected to occur over this time frame.

The District has also prepared a fiscal analysis to determine the potential effect of the annexation on local tax revenues and hence on local programs of other government agencies. The fiscal analysis is in Appendix D.

After the CEQA process is complete, the Final Service Plan, Final EIR, and the accompanying Fiscal Analysis will be included in the District's application to the San Mateo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) to expand the District's Boundary and Sphere of Influence to include the Coastal Annexation Area.

This chapter defines the LAFCo process and identifies how future actions are expected to comply with CEQA. The relationship of the Draft Service Plan to the District's and other agencies' existing regulations is explained in detail in this EIR in Chapter III, Plan Consistency.

A. Actions pending before the District as Lead Agency and Santa Clara LAFCo and San Mateo LAFCo as Responsible Agencies

According to the Cortese-Knox Hertzberg Act of 2000, when a district has territory in more than one county, the county with the most assessed valuation is the LAFCo which has jurisdiction over boundary changes for the district in any county. Therefore, because the majority of the assessed valuation of the District is located in Santa Clara County, Santa Clara LAFCo is the "principal" LAFCo for the District. As such, Santa Clara LAFCo would normally be the agency adopting the resolution either approving or denying an application to annex territory to the District. However, San Mateo and Santa Clara LAFCos adopted an agreement in 1987 that if the district is in more than one county, the county where the district's project is located has the authority to hold a hearing and make a recommendation to the Lead County for formal action. Because this annexation proposal is located entirely within San Mateo County, San Mateo LAFCo requested that Santa Clara LAFCo vest jurisdiction in San Mateo LAFCo regarding the District's application to annex the San Mateo coastal area (Paul Koenig, San Mateo LAFCo, memo Jan. 12, 1999). Santa Clara LAFCo agreed to the request and formally vested jurisdiction of this project with San Mateo LAFCo. Therefore, San Mateo LAFCo will be the principal LAFCo for this project. The project will be referred to Santa Clara LAFCo for a recommendation prior to San Mateo LAFCo taking a final action on the project (Martha Poyatos, San Mateo LAFCo, pers. comm.)

According to the San Mateo LAFCo *Procedures for the Evaluation of Proposals*, San Mateo LAFCo is usually a "responsible agency" under CEQA requirements. If a special district is the proponent for a project, as the District is in this case, it is usually the "lead agency" under CEQA requirements. In this case, the District is the lead agency because its' decision as to whether to request LAFCo's approval of annexation is the first decision to be made regarding the project. Before acting on the annexation application, the District will consider this EIR and will certify it if it finds it complete. San Mateo LAFCo and Santa Clara LAFCo will be "responsible agencies" and will review and consider this EIR in their actions on the project.

B. District Adoption of the Resolution of Application to LAFCo for the Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation of the Coastal Area

As stated in the Draft Service Plan, services of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District to be extended to the Coastal Annexation Area will implement the policies, guidelines, and implementation actions set forth in the Draft Service Plan, and will fulfill the District's mission for the San Mateo Coastal Annexation Area. District actions of acquisition, operation and management within the Coastal Annexation Area would be similar to existing District actions within its current boundaries, modified by the Guiding Principles for the Coastal Annexation Area.

District services can feasibly be extended to properties within the Coastal Annexation Area following final approval of annexation by the San Mateo County LAFCo. Financing for services would be from existing District revenues augmented by other government and private funding. Specific services are defined in the Draft Service Plan and are listed in Chapter II, Project Description.

C. Environmental Issues

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and an Environmental Checklist Form, along with the Draft Service Plan, were mailed to various agencies and interested community members on June 9, 2000. A series of public informational and scoping meetings were held in the Coastal Annexation area and at the District's offices in July and August 2000 to receive input from the community to help refine the issues, mitigation measures, and alternatives to be addressed in the draft EIR. The District determined that an EIR should be prepared and that the appropriate CEQA document is a Program EIR because the District would implement the Annexation Project through a series of subsequent specific projects.

The following issues were either identified in the Initial Study/NOP or are from the responses/comments of the NOP. They will be the subject of the environmental analysis contained in this EIR.

1. Land Use / Planning, including Recreation
2. Agriculture
3. Public Services/Transportation & Traffic/Utilities & Service Systems
4. Hazards & Hazardous Materials
5. Noise
6. Air Quality
7. Aesthetics
8. Hydrology / Water Quality
9. Biological Resources
10. Cultural Resources
11. Geological Resources

D. Issues Found not to have Potential Environmental Impacts

As part of the NOP process, the following issues were found not to have potential environmental impacts and are not considered further in the EIR:

1. Mineral Resources
2. Population/Housing

E. Program EIR Methodology

1. Definition of Program EIR

The District, as lead agency under CEQA, has prepared this document as a Program EIR. A Program EIR, defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, is used for a series of individual actions that are related "geographically, as logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions in connection with ... a continuing program, or as individual actions carried out under the same

statutory or regulatory authority having generally the same environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways."

It is the District's intent to rely on this Program EIR and the Draft Service Plan as the basis for proceeding with the Coastal Annexation process under CEQA. If the Annexation is approved, subsequent District land acquisitions will be subject to the District's Open Space Use and Management Planning Process, and subsequent preparation of site-specific Use and Management Plans. Project-specific CEQA documentation will be prepared on each acquisition and Use and Management Plan. That documentation will rely on the information in this EIR to the extent it is reasonable and feasible to do so.

2. Description of Further Environmental Review for Individual Acquisition and Management of Open Space Lands

In order to implement the program of open space land acquisition, operation and management under the annexation, the District will need to comply with CEQA by examining each subsequent activity in the program to see if:

- It is subject to CEQA and based on an Initial Study
 - It can be approved with a Negative Declaration; or
 - It requires a full Environmental Impact Report.
- It is adequately covered by this Program EIR.
- It is exempt from CEQA because
 - The activity is not a project;
 - The project has been granted an exemption by statute, or by categorical exemption; or
 - The activity is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA.

II. Project Description

OVERVIEW

The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District is a public agency that acquires and manages open space resources in Santa Cruz, Santa Clara and San Mateo counties. The District proposes to extend its boundaries to include the majority of the San Mateo County coastside, approximately 140,000 acres, in order to acquire land and easements for the preservation of open space and agriculture, and the protection of sensitive resources. The proposed annexation to the District is subject to approval by the San Mateo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

As a special district formed under the provisions of state legislation, the Midpeninsula Open Space District has the power of eminent domain. However, the properties or easements within the Coastal Annexation Area (CAA) will be purchased by the District from willing sellers only. The District will not exercise its power of eminent domain in the coastal area. This policy is set out in the Service Plan, in this EIR, and will be adopted as an ordinance of the District. It will therefore be an integral part of the District's Service Plan and annexation application presented to LAFCO for approval.

As stated in Chapter I, Introduction, if the Coastal Annexation Area project is approved, future District actions will be subject to subsequent planning processes. Prior to making lands that it acquires or manages open to public access, the District will prepare a use and management plan for these lands, and will prepare CEQA documentation for each use and management plan.

Specific lands to be acquired by the District have not been identified. The District would focus its preservation and management in part on lands that contain sensitive resources. These sensitive resources include lands that are critical to protecting watershed integrity, water quality, and special-status species such as steelhead. Some acquired lands would thus likely contain sensitive natural communities, such as riparian habitat and wetlands.

All properties acquired by the District in the Coastal Annexation Area would remain subject to existing Federal, State, County, and City laws, including local land use regulations and zoning designations. Approximately three-fifths of the Coastal Annexation Area is within the Coastal Zone and therefore subject to local coastal policies adopted by San Mateo County pursuant to the California Coastal Act. No changes in existing land use designations or land use controls are associated with the proposed annexation or the resulting District activities.

The following District activities will be introduced into the Coastal Annexation Area as a result of the proposed expansion of District boundaries.

- Acquisition of lands and easements subject to the availability of funding,
- Management of lands acquired by the District and management of lands through contract with other public and private property owners (e.g., Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST), State of California) involving stewardship programs and visitor-serving low-intensity recreation access. Contracts for ranger patrol, maintenance, and construction of improvements in managing other property owner's lands would be subject to available District resources such that no significant negative effect to existing District services would result.

- Development and approval by the District Board of long-range plans to guide District programs. These plans will be in the form of: 1) revision of the District Master Plan to include the Coastal Annexation Areas; and 2) revision of the Regional Open Space Study to include the Coastal Annexation Area.
- Potential sale or lease of District-owned lands for: 1) agricultural uses after conservation or public access easements or conditions are applied to the property based on the site-specific resource characteristics of the property; and 2) appropriate recreation uses sponsored by public agencies, such as San Mateo County Department of Parks and Recreation, that would be consistent with applicable general plan and zoning regulations.
- Preparation of site assessments or use and management plans for individual properties that are either acquired by the District or managed by the District for other public or non-profit landowners.

If the Coastal Annexation Area is included within the District, District resources will be used to more formally involve residents of the Coastal Annexation Area in decision-making and the opportunity for a local resident or residents to be elected to the District Board of Directors will be provided.

As stated in Chapter I, Introduction, the annexation of the Coastal Area, adoption of the Service Plan, adoption of a District annexation policy for the Coastal Annexation Area, and adoption of an ordinance prohibiting the use of eminent domain in the Coastal Annexation Area is the proposed project which is the subject of this EIR. After this annexation project is approved by LAFCo, the District will conduct hearings in the Coastal Annexation Area to develop Basic Policies for the CAA consistent with the Service Plan. These hearings will address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agriculture and timber production; inter-agency relationships; and public information. These proposed project characteristics are outlined below and in the Draft Service Plan.

The District's Draft Service Plan emphasizes working in partnership with other land conservation interests in acquiring land, both public and private. Due to fiscal constraints, annexation will not result in the District purchasing a significant area of land without partnerships. The Draft Service Plan emphasizes the District taking a leading role in land stewardship programs and, where appropriate, providing limited visitor-serving facilities that would generally be in the form of staging areas and trails.

A. Project Objectives

In response to public requests to consider extending District activities to the San Mateo County coastside, the District Board of Directors found that the agricultural and open space resources along approximately 40 miles of the San Mateo County coast are of national significance and deserve the highest level of stewardship possible. The District Board believes that the continuation of active agricultural and ranching uses on the San Mateo County coast is very important in retaining the area's rural open space atmosphere and way of life. Extending the District's boundaries to include the Coastal Annexation Area will allow the District to acquire lands and conservation and agricultural easements, as well as allowing the District to conduct stewardship programs to preserve and manage open space resources in the Coastal Annexation Area. These activities will be conducted by the District both on its own and in partnership with other organizations and individual property owners.

The District will focus its efforts in the Coastal Annexation Area on the preservation and management of the open space resources of its own lands or the lands of other public or non-profit entities that contract for management assistance from the District. The objectives of management are to:

- protect watershed integrity and water quality;
- protect sensitive resources such as habitats for special-status species;
- provide key links to existing District and other public open space lands;
- maintain long-term opportunities for economically viable agriculture;
- provide visitor-serving facilities for low-intensity recreation;
- support development of an integrated regional trail system coordinated with the San Mateo County Trails Plan; and
- provide opportunities for scientific research, resource conservation demonstration projects, outdoor environmental education programs, and interpretive programs.

B. The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

The District was created through the efforts of local conservationists who were successful in placing a voter initiative on the ballot in 1972. At that time, the District's boundaries were within northwestern Santa Clara County, but in 1976, voters approved annexation into southwestern San Mateo County. In 1992, the District annexed a small portion of Santa Cruz County (See Map 1, Vicinity). The District offices are located in the City of Los Altos in Santa Clara County.

The District was formed for the purpose of acquiring and maintaining open space lands. The District's goal is to create a regional greenbelt of open space lands, linking District preserves with other public parklands. The District is one of only four similar agencies in the state. The District participates in such cooperative efforts as the Bay Trail, the Ridge Trail, and the Skyline-to-the-Sea Trail, to extend the overall regional trail system that includes District lands as well as trail and open space easements over privately owned lands.



Protecting watershed integrity and water quality along waterways such as Pescadero Creek would be one of the District's main goals within the Coastal Annexation Area.

The District's enabling legislation (California Public Resources Code sec. 5500) allows it to acquire land rights and interests in land, and to operate and maintain a system of public ecological and open space preserves, trails, and other facilities for the use, education, and enjoyment of all the inhabitants of the District. The current jurisdiction is a precisely defined geographic area in the midpeninsula region south of San Francisco and northwest of San Jose.

The District's 26 open space preserves range in size from 55 to over 12,000 acres. The open space preserves are generally kept in a natural condition in order to best protect the

environment and habitat and are developed with only the amenities needed to provide public access for low-intensity recreation. The diverse ecosystems on the preserves include redwood, oak, and fir forests, chaparral-covered hillsides, riparian corridors, meadows, grasslands, and shore frontage along San Francisco Bay. Improvements within existing preserves include gravel parking areas, restrooms, signed trails for hiking, bicycling, and equestrian use, and an occasional bench or picnic table.

Financing for construction of low-intensity public access improvements and operation of District services has typically been provided from District general revenues augmented by Federal and State grant programs. Entry fees for public recreational use of District lands are generally not charged. On a case-by-case basis, the District receives income from commercial or agricultural leases and residential rentals. Lessees are assessed a possessory interest tax by the County in lieu of property tax.

The Controller of the State of California defines a special district as a "legally constituted governmental entity, which is neither a city nor county, established for the purpose of carrying on specific activities within...defined boundaries." Special districts also have many of the same powers as other units of local government, including the right to "have perpetual succession; the power to sue and to be sued; to acquire real or personal property; to exercise the right of eminent domain; to adopt a seal; and to tax." However, as a policy of this annexation, the District will not use the power of eminent domain in the CAA. The District's primary source of revenue is a share of the annual total property tax collected within the District boundaries. This income is equivalent to about 1.7 cents out of the total one dollar rate per \$100 of assessed value on real property within the District's current boundaries. Other revenue sources include federal and state grants, gifts and bargain sales of land, and private donations by individuals and organizations. These sources have increased the District's land purchasing power by more than 33%.

The District uses a substantial portion of its resources to acquire interest in parcels having high open space values, and which might otherwise be developed if the District fails to preserve these parcels. Examples of criteria that make an area one of high open space value include: a parcel's importance as scenic backdrop; importance for trail connections; a fragile ecosystem or critical habitat for wildlife, particularly a "threatened" species; it fills a "gap" in an existing open space preserve or corridor; or it improves public access to existing open space lands.

In addition, the District seeks acquisitions or easements that would extend the Bay Area Ridge Trail, a network of trails that will eventually form a loop along the ridge tops surrounding the Bay. The Bay Trail, which will ultimately form a continuous route on the shoreline around San Francisco Bay, already crosses over District lands and utilizes existing District trails (Excerpt from Land Acquisition Policies and Procedures, 1988).

Most of the District's land purchase transactions have been initiated by landowners who were interested in selling their property. In some cases, the District has initiated contact when previous acquisitions in a certain area have made the purchase of additional parcels desirable. The District's main acquisition interests are in large, undeveloped or sparsely developed parcels of land.

District Master Plan

The District's Master Plan aids the District in carrying out the District's objectives by providing guidance for the Land Acquisition Programs. The Master Plan, which would be

extended to the Coastal Annexation Area, does not contain specific land management policies. The Master Plan is organized into the following three major sections:

- **Open Space Acquisition Policies**—Presents the policies that help guide the District in determining the types of open space lands it will acquire. These policies provide the basis for the District's land acquisition decisions and consider the following factors: 1) protection of natural vegetation and wildlife, 3) low-intensity recreation, 4) guidance of urban development, 5) preservation of scenic resources and unique sites, 6) protection of agricultural production, 7) protection of open space values from mineral production, 8) public health and safety, and 9) protection of regionally significant urban open space.
- **Open Space Lands Evaluation**—Aids the District in identifying areas that have high composite open space value, as well as those areas having high value for performing individual open space functions of interest to the District.
- **Implementation**—Discusses the District's open space preservation powers and identifies additional factors entering into the District's land acquisition decisions. These factors include public support, the area's open space importance, acquisition and maintenance cost, development threats, location relative to other open space, owner willingness to sell, and the potential for action by or with other agencies. This section also discusses the open space preservation powers and roles of other agencies and organizations that can help preserve open space within the District.

The Master Plan thus provides the overall policies that guide the District in open space protection. The Guiding Principles provided in the Draft Service Plan provide a foundation for development of policies that would be specific to the Coastal Annexation Area. These policies would supplement, but not supersede, the Master Plan.

C. Area Proposed for Annexation

The proposed Coastal Annexation Area is entirely within San Mateo County and west of Highway 280. The Coastal Annexation Area is generally defined as follows:

- on the east by the existing District boundary and San Francisco watershed lands
- on the west by the Pacific Ocean
- on the north by the southern boundary of the City of Pacifica
- on the south by the San Mateo County / Santa Cruz County boundary

This EIR contains an atlas of maps which give an overview of the physical and social geography of the Coastal Annexation Area. The maps are found at the end of the main text.

The Coastal Annexation Area is predominately rural and devoted to agricultural, recreational and open space uses. Development is concentrated in a collection of small urban communities, stretching 10 miles along the Pacific Ocean from Montara in the north (below Pacifica) to Half Moon Bay in the south. Agriculture is the dominant land use by area: crops are grown on broad coastal terraces and in narrow alluvial stream valleys, while cattle grazing and dry farming occur on the surrounding Coastal foothills. (See also discussion in Section IV.A. Land Use).

The Coastal Annexation Area includes portions of the Skyline Area along Skyline Boulevard, La Honda Road, and Pescadero Road which is used predominantly for recreation,

timber harvesting, grazing and general open space. Because of the Skyline Area's rugged mountainous beauty, abundant streams, and redwood forests, and because it is so close to urban areas, the State, San Mateo County, and the District have over the years purchased land in the area for recreation and open space uses.

The San Mateo County Coastside has three small, somewhat isolated rural communities designated as "rural service centers" in the San Mateo County General Plan. San Gregorio and Pescadero, located just east of State Highway 1 in the Coastal zone, provide services to the predominantly agricultural and recreational economy of the South Coast. La Honda is located in the Santa Cruz Mountains. La Honda is home to approximately twice as many permanent residents, many of whom commute to jobs in the urban Bayside. La Honda also provides services to employees of and visitors to the local park areas and the surrounding timber industry (San Mateo County General Plan, Rural Land Use Element, page 9.2).

D. Project Characteristics

The District's services of low intensity recreation, land stewardship and management programs would be extended to properties within the Coastal Annexation Area following final approval of annexation by the San Mateo County LAFCo. The characteristics of each of these aspects is described below. Table II-1 lists the complete program during the first 15 years after annexation. As noted in Chapter I, Introduction, the Draft Service Plan, Fiscal Analysis, and EIR use a 15-year planning time frame to forecast implementation actions for purposes of environmental analysis. The exact manner in which the Plan will be implemented is not known, but a 15-year forecast is a reasonable projection of how implementation can be expected to proceed. Although the District will continue to manage and acquire some lands beyond the 15-year forecast period, there is no reasonable way to make meaningful projections beyond the 15-year forecast period.



Grazing lands typical of the Coastal Annexation Area.

1. Planning

To guide the District's open space preservation efforts in the Coastal Annexation Area, the District will update its Master Plan and Regional Open Space Study. The Master Plan sets forth guidelines for District acquisitions and shows the relative desirability of potential open space preservation opportunities without establishing a priority for land acquisition. The Regional Open Space Study shows the general extent of lands and public access improvements existing and under consideration by the District and other park and open space agencies to complete the District's mission. Both documents are subject to periodic review and modification by the Board of Directors after public hearings. The Regional Open Space Study is also subject to periodic technical updates, and was last updated in 1999.

To further ensure recommendations representing local involvement are considered in all significant District planning and decision-making relating to the Coastal Annexation Area, the

District shall directly notify adjacent property owners, community-interest groups, non-profit land trusts, elected officials, and other conservation-oriented organizations and interested parties.

Following annexation, no action regarding adoption of Coastal Annexation Area policies shall be taken by the District without consultation with elected officials, government agencies, and government-sponsored organizations within the Coastal Annexation Area.

The following Draft Service Plan Guidelines and Implementation Actions define the planning efforts that will occur after annexation has been approved:

Policy	Description
Guideline G.1	The District shall only acquire lands or enter into management agreements with other public or non-profit entities where such agreement would not result in any negative significant impact to existing services
Guideline G.2	Prior to making any lands available to public access for low-intensity recreation in the Coastal Annexation Area, the District shall have personnel and equipment available to manage public access such that: there would be no significant negative impact on existing services; and adequate stewardship to protect natural resources will be provided.
Implementation Action G.2.A(i)	The District shall conduct a site assessment prior to entering into any acquisition and/or management agreements to assure that the District shall not undertake any project without sufficient resources to sustain that project.
Guideline G.5.1	Upon annexation, the District shall institute appropriate forms of representation so that District planning and decision-making relating to the Coastal Annexation Area includes the input of Coastal Annexation Area residents. During the development of policies for the Coastal Annexation Area the District shall consider the formation of advisory committees as needed to address specific policy topics.
Implementation Action G.5.A(i)	The District Board shall conduct periodic meetings within the Coastal Annexation Area when appropriate and when significant agenda items specifically relate to the Coastal Annexation Area. All proposed Coastal Annexation Area policies will be reviewed by the full Board of Directors at public meetings held in the Coastal Annexation Area.
Implementation Action G.5.B-1(i)	To ensure that local viewpoints are considered in all significant District planning and decision-making relating to the Coastal Annexation Area, the District will consult with local elected officials, government agencies, and government-sponsored organizations within the Coastal Annexation Area.
Implementation Action G.5.C(i)	To further ensure recommendations representing local involvement are considered in all significant District planning and decision-making relating to the Coastal Annexation Area, the District shall directly notify community-interest groups, non-profit land trusts, elected officials, and other conservation-oriented organizations about District Board meetings or other public meetings that involve subjects relating to the District's activities within the Coastal Annexation Area.
Implementation Action G.5.D(i)	The District shall notify owners of contiguous properties about public meetings where property acquisitions in the Coastal Annexation Area or any significant use or improvements proposed on District-owned lands in the Coastal Annexation Area are considered.
Implementation Action G.5.E(i)	Following annexation, no action regarding adoption of Coastal Annexation Area policies shall be taken by the District without consultation with elected officials, government agencies, and government-sponsored organizations within the Coastal Annexation Area.
Guideline G.6.1	The District will develop a set of Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area.

Policy	Description
Guideline G.6.2	The District's existing Master Plan and Regional Open Space Study will be expanded to include the Coastal Annexation Area.
Guideline G.6.3	Inherent in the preservation of open space resources is the protection of: rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species; ecological systems; water quality; visual resources; and the unique cultural resources in the Coastal Annexation Area, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources. Therefore, prior to making any lands available to low-intensity public recreational access, the District shall prepare and adopt a site-specific resource management and public access plan for any lands acquired by the District or managed through contract for other public or private non-profit property owners. The development of plans will include opportunities for public involvement.
Implementation Action G.6.A(i)	Upon completion of the annexation process and with public involvement through local groups, the District shall conduct hearings to develop its Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area. These hearings shall address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agriculture and timber production; inter-agency relationships; and public information. <i>See also Implementation Actions G.5.C(i) and G.5.E(i)</i>
Implementation Action G.6.B(i)	Following adoption of Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area, the District shall complete an expansion of its Master Plan for the Coastal Annexation Area. The Master Plan shall include guidelines for District acquisitions and show the relative desirability of lands as potential open space, without establishing a priority for land acquisition. <i>See also Implementation Actions G.5.C(i) and G.5.E(i)</i>
Implementation Action G.6.C(i)	A District staff liaison will be assigned to the Coastal Annexation Area to work with local residents, property owners, government, and interest groups in developing recommendations to the District Board of Directors.
Implementation Action G.6.D(i)	The District will open a field office and maintenance facilities within the Coastal Annexation Area once the District has the need and funding for permanent management presence in the area.
Guideline G.7	In implementing any specific management or public access plans, the District shall obtain all necessary permits from appropriate Federal, State, and local land and resource regulatory agencies. Such agencies include, but are not limited to, San Mateo County, the City of Half Moon Bay, and the California Coastal Commission.
Permanent Policy P.2	Within the Coastal Zone, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.
Permanent Policy P.3	The District shall secure County and other required agency permits on lands it owns or manages for open space and visitor-serving low-intensity recreation uses and for staff facilities. Such uses shall comply with all applicable County land use policies and regulations.

2. Funding

Financing for services would be from existing District revenues augmented by other government and private funding. District land acquisition within the Coastal Annexation Area would be limited to those properties offered by willing sellers and to funding available from government grants and private sources. In many cases, the District would manage land acquired by others. Under the proposed project, no lands within the Coastal Annexation Area will be assessed, nor will any new taxes be imposed on Coastal Annexation Area residents as part of this annexation. However, annexation will allow the District to work with local interests

within the Coastal Annexation Area and within the existing District boundaries to identify a funding measure that, at a later time, could be submitted for ballot approval to complement existing District funding programs. Proposal of a new tax and/or assessment district requires extensive research and analysis to identify projected needs for funding, target uses for funds to be derived, and evaluate willingness to pay on the part of the voting constituency.

The following Draft Service Plan Guidelines and Implementation Actions define the funding efforts that will occur after annexation has been approved:

Policy	Description
Implementation Action G.1.A(i)	Following annexation, the District will work cooperatively with its constituents to develop appropriate District funding measures to augment existing funding sources for land acquisition and management within the Coastal Annexation Area. <i>See also Implementation Action G.5.C(i)</i>
Guideline G.2	Prior to making any lands available to public access for low-intensity recreation in the Coastal Annexation Area, the District shall have personnel and equipment available to manage public access such that: there would be no significant negative impact on existing services; and adequate stewardship to protect natural resources will be provided.
Implementation Action G.2.A(i)	The District shall conduct a site assessment prior to entering into any acquisition and/or management agreements to assure that the District shall not undertake any project without sufficient resources to sustain that project.

3. Land Acquisition

The District can manage open space resources on either land it owns or on land that the owner has placed under District management by agreement. The District can only provide public access for low-intensity recreation on land it does not own by purchasing conservation easements that allow the District limited use of property for public access, to preserve existing open space viewsheds and for open space conservation.

The Draft Service Plan estimates that after annexation is approved, the District will acquire approximately 1000 to 1200 acres per year in the first 5 years, 100 to 200 acres per year between years 6-10, then 50-100 acres per year between years 11-15, for a total amount between 5,750 and 7,500 acres after the first 15 years. The District will not use the power of eminent domain to acquire any land or easements. In addition, the District will acquire approximately 130 to 240 acres of easements per year in the first 4 years, 60 to 110 acres of easement per year between years 6-10, and then 8 to 10 acres per year between year 11-15, for a total amount between 990 and 1,800 acres after the first 15 years.

Before District Board approval of any proposed acquisition in the Coastal Annexation Area, District staff will prepare a Preliminary Use and Management Plan, which contains an initial site assessment describing in general the natural resources, potential trail connections, and other features which support the recommendation for acquisition. All District approvals for lands to be acquired in the Coastal Annexation Area will be presented to the Board for consideration at a public meeting.

The District may acquire lands that contain existing structures. These structures may be maintained and improved for uses such as staff or caretaker housing or for rental to others (such as farm laborers). Structures may or may not be retained depending on their condition and potential for compatible use. If retained, structures would likely not be expanded.

Dilapidated or dangerous structures and other hazardous structures not of historic or scenic value may be demolished.

The Draft Service Plan states that “parcels of 40 or more acres will typically be considered for purchase, however some smaller parcels may be sought for acquisition. The District’s acquisition interests will typically be large, undeveloped or sparsely developed parcels of land. These may include parcels that are key habitat, trail routes, inholdings, or parcels needed for service access.” The Draft Service Plan also states that “District land acquisition will tend to emphasize properties that are contiguous with District lands along and west of Skyline Ridge. The land acquisition program of the District will be limited by the District’s fiscal capability to manage lands.”

The following Draft Service Plan Guidelines and Implementation Actions define the acquisition efforts that will occur after annexation has been approved:

Policy	Description
Permanent Policy P.1	Within the Coastal Annexation Area, the District shall only acquire lands or interests in lands from willing sellers. The power of eminent domain will not be exercised by the District within the Coastal Annexation Area. This policy is a Basic Policy for the Coastal Annexation Area.
Implementation Action P.1.A.(i)	This policy within the defined Coastal Annexation Area shall be a permanent policy of the District adopted by ordinance of the District Board of Directors.
Implementation Action P.1.B.(i)	This policy is a basic component of the District’s application to the San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission. It will be a basic component of the Service Plan to be approved by LAFCo. The District will request that this policy be made a Finding by the San Mateo LAFCo in its decision.
Implementation Action P.1.C.(i)	This policy will be adopted by the District as an ordinance, and through the District Board of Directors’ certification of the Coastal Annexation Area Environmental Impact Report, will serve as an agricultural impact mitigation measure pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
Implementation Action P.1.D.(i)	This policy will be referenced in every governing document and proposal by the District in connection with the Coastal Annexation Area.

4. Land Management

After land or easements are acquired, the District will follow management policies that ensure proper care of the land, that provide public access appropriate to the nature of the land, and that are consistent with ecological values and public safety. The District will protect and restore the natural diversity and integrity of its resources for their value to the environment, and the public, and provide for the use of the preserves consistent with resource protection. In some cases, land could be managed for agricultural or biological resource protection without public access.

The District will manage its own lands as well as lands owned by other private or public entities. The District will work cooperatively with other open space providers within the Coastal Annexation Area, such as San Mateo County, the State Parks system and the GGNRA to cooperatively manage open space resources and public facilities such as trailheads and trails. The District will also work with other groups, such as POST, the Sempervirens Fund and the Sequoia Audubon Society to cooperatively manage lands that these groups may acquire.

After annexation is approved, the District is expected to manage approximately 100 to 200 acres per year in the first 5 years, then from 150 to 200 acres per year between years 6-10, and 50 to 100 acres per year between years 11-15, for a total amount between 1,500 and 2,500 acres after the first 15 years. This program expansion and the provision of the District’s land management expertise will be based on partnership opportunities and existing District funding. Any lands purchased in the Coastal Annexation Area will be preserved in perpetuity, which will protect both the agricultural and the natural resources of the Coastal Annexation Area.

The Fiscal Impact analysis prepared by Economics Research Associates for the Coastal Annexation project (Appendix D) considers the effects of providing open space management for properties acquired as a result of Proposition 12 (Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2000) and Proposition 40 (California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2002).

Although the District is not an agricultural preservation district, and does not propose any direct agricultural subsidy programs, the District recognizes the importance of agriculture to the economy and heritage of the Coastal Annexation Area. Thus, the Draft Service Plan defines program guidelines to conserve resources on District-owned lands that could be used for agriculture, and to allow the leasing of District properties for outdoor agriculture. Guidelines have been established for managing the impacts of District programs that could potentially affect adjacent agricultural operations. The Draft Service Plan provides for the acquisition of conservation easements from willing sellers over private agricultural properties to promote the economic vitality of continued agricultural operations. The District will carefully plan and conduct its land management practices to minimize impacts to adjacent property.

The District will strive to assure that all prime agricultural land and other lands suitable for agriculture which are not needed for the protection and vital functioning of a sensitive habitat will be protected for economically viable agriculture.

For management of public access and stewardship programs, it is anticipated that an average of one field staff person would be provided to manage every 1,720 acres of land purchased in fee or under management contract. Additional personnel would be required to manage lands with more than 10 miles of trails per 1,720 acres. Staff will also be added as District holdings on the Coast increase to meet corresponding resource management needs for more planning and administrative service. One planning staff person would be provided at the outset to develop policies and update the District’s Master Plan and Regional Open Space Study to include the Coastal Annexation Area. In addition, one planning and administrative staff would be provided for every 3,440 acres of land purchased in fee or under management contract, and one for every 5,160 acres of conservation easements.

The following Draft Service Plan Guidelines and Implementation Actions define the land management efforts that will occur after annexation has been approved:

Policy	Description
Guideline G.3.2	Improvements or public uses located upon open space lands other than agriculture shall be located away from existing prime agricultural lands toward areas containing non-prime agricultural lands, unless such location would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient use of an area.

Policy	Description
Implementation Action G.3.A(i)	In acquiring lands and preparing site assessments, the District shall recognize that agriculture in the marketplace is dynamic and that agricultural use practices must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, relative to current marketplace conditions. On a case-by-case basis, the District shall determine how best to continue agricultural uses consistent with protection of rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species and their habitat. <i>See also Guideline G.6.3</i>
Implementation Action G.3.B(i)	The development of agricultural policies, preparation of site assessments and preparation of access plans for low-intensity public recreation by the District affecting prime agricultural lands shall include consultation with local agricultural interests such as the San Mateo County Agricultural Advisory Committee, the Resource Conservation District, and the local Farm Bureau, and will be subject to public review. <i>See also Guidelines G.6.3 and G.7</i>
Implementation Action G.3.C(i)	Where the District acquires conservation easements on agricultural lands, the District will consider as a term of the easement on a case-by-case basis allowing all agricultural uses permitted by San Mateo County.
Guideline G.8	The District shall work with other public recreation and open space providers, conservation agencies, non-profit land trusts, and community organizations for the preservation and management of open space resources that are regionally significant. District participation, to the extent allowed by law, could include: partial financing for land acquisition; temporary receivership of property; coordination of technical planning and legal services relating to open space issues; joint grant proposals; co-sponsorship and participation in demonstration projects; and joint open space resource management training.
Guideline G.9	The District will encourage active public participation in: maintaining, restoring, and protecting natural resources; assisting in scientific research programs; and providing science and conservation education opportunities to the public.
Permanent Policy P.2	Within the Coastal Zone, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.
Permanent Policy P.3	The District shall secure County and other required agency permits on lands it owns or manages for open space and visitor-serving low-intensity recreation uses and for staff facilities. Such uses shall comply with all applicable County land use policies and regulations.

5. Improvements

Improvements for low-intensity public recreation on District-owned or managed lands will be similar to existing improvements and use patterns now typical throughout much of the Skyline area. It is anticipated that publicly accessible trails would be provided at a ratio of approximately 7 miles per 1,720 acres of District-owned or managed lands. No trails are expected to occur on easement lands. It is anticipated that approximately one-third of the proposed trails would be new (between 6.8 to 9.7 miles after 15 years) and built by the District, with the remaining two-thirds being existing ranch roads, fire roads, or trails (between 18.9 to 27.0 miles after 15 years). Staging areas would be provided at the same per trail mile ratio as they are in



Typical facility improvements, Windy Hill Open Space Preserve

existing District lands, which is approximately one staging area per 18 miles of trail. These trails will remain unpaved for hiking, bicycling and equestrian uses. While it is the District's policy not to run trails along stream banks, trail bridges may be used at some stream crossings to minimize impacts to sensitive stream habitats. Trails will be typically 4-6 feet wide, to reflect current trails in District facilities.

The District is most interested in obtaining and/or managing "open space" properties. These are properties that typically have few or very limited existing improvements. Municipal sewer or water services are not normally sought by the District unless already available to the property.

Lands acquired in the Coastal Annexation Area will have signage, and depending on the site selected, may have an access road to the facility. Signs are provided at staging areas, roadside parking areas and gates. District lands are normally fenced to control access and gated access roads will be used for patrol, maintenance and emergency access for fire fighting. Patrol will be provided on existing unpaved road which are typically 8-12 feet wide. Staging areas will have vault toilets but no other utilities.

In the near term, temporary field staff offices in the Coastal Annexation Area will be provided in buildings acquired or leased by the District. A full field staff office and maintenance facility would only be economically justifiable and would be developed once the District manages approximately 15,000 acres of land within the Coastal Annexation Area.

Eventual improvements the District would likely develop include a ranger office, maintenance facilities and related facilities to support stewardship activities, and visitor-serving facilities for public low-intensity recreation. A ranger office and maintenance facility would be combined on one site and would typically include office space, meeting rooms, restrooms and shop space (the District's ranger office at Skyline Preserve is approximately 2500 square feet). Shop space is provided

for carpentry and metal work, and for maintenance and repair of vehicles, large equipment such as tractors, and small equipment such as mowers and chain saws (the shop building at Skyline is approximately 1800 square feet). Outdoor storage is provided for lumber, gravel and other materials necessary to maintain trails, roads and fences. Contained storage is provided for fuels and hazardous materials. Indoor storage is provided for tools, fire-fighting equipment, emergency supplies, office supplies, cleaning supplies and paper supplies. District vehicles including pick-up trucks, tractors and other trucks are parked on site when not in use. Employees would park their personal vehicles on the maintenance facility site when on duty. In addition, any field office in the Coastal Annexation Area would be served with electrical, water, and sewer/septic.



Typical vault toilet at the District's Open Space Preserves.

**Table II-1
Basic Service Plan**

Approximate Time Frame	Basic Service Plan Premise: Funding for land acquisition principally from grants; emphasis on land management funded from existing sources ⁽¹⁾																
Years 1-5	<u>Planning</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focused planning discussions with local interests to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy Review for the Coastal Annexation Area - Update of the District Master Plan and Open Space Study to include the Coastal Annexation Area 																
	<u>Funding</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of existing District revenues; apply for public and private grants and gifts 																
	<u>Land Acquisition</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acquire approximately 1,000 to 1,200 acres / year via existing District funding augmented by grants Acquire approximately 130 to 240 acres of easements / year via existing District funding augmented by grants 																
	<u>Land Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screen partnership opportunities for resource and public access management Limited program expansion of resource and public access management by approximately 100 to 200 acres / year based on partnership opportunities and existing District funding 																
	<u>Improvements</u> ⁽²⁾ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish District presence through ranger residency program in housing located on properties acquired by the District Open a few areas to public access 																
Cumulative Total: End of Year 5	<table> <tr> <td>Lands Acquired:</td> <td>appx. 5,000 to 6,000 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Easements Acquired:</td> <td>appx. 650 to 1,200 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lands Managed Under Contract:</td> <td>appx. 500 to 1,000 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Lands in System:</td> <td>appx. 6,150 to 8,200 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Facilities:³</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• trails: existing roads /trails</td> <td>appx. 14.3 to 19.0 miles</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• trails: new</td> <td>appx. 2.4 to 3.2 miles</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• staging areas</td> <td>appx. 1</td> </tr> </table>	Lands Acquired:	appx. 5,000 to 6,000 acres	Easements Acquired:	appx. 650 to 1,200 acres	Lands Managed Under Contract:	appx. 500 to 1,000 acres	Total Lands in System:	appx. 6,150 to 8,200 acres	Facilities: ³		• trails: existing roads /trails	appx. 14.3 to 19.0 miles	• trails: new	appx. 2.4 to 3.2 miles	• staging areas	appx. 1
Lands Acquired:	appx. 5,000 to 6,000 acres																
Easements Acquired:	appx. 650 to 1,200 acres																
Lands Managed Under Contract:	appx. 500 to 1,000 acres																
Total Lands in System:	appx. 6,150 to 8,200 acres																
Facilities: ³																	
• trails: existing roads /trails	appx. 14.3 to 19.0 miles																
• trails: new	appx. 2.4 to 3.2 miles																
• staging areas	appx. 1																
Years 6-10	<u>Planning</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiate land use and management plans for District-owned property for public access 																
	<u>Land Acquisition</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acquire approximately 100 to 200 acres / year based primarily on grants and gifts Acquire approximately 60 to 110 acres of easements / year based primarily on grants and gifts ¹ 																
	<u>Land Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited expansion of resource and public access management by 150 to 200 acres /year based principally on partnership opportunities and existing District funding 																
	<u>Improvements</u> ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand District presence through ranger residency program in housing located on properties acquired by the District Further public access by opening / constructing minor staging areas, trails and related facilities based on site-specific resource management and public access plans 																
Cumulative Total: End of Year 10	<table> <tr> <td>Lands Acquired:</td> <td>appx. 5,500 to 7,000 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Easements Acquired</td> <td>appx. 950 to 1,750 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lands Managed Under Contract:</td> <td>appx. 1,250 to 2,000 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Lands in System:</td> <td>appx. 7,700 to 10,750 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Facilities:³</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• trails: existing roads /trails</td> <td>appx. 17.6 to 24.5 miles</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• trails: new</td> <td>appx. 6.2 to 8.6 miles</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• staging areas</td> <td>appx. 1</td> </tr> </table>	Lands Acquired:	appx. 5,500 to 7,000 acres	Easements Acquired	appx. 950 to 1,750 acres	Lands Managed Under Contract:	appx. 1,250 to 2,000 acres	Total Lands in System:	appx. 7,700 to 10,750 acres	Facilities: ³		• trails: existing roads /trails	appx. 17.6 to 24.5 miles	• trails: new	appx. 6.2 to 8.6 miles	• staging areas	appx. 1
Lands Acquired:	appx. 5,500 to 7,000 acres																
Easements Acquired	appx. 950 to 1,750 acres																
Lands Managed Under Contract:	appx. 1,250 to 2,000 acres																
Total Lands in System:	appx. 7,700 to 10,750 acres																
Facilities: ³																	
• trails: existing roads /trails	appx. 17.6 to 24.5 miles																
• trails: new	appx. 6.2 to 8.6 miles																
• staging areas	appx. 1																

Approximate Time Frame	Basic Service Plan Premise: Funding for land acquisition principally from grants; emphasis on land management funded from existing sources. ⁽¹⁾
Years 11-15	<u>Planning</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue developing and implementing land use and management plans for District-owned property
	<u>Land Acquisition</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acquire approximately 50-100 acres / year based primarily on grants and gifts Acquire approximately 8 to 10 acres of easements / year based primarily on grants and gifts¹
	<u>Land Management</u> ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited expansion of resource and public access management by approximately 50 to 100 acres / year based principally on partnership opportunities and existing District funding²
	<u>Improvements</u> ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand District presence through Ranger residency program in housing on properties acquired by the District Expand public access by opening / constructing a major staging area, trails and related facilities based on site-specific resource management and public access plans Establish District field office and maintenance shop in facilities existing on properties acquired by the District
Cumulative Total: End of Year 15	<p>Lands Acquired: appx. 5,750 to 7,500 acres</p> <p>Easements Acquired appx. 990 to 1,800 acres</p> <p>Lands Managed Under Contract: appx. 1,500 to 2,500 acres</p> <p>Total Lands in System: appx. 8,240 to 11,800 acres</p> <p>Facilities:(3)</p> <p>trails: existing roads/trails appx. 18.9 to 27.0miles</p> <p>trails: new appx. 6.8 to 9.7 miles</p> <p>staging areas appx. 2</p>

¹ Funding opportunities from grant programs for land acquisition vary significantly over time. Grant programs also vary in purpose, geographic area, and other requirements for receiving matching funds.

² Assumes that preliminary use and management plans focus on site safety and resource protection, therefore few areas would be opened for public use and limited access would be provided to existing roads and trails.

³ Assumes the following:

- Approximately 7 miles of trail opened to public use per 1,720 acres of land owned or managed by the District; of these approximately 2/3 will be trails that either exist or are unpaved ranch/fire roads converted to trail use. Trails available for public use will not occur immediately upon the inclusion of lands into the District. Therefore trail mileages indicated are lower than the maximum that could be calculated based on the above formula ; and
- Staging areas are provided at a rate of one area per 18 miles of trails and will be evenly distributed between major and minor staging areas.

Note: For purposes of this plan, the cost of managing easements and managing fee title lands is equal.
 Source: Draft Service Plan, 2M Associates, 2002.

III. Plan Consistency

This section evaluates the consistency of the District's proposed Service Plan for the Coastal Annexation Area with the established plans and policies of the government agencies regulating land use in the project area. The relevant plans and policies include:

San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) Policies,
San Mateo County General Plan, Skyline Area Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Trails Plan, and City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program.

This section also evaluates the consistency of the District's Service Plan for the Coastal Annexation Area with the plans and policies of the recreation agencies which presently provide park and open space resources in the project area. These agencies include:

City of Half Moon Bay Department of Parks and Recreation,
San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division,
State Department of Parks and Recreation, and
National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

To determine project consistency, the policies in the Draft Service Plan (attached) are compared to the adopted plans and policies of the land use agencies and the missions of the park and open space agencies. Other policies of these agencies and the applicable laws and regulations of additional agencies, such as the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), are discussed in Chapter IV under specific environmental issues where they are relevant.

A. Consistency with Local Plans and Policies

1. San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) Policies

The San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) has jurisdiction over boundary changes for local governmental agencies including cities and special districts. The District will need to gain approval from San Mateo LAFCo in order to amend its Sphere of Influence and to annex the Coastal Annexation Area¹. San Mateo LAFCo has a set of adopted standards, procedures and policies that govern boundary changes such as the one proposed by the District. San Mateo LAFCo policies were amended recently to take into account changes enacted by the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act of 2000. In addition to this EIR, three other documents that address the relevant LAFCO policies, the Draft Service Plan, the Fiscal Impact Analysis and the LAFCo Application, will be submitted to the San Mateo LAFCo.

Some of the changes enacted by the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act of 2000 (Act) are relevant to the District's proposed annexation. These changes include strengthening LAFCo powers to prevent sprawl and ensure the orderly extension of government services. The Act also strengthened LAFCo policies to protect agriculture and open space lands. These changes were incorporated into San Mateo LAFCo policies.

¹For an explanation of the LAFCo approval process, please see Section I, Introduction. The project will also be referred to Santa Clara LAFCo for a recommendation on the project.

Analysis: LAFCo policies encourage planned, orderly, and efficient patterns of urban development (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, San Mateo LAFCo policies, 2001). While the project itself will not result in urban development, it will promote orderly urban development by preserving open space and agricultural lands outside urban areas.

LAFCo policies encourage the preservation of agriculture and open space (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, San Mateo LAFCo policies, 2001). The project will promote the preservation of agriculture and open space through purchase and management programs.

LAFCo policies particularly emphasize the importance of preserving prime agricultural land (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, San Mateo LAFCo policies, 2001). The Draft Service Plan contains Guidelines (G.3.1, G.3.2) and Implementation Actions (G.3.A.(I), G.3.B(I), and G.3.C.(I)) which address agricultural use within lands acquired and managed by the District. They also address impacts of District properties on adjacent agricultural lands. These Guidelines and Implementation Actions are designed to protect prime agricultural land, both those owned or managed by the District, as well as prime agricultural lands contiguous to properties owned or managed by the District.

LAFCo policies encourage the efficient provision of services (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, San Mateo LAFCo policies, 2001). The Service Plan and Fiscal Impact Analysis conclude that the District is capable of providing the service of open space preservation without significantly impacting existing services.

LAFCo policies require LAFCo to consider the consistency of the proposal with relevant City or County General or Specific Plans (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, San Mateo LAFCo policies, 2001). Other parts of this Plan Consistency section analyze the proposal's conformity with relevant Plans. In general, the proposal is consistent with the County of San Mateo General Plan and Local Coastal Program. It is also consistent with the City of Half Moon Bay's Local Coastal Program.

The Coastal Annexation project is considered consistent with relevant San Mateo LAFCo policies.

2. San Mateo County General Plan

The San Mateo County General Plan is the guiding land use document for the unincorporated portions of San Mateo County. The majority of the proposed annexation area is in the unincorporated area of the County with the exception of the City of Half Moon Bay. In addition, approximately 65% of the proposed 140,000 acre annexation area is within the Coastal Zone and will be subject to the Local Coastal Program (LCP) adopted by San Mateo County pursuant to the California Coastal Act. Consistency with the Half Moon Bay and San Mateo County LCP is addressed separately below.

The County General Plan contains many specific policies that address particular environmental issues. These policies include: Vegetative, Water, Fish and Wildlife Resources, Soil Resources, Mineral Resources, Visual Quality, Historical and Archaeological Resources, Park and Recreation Resources, Water Supply, Wastewater, Transportation, Solid Waste, Natural Hazards, and Man-Made Hazards. Many of the policies are designed to reduce

environmental impacts. These specific policies are summarized in the relevant sections of this EIR (e.g. vegetative resource policies are summarized in the biological resource section).

Analysis: The County General Plan's primary policy direction is to protect and manage the County's natural resources and generally to direct new development to existing urban areas. The District's primary mission is protect open space, protect and restore the natural environment and provide opportunities for ecologically sensitive public enjoyment and education (MROSD Basic Policies, p.2). There are no inconsistencies between the District's primary mission and the County General Plan. Both strive to protect natural resources and guide development to urban areas. The District accomplishes this goal through open space acquisition and preservation in areas outside urban areas and the General Plan through General Plan policies and land use designations limiting urban development to urban areas. Further analysis is presented in each of the environmental sections of this EIR.

As stated in Chapter II, Project Description, if the project is approved, future District activities within the Coastal Annexation Area will be subject to both CEQA and General Plan conformance review. Prior to making lands that it acquires or manages open to public access, the District will prepare a use and management plan, pursuant to the District's Open Space Use and Management Planning process. This plan along with any proposed construction activities will require CEQA review which includes a review for consistency with the County General Plan. In addition, Government Code 65402 requires that prior to acquisition of a property or development of any structures on a property, the District must submit plans to the County Planning Department to determine conformance with the General Plan. Any actions requiring a permit from the County would undergo CEQA review and would be required to conform with the General Plan, with its components as applicable: the Skyline Area Plan and the Local Coastal Program.

The Draft Service Plan contains specific policies that will ensure the conformance of the proposed project to the County's General Plan, including the following:

Policy	Description
Guideline G.7	In implementing any specific management or public access plans, the District shall obtain all necessary permits from appropriate Federal, State, and local land and resource regulatory agencies. Such agencies include, but are not limited to, San Mateo County, the City of Half Moon Bay, and the California Coastal Commission.
Permanent Policy P.2	Within the Coastal Zone, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.
Permanent Policy P.3	The District shall secure County and other required agency permits on lands it owns or manages for open space and visitor-serving low-intensity recreation uses and for staff facilities. Such uses shall comply with all applicable County land use policies and regulations.

The project is, therefore, in general conformance with the County General Plan.

a. Skyline Area Plan

The County General Plan contains Area Plans for specific subregions of the County. The Skyline Area Plan the only such subregion that covers a portion of the area proposed for annexation by the District. Therefore, any activity undertaken by the District within the Skyline Area Plan would need to be consistent with this plan. The policies in this Area Plan address the issues of land use and cumulative impact in the Skyline Area. There are also policies in the Skyline Area Plan that address infrastructure needs of the area including roads and water supply.

The Skyline Area Plan addresses the unique character of the Skyline Area. Policy 2.1 of the Skyline Area Plan states that the County will:

- Preserve the open space character of the Skyline-Santa Cruz Mountains area by:
- a. Conserving and protecting visual, timber and watershed resources which give the area its unique character.
 - b. Ensuring that land use designations in the General Plan are compatible with the protection of resources in the area.

Analysis: Within its existing boundaries, the District already owns and manages several preserves within the Skyline Area Plan. The District's mission of protecting open space resources is consistent with the intent of the Skyline Area Plan.

The Draft Service Plan contains specific policies that will ensure the conformance of the proposed project to the County's Skyline Area Plan, including the following:

Policy	Description
Guideline G.4.1	The District shall not propose commercial harvest of timber on District-owned property except in the limited cases described in Guideline G.4.3 below.
Guideline G.4.2	On a case-by-case basis, the District may purchase property or an easement that includes approved timber harvest plans.
Implementation Action G.6.A(I)	Upon completion of the annexation process and with public involvement through local groups, the District shall conduct hearings to develop its Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area. These hearings shall address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agriculture and timber production; inter-agency relationships; and public information. <i>See also Implementation Actions G.5.C(I) and G.5.E(I)</i>

The project is, therefore, in general conformance with the Skyline Area Plan.

b. San Mateo Local Coastal Program

Approximately 65% of the 140,540-acre Coastal Annexation Area is within the Coastal Zone (see Map 1, Vicinity Map in last section and Table II-1, Coastal Annexation Acreage). The California Coastal Act requires the development of a Local Coastal Program for all jurisdictions (cities and counties) located within the Coastal Zone. Once a jurisdiction's Local Coastal Program is approved by the Coastal Commission, the jurisdiction is given land use authority within the coastal zone. In 1980, San Mateo County's Local Coastal Program (LCP) was approved by

the Coastal Commission. The County then assumed responsibility for issuing coastal development permits for any development within the coastal zone. All development within the Coastal Zone requires a Coastal Development Permit or an exemption from permit requirements. A development must comply with LCP policies in order to obtain a permit.

The LCP is the County’s implementation of the Coastal Act and derives its policy direction from the Coastal Act. According to the Coastal Act, the basic goals of the state for the coastal zone are to:

- (a) Protect, maintain, and where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and artificial resources.
- (b) Assure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of coastal zone resources taking into account the social and economic needs of the people of the state.
- (c) Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resource conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners.
- (d) Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.
- (e) Encourage state and local initiatives and cooperation in preparing procedures to implement coordinated planning and development for mutually beneficial uses, including educational uses, in the coastal zone. (California Coastal Act, Section 30001.5)

In implementing the Coastal Act, the San Mateo County LCP’s policies include protection of natural resources such as wetlands, sensitive habitats and prime agricultural lands. Additional policies include providing coastal access, facilitating coastal dependent development, and encouraging visitor-serving facilities. The LCP also establishes an urban rural boundary to clearly distinguish urban and rural areas and directs new development to urban areas.

The San Mateo County LCP includes the following components: Locating and Planning New Development, Public Works, Housing, Energy, Agriculture, Aquaculture, Sensitive Habitats, Visual Resources, Hazards, Shoreline Access, Recreation/Visitor Serving Facilities, and Commercial Fishing/Recreational Boating.

Analysis: The LCP’s primary policy direction is preservation of natural resources, protection of agriculture and provision of coastal access to the public. It also emphasizes allowing coastal dependent development, visitor-serving facilities along the coast and directing urban development to urban areas. The District’s primary mission is protect open space, protect and restore the natural environment and provide opportunities for ecologically sensitive public enjoyment and education (District Basic Policies, p.2). There are no inconsistencies between the District’s primary mission and the County LCP. Both strive to protect natural resources and guide development to urban areas. The District accomplishes this goal through open space acquisition and preservation in areas outside urban areas and the LCP through policies and land use designations limiting urban development to urban areas.

The Draft Service Plan contains specific policies that will ensure the conformance of the proposed project to the County’s Local Coastal Plan, including the following:

Policy	Description
Permanent Policy P.2.	Within the Coastal Zone, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.

Guideline G.6.3	Inherent in the preservation of open space resources is the protection of: rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species; ecological systems; water quality; visual resources; and the unique cultural resources in the Coastal Annexation Area, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources. Therefore, prior to making any lands available to low-intensity public recreational access, the District shall prepare and adopt a site-specific resource management and public access plan for any lands acquired by the District or managed through contract for other public or private non-profit property owners. The development of plans will include opportunities for public involvement.
Implementation Action G.6.A(I)	Upon completion of the annexation process and with public involvement through local groups, the District shall conduct hearings to develop its Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area. These hearings shall address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agriculture and timber production; inter-agency relationships; and public information.
Guideline G.7	In implementing any specific management or public access plans, the District shall obtain all necessary permits from appropriate Federal, State, and local land and resource regulatory agencies. Such agencies include, but are not limited to, San Mateo County, the City of Half Moon Bay, and the California Coastal Commission.

The project is, therefore, in general conformance with the County LCP.

c. San Mateo County Trails Plan

In February 2001, the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors adopted the San Mateo County Trails Plan (Trails Plan). The Trails Plan proposes general trail alignments, policies, design guidelines and use and management guidelines (see Map 8, San Mateo County Trails Plan). The Plan is intended to serve as a framework for all future recreational trail planning in the cities and the County. The Trails Plan was adopted as part of the County General Plan and replaced the 1990 San Mateo County Trails Plan.

According to the Trails Plan, while it serves as a guide for county action towards implementation of the proposed trail alignments as designated on the County Trails Plan map, it recognizes that the County must defer direct responsibility for implementation of many trail route segments to other jurisdictions, including the District. The County trails policies encourage coordinated decisions and actions by the cities, adjacent counties and other trail providers (including the District) to implement their particular segments of the Trails Plan consistent with the County's vision (San Mateo County Trails Plan Draft EIR). The District is not mandated to follow the County Trails Plan, however, where feasible, the District will implement the Trails Plan on their lands and will coordinate the actions of others to ensure compatibility between the District's trails and the County trails.

The Trail Plan policies are a subsection of the County General Plan Chapter 6: Park and Recreation Resources. These policies address environmental compatibility, access to park and recreation facilities, locating suitable park and recreation facilities in rural areas, minimizing agricultural conflicts, development plans, site planning for public and private facilities, prioritizing facility development, techniques for providing park and recreation facilities, acquisition and disposal, maintenance and operation, multi-jurisdictional coordination and cooperation, finance, and program responsibilities.

The Trail Plan also includes Design Guidelines and Use and Management Guidelines which provide guidance to the County and other jurisdictions (including the District) for the implementation of new trails, reworking existing trails or maintenance of existing trails. These guidelines are intended for use on trails constructed and maintained by the County of San Mateo, specifically trail routes depicted on the County Trails Plan Map. The County encourages but does not mandate entities such as the District to reference and/or adopt these guidelines, where and if appropriate, as part of their own plans for major trails.

Analysis: The District has adopted Trail Use Policies which include: Trail Use Policy 7.0 “The District will work with other agencies, interest groups, and private landowners in an effort to promote an interconnecting trail system throughout the region. The District recognizes that connections should be compatible with other jurisdiction’s designations and land owner objectives as well as these policies and trail use guidelines.” The District has stated it is “committed to supporting [the Trails Plan] implementation through District’s activities.” (District comment letter, Trails Plan Draft Program EIR). The Draft Service Plan contains specific policies that further identify the conformance of the proposed project to the County’s Trails Plan, including the following:

Policy	Description
Guideline G.8	The District shall work with other public recreation and open space providers, conservation agencies, non-profit land trusts, and community organizations for the preservation and management of open space resources that are regionally significant. District participation, to the extent allowed by law, could include: partial financing for land acquisition; temporary receivership of property; coordination of technical planning and legal services relating to open space issues; joint grant proposals; co-sponsorship and participation in demonstration projects; and joint open space resource management training.
Guideline G.9	The District will encourage active public participation in: maintaining, restoring, and protecting natural resources; assisting in scientific research programs; and providing science and conservation education opportunities to the public.

All of the Draft Service Plan policies listed in the discussion above regarding the conformance of the project with the San Mateo County Local Coastal Plan also ensure conformance with the County’s Trails Plan.

3. City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (1993)

The entire City of Half Moon Bay lies within the California Coastal Zone. A coastal plan for the City has been prepared and adopted by the City and certified by the California Coastal Commission. This plan, known as the Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (LUP) establishes policies governing conservation and development within the City, and serves as the land use plan in lieu of a land use element of the General Plan required outside the Coastal Zone. The plan establishes policies and development standards in the following topical areas: Coastal Access and Recreation, Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas, Hazards, Archaeological and Paleontological Resources, Visual Resources, Agriculture, Development and Public Works.

Specific policies that are relevant to a particular environmental issue are summarized in the relevant section of this EIR (e.g. policies regarding Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas are summarized in the biological resource section).

The three issues of primary significance in the LUP are:

- (1) provision of adequate sites for development of housing to meet the City's share of existing unmet and projected regional housing needs;
- (2) actions the City can and should take to encourage the achievement of coastal act goals, including the preservation of prime agricultural, open space, and recreational lands in the unincorporated areas of San Mateo County coastside, by concentrating development within the boundaries of the City in accordance with Sections 30250, 30007.5, and 30242 of the Act; and
- (3) limiting future residential population growth to a maximum annual increase of 1% (Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan, p.18).

The Half Moon Bay General Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan is currently undergoing a comprehensive update. An administrative draft General Plan/Coastal Plan was presented to the City Council and Planning Commission on July 11, 2000. This administrative draft is currently undergoing major revisions and will be presented to the City Council later this year (Mike Martin, City of Half Moon Bay, pers. comm.) Therefore, the current General Plan is still the appropriate document to be used in determining project conformance.

Analysis: The District would be able to purchase lands within the City of Half Moon Bay after the proposed annexation takes place², however the District's strategic emphasis is to use its resources to primarily acquire or preserve land outside Urban Service Area boundaries of cities (District Basic Policies, p.2). Since the City of Half Moon Bay is located within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area, it is still relevant to ensure that the District's mission is consistent with the City of Half Moon Bay's LUP. In addition, if the District were to construct a field office or maintenance facilities within the City of Half Moon Bay, the development would have to obtain a coastal development permit and comply with all relevant development policies and zoning ordinances.

The District's primary mission is protect open space, protect and restore the natural environment and provide opportunities for ecologically sensitive public enjoyment and education (District Basic Policies, p.2). There are no inconsistencies between the District's primary mission and the City's LUP. Both strive to protect natural resources and guide development to urban areas. The District accomplishes this goal through open space acquisition and preservation in areas outside urban service areas and the LUP through General Plan policies and land use designations guiding urban development within the City.

The project is, therefore, consistent with the City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan.

B. Consistency with other Parks and Open Space Providers

San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division, the City of Half Moon Bay Department of Parks and Recreation, California Department of Parks and Recreation and the National Park Service provide parks and open space within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area. All of these agencies focus on the provision of traditional park and recreation facilities. The agencies'

² The Draft Service Plan states that "parcels of 40 or more acres will typically be considered for purchase, however some smaller parcels may be sought for acquisition. These may include parcels that are key habitat, trail routes, inholdings, or parcels needed for service access." Typically, these parcels do not occur within the City of Half Moon Bay.

facilities and any relevant plans are described below. The District's proposed annexation is analyzed for consistency with each of these agencies' general missions.

1. San Mateo County

San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division maintains 3 parks, 1 marine preserve, regional trails and numerous other county and local trails encompassing approximately 8,500 acres within the Coastal Annexation Area. The 3 parks are Sam McDonald Park, Pescadero Creek Park and Memorial Park. Master Plans are prepared for individual park units which guide the development of each unit. A Master Plan exists only for the Pescadero Creek County Park (County General Plan Parks and Recreation Element). A Master Plan is being prepared for the Fitzgerald Marine Preserve (Sam Herzberg, San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division, pers. comm.)

The General Plan Parks and Recreation Element defines public park and recreation facilities as "lands and facilities serving a range of recreation and/or preservation functions and owned by public agencies or other nonprofit organizations. Such facilities include, but are not limited to, public beaches, parks, recreation areas (including golf courses), natural preserves, wild areas and trails." The Parks and Recreation Element also defines the roles of the various park providers including the Federal, State, County and City Governments and Special Districts (including the District). The County role is defined as providing parks that cities cannot provide due to spatial and fiscal limitations and serving the needs of the County-wide population.

Analysis: According to the Director of San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division, the mission of County Parks differs from the District's because it is more focused on more intense recreational use (District Coastal Annexation Fiscal Impact Analysis, May 2001). The District has worked jointly with the Parks and Recreation Division by taking on management responsibilities under contract for County park lands that are not designated for active recreation. According to the Service Plan, there is also the potential for County Parks to purchase or lease lands from the District for the purpose of providing recreation uses consistent with applicable general plan and zoning regulations. The District will partner with San Mateo County Parks to ensure that services are provided in a complementary manner.

San Mateo County Parks recently completed a Recreational Needs Assessment for San Mateo County. This need assessment included a telephone survey of the community-at-large and registered voters. The survey addressed the desires of residents for future development of County parks, trails, recreation facilities, and other parklands and programs that might be provided by San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division. The Needs Analysis focused specifically on the Mid-Coast region of San Mateo County including the communities of Montara, Moss Beach, Princeton, Miramar and El Granada. The survey also identified the level of support for a countywide tax initiative and the threshold for willingness to pay for additional parklands, park facilities and programs. The findings of this survey are summarized in the Needs Analysis and Tax/Assessment Feasibility Study (August 2001). The overall finding is that the top ranked spending priority of San Mateo County residents is natural resource management (protecting wildlife, watersheds, and open spaces). The top three priorities for people in the mid-coast were: preserving natural open space, walking/jogging trails and multi-use trails. The findings of the survey support the District's mission of protecting open space and natural resource management.

If the District plans to purchase property adjacent to County Parks properties, it will consult with the County Parks and Recreation Division during the planning process for that particular property to ensure that any future plans for the property are consistent with the operation of the adjacent County park. The District would also reference any relevant Master Plans for adjacent County Parks. Guideline 8 (G.8) of the Draft Service Plan states that the District will work with other public recreation and open space providers for the preservation and management of open space resources that are regionally significant. According to the Service Plan, where District lands are adjacent to land owned by other entities such as the County, the District would manage its adjacent lands in a compatible way. For example, developing trails where a logical connection exists between a County park and a District preserve or ensuring compatible uses of trails connecting District and County Parks properties. The Draft Service Plan would not permit intensive recreation development or active recreation on District property where it may exist on an adjacent County Parks property. Since the District's Service Plan activities would not conflict with the existing uses of county park facilities, the project is consistent with the general mission of the County Parks and Recreation Division.

2. City of Half Moon Bay

The City of Half Moon Bay Department of Parks and Recreation provides parks within the City limits. These are on the scale of community and neighborhood parks to serve residents within the City of Half Moon Bay.

The City of Half Moon Bay General Plan contains a Parks and Recreation Element (1995) in addition to recreation policies in the Land Use Plan (LUP). This element is consistent with the LUP and provides a more detailed level of planning for park and recreation facilities.

The major goals of this element are:

Goal 1: Park System Development

Develop a public park system that provides adequate space and facilities to meet the varied needs of the existing and future population

Goal 2: Trails and Bikeways

Develop a network of pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian trails to link individual components of the park system

Goal 3: Implementation

Develop a long- and short-term range program to achieve the policies set forth in this element through a combination of public and private funding, regulatory methods and other strategies.

Goal 4: Operation and Maintenance

Develop the necessary organizational staffing and funding mechanisms to assure that all parks, facilities, and open spaces are well-maintained.

Analysis: The strategic emphasis of the District, to provide open space outside of urban service areas, would have no impact on the provision of parks within the City of Half Moon Bay. Therefore, the project is consistent with the general mission of the City of Half Moon Bay Parks and Recreation Department.

3. State of California

The California Department of Parks and Recreation's (State Parks) operates a number of State Parks, State Beaches and a State Reserve in the proposed annexation area. The State Parks include: Burleigh Murray, Butano and Portola Redwoods. Ano Nuevo is a State Reserve and includes Cascade Ranch. The only General Plan document currently available for these parks is the San Mateo Coast Area General Plan (June 1979) which covers the San Mateo Coast State Beaches and Ano Nuevo. There is currently no General Plan for Burleigh Murray, Butano or Portola Redwoods, however State Parks is in the process of preparing General Plans for those units without plans and also updating them for others (Paul Keel, State Parks, pers. comm.).

The San Mateo Coast Area General Plan provides direction for resource protection, management and development at the units it covers. Proposed development includes improvements and proposed additions to the units. Since the document is rather outdated, most of the recommended improvements and additions have already taken place. There is currently no planning document that directs future acquisitions of State Parks in San Mateo County. The District Superintendent for the Bay Area District stated that no major expansions for State Parks on the San Mateo Coast are planned due to the inability to provide staffing for any such expansions (Ron Schafer, State Parks, pers. comm.). The State Parks may accept some new properties from other organizations such as POST or the Coastal Conservancy, but still does not have major funding for operations and maintenance of new properties.

Analysis: The primary mission of State Parks is "To provide for the health, inspiration, and education of the people of California by helping to preserve the state's extraordinary biological diversity, protecting its most valued natural and cultural resources, and creating opportunities for high-quality outdoor recreation."

In general, the Superintendent for State Parks in the Coastal Annexation Area did not see any potential inconsistencies between State Parks plans for the San Mateo coast and the District's plans to annex the coast. The only issue that had the potential for impacts to State Parks would be any inconsistencies in trail usage. If trails managed by the District allow different types of users than State Parks on trails that are connected, the inconsistency would need to be addressed. For example, if the District allows mountain bikers and State Parks does not on a connected trail, this incompatibility would need to be resolved. Therefore, to avoid this inconsistency, the District will work with State Parks to ensure consistent trail uses for connecting trails.

If the District plans to purchase property adjacent to State Parks properties, it will consult with State Parks during the planning process for that particular property to ensure that any future plans for the property are consistent with the operation of the adjacent State Park property. Guideline 8 (G.8) of the Draft Service Plan states that the District will work with other public recreation and open space providers for the preservation and management of open space resources that are regionally significant. According to the Service Plan, where District lands are adjacent to land owned by other entities such as State Parks, the District would manage its adjacent lands in a compatible way. Therefore, the project is consistent with the general mission of State Parks.

4. National Park Service - Golden Gate National Recreation Area

The National Park Service (NPS) operates the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) whose authorized boundaries extend north into Marin County, include the City and County of San Francisco and south into San Mateo County. Only a portion of San Mateo County

is included in the current GGNRA boundary. There is an overlap between the GGNRA boundary and the proposed Coastal Annexation Area in the northern part of San Mateo County. The southernmost properties managed by GGNRA are the Phleger Estate (near Woodside) and Sweeney Ridge (near Pacifica) neither of which are in the proposed annexation area (the Phleger Estate is within the existing District boundary). The GGNRA also has a Scenic and Recreation Easement over the Peninsula Watershed owned by the San Francisco Water Department. There are no GGNRA managed units currently within the proposed annexation area.

The General Management Plan prepared in 1980 is the GGNRA's current planning document. This plan does not cover the area in San Mateo County since it was not within the GGNRA boundaries in 1980. The National Park Service is in the process of acquiring funding to update this plan to include new areas within the GGNRA boundaries, including northern San Mateo County. Until that time, there is no official plan for the GGNRA within San Mateo County (Nicholas Weeks, National Park Service, pers. comm.).

The GGNRA's mission is to "preserve and enhance the natural environment and cultural resources of the coastal lands north and south of the Golden Gate for the inspiration, education, and recreation of people today, and for future generations."

According to Nicholas Weeks of the GGNRA, the NPS can only acquire land that is within the authorized GGNRA boundary. The land must meet several criteria including that it must "possess nationally significant natural or cultural resources." It also must be a suitable and feasible addition and "require direct NPS management." (National Park Service, 2001 Management Policies, p.10). Recent congressional legislation added approximately 1200 acres to the GGNRA, including approximately 1000 acres in San Mateo County in and around Pacifica (H.R. 3632 - "Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act of 2000."). This boundary adjustment includes the 105 acre Mori Point property in Pacifica, which was recently transferred to the GGNRA from the Trust for Public Land. Congress must approve any major GGNRA boundary changes as well as appropriations which meet the aforementioned criteria.

A new boundary adjustment has been introduced as federal legislation (H.R. 1953 & S.941) that would include approximately 4,800 new acres in San Mateo County into the GGNRA boundaries (Golden Gate National Parks Association newsletter, Fall 2001). This proposed addition comprises the 4,291 acre Rancho Corral de Tierra and other parcels near the City of Pacifica totaling 525 acres. The Peninsula Open Space Trust has acquired an option to purchase Rancho Corral de Tierra and then proposes to transfer most of it to the National Park Service to become part of the GGNRA. A small portion of this acreage contiguous to McNee Ranch State Park (250 acres) may also be transferred to State Parks. The other parcels near Pacifica include CalTrans right of way and other privately owned parcels (San Mateo County Boundary Study Golden Gate National Recreation Area, May 2001).

A boundary study was prepared to determine whether the GGNRA boundary should be expanded to include these properties (San Mateo County Boundary Study Golden Gate National Recreation Area, May 2001). The boundary study determined that the properties met the NPS criteria for boundary additions discussed above. After reviewing the boundary study, the GGNRA Advisory Board recommended that Congress approve the boundary change. The entire area within the proposed boundary change is located within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area.

Analysis: In general, there are no inconsistencies between GGNRA's mission and the District's plans to annex the coast. As stated previously, the land acquired by the NPS must meet specific criteria including that it be of national significance whereas the District focuses its efforts

on lands of local and regional significance.

If the District plans to purchase property adjacent to GGNRA lands, it will consult with the National Park Service during the planning process for that particular property to ensure that any future plans for the property are consistent with the operation of the adjacent GGNRA property. If trails managed by the District allow different types of users than GGNRA on trails that are connected, the inconsistency would need to be addressed. For example, if the District allows mountain bikers and GGNRA does not on a connected trail, this incompatibility will need to be addressed. Therefore, to avoid inconsistency, the District will work with GGNRA to ensure consistent trail uses for connecting trails. Guideline 8 (G.8) of the Draft Service Plan states that the District will work with other public recreation and open space providers for the preservation and management of open space resources that are regionally significant. According to the Service Plan, where District lands are adjacent to land owned by other entities such as the GGNRA, the District would manage its adjacent lands in a compatible way. According to Nicholas Weeks, the types of recreational uses allowed by both entities is consistent, since the GGNRA focuses on lower intensity types of recreational uses similar to the District. Therefore, the project is consistent with the general mission of the GGNRA.

IV. Environmental Assessment

For each topic, a summary in *italics* of the discussion is provided first. The detailed discussion of each topic section in this Chapter then follows this format:

1. *Existing Setting*

The Existing Setting describes the existing conditions as they relate to the attributes of the environment that may be affected by the project. Pursuant to Section 15125 of the state CEQA Guidelines, the environmental settings have been prepared at a level of detail necessary to provide an understanding of the significant effects of the proposed project and its alternatives.

2. *Applicable Policies and Regulations*

The Applicable Policies and Regulations section lists only those policies and regulations pertinent to the topic section. Relevant policies usually include those of San Mateo County and those of the City of Half Moon Bay. The General Plan policies listed in each section are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on environmental resources. Conformance with these policies will have the effect of avoiding or minimizing adverse physical impacts. The use and management plans prepared by the District for specific lands must be consistent with these policies. The issue specific environmental analysis here supplements the overall discussion of conformance of the proposed Coastal Annexation project in Chapter III, Plan Consistency. The complete text of relevant San Mateo County General Plan, Local Coastal Program and City of Half Moon Bay General Plan policies is found in Appendix A.

3. *Significance Criteria*

The significance criteria provide the basis for evaluating whether the project would cause an adverse substantial change in the environment. Where applicable, the analysis of impacts identifies specific relevant state, federal, and local environmental standards (i.e., water quality standards, air quality standards, zoning provisions, etc.) by which such changes can be assessed.

4. *Impacts and Mitigation Measures*

This analysis lists as mitigation policies that can avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts that would result from adoption of the proposed Draft Service Plan. Each potential impact has been compared to the relevant policies and guidelines found in the Draft Service Plan. If these policies and guidelines alone are not sufficient to avoid significant adverse impacts, then mitigation is proposed.

The impact analyses have been prepared to comply with Section 15143 of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that the “significant effects should be discussed with emphasis in proportion to their severity and probability of occurrence.” The level of significance is identified for each impact based on a comparison with the impact evaluation criteria. Potentially significant impacts are discussed first, followed by impacts determined to be less than significant. Where the project results in impacts that are considered significant with respect to the impact evaluation criteria, mitigation measures are proposed to avoid or minimize the impact. Because this is a Program EIR, and the location and character of future acquisitions or facilities is not yet known, the analysis must consider the general potential for environmental impact and the general

capacity to mitigate impact. Specific future actions would also undergo CEQA compliance and further specific mitigation would be determined at that time.

Upon the District's approval of the project, the District will also adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program specifying the timing and implementation for each mitigation measure.

A. Land Use

OVERVIEW

This section lists potential impacts related to land use and recreation resources that could occur if the District extended its boundaries to include the majority of the San Mateo County coastside, approximately 140,000 acres. While the District is not proposing acquisition of easements or lands through this project, the Annexation project, the Draft Service Plan and related annexation policies, once approved, will provide a means by which subsequent District actions will occur. While these subsequent actions will be subject to the preparation of site-specific Use and Management Plans and CEQA documentation, potential project level and cumulative impacts that can be reasonably anticipated have been identified in this Program EIR. The proposed mitigation measures would reduce all listed impacts to less than significant levels.

District protection of open space in the Coastal Annexation Area would further existing San Mateo County and Local Coastal Plan goals and objectives for the area and would minimize future land use conflict. District acquisition of parcels and easements and management and operation of District open space preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area would further the goals of other open space and light-recreation providers in the area, most notably the County Parks and State Parks systems. Mitigation is prescribed to ensure that the project would not conflict with existing land uses on adjacent properties or with applicable lands use plans, policies, or regulations. Implementation of the proposed annexation project would be a benefit to preserving the existing rural quality of life and would provide more preservation, recreation, and stewardship opportunities in the Coastal Annexation Area.

1. Existing Setting

a. Geography of the Coastal Annexation Area

The San Mateo Coastside has great diversity in land use, reflecting the diversity in terrain, access, soils, and climate. The area has long been treated as a distinct geographical planning unit. In the EIR analysis, it is convenient to define several geographical subareas within the Coastal Annexation Area as a whole. These areas are also used in the discussion of alternatives (Chapter V) and are defined by Map 17.

Skyline Upper Watersheds

The Skyline Upper Watersheds subarea comprises roughly 47,500 acres (34 % of the annexation area), extending from the current District boundary on the east, west to the Local Coastal Plan (LCP) boundary and south to the Santa Cruz County boundary. This area has low population, relatively steep terrain and poor access. There is some timber harvest here, but little agriculture other than grazing.

Northern Watersheds

The Northern Watersheds subarea comprises roughly 57,400 acres (41 % of the annexation area), extending from the Pacifica city boundary south to Pescadero Watershed and

from the District boundary or the inland LCP line west to Pacific Ocean. Most of the coast side population is in the north watersheds subarea, including the City of Half Moon Bay and the unincorporated communities to the north (Montara, Moss Beach, Princeton, El Granada, and Miramar) and to the South (Purisima and San Gregorio). The extensive coastal plain supports half of coastside farming and the gentle hills support the majority of coastside ranching .

Southern Watersheds

The Southern Watersheds subarea comprises roughly 35,100 acres (25 % of the annexation area), extending from Pescadero Watershed south to the Santa Cruz County boundary and from the inland LCP line west to the Pacific Ocean. The principal population center is the town of Pescadero. There is a roughly equal mixture of farming and grazing.

b. Current Land Uses Within the Coastal Annexation Area

Of the area proposed for annexation, roughly 4,300 acres (3%) are in urban land uses, 13,400 acres (10%) are in cultivated agricultural production, and 38,300 acres (27%) are used for grazing. There are roughly 40,000 acres of forest land containing some 27,000 acres of timberlands, which are lands potentially used for timber production. Public ownership is primarily used for recreation/open space purposes (Federal, State, and County parks), and in the Coastal Annexation Area, this amounts to some 17,300 acres (12%) (see Table IV-A-1). Table IV-A-1 and the tabular analysis of Map 9, Existing Land Use summarize the most recent available regional land use data, which is from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG, 1995).

Some of the land within the Coastal Annexation Area is already protected as permanent open space. Table IV-A-2 lists the County’s rural land use categories as stated in the County’s General Plan. Table IV-A-3 lists the ownership status as represented by acreage, type of land use and whether the land is in private or public ownership. This table is further divided by geographical location. Map 17 illustrates each geographical division. These geographical divisions further define land uses.

**Table IV-A-1
Land Use Summary**

Land Use	Area (acres)			Total	% of total
	Northern Watersheds	Skyline	Southern Watersheds		
Urban	2,692	902	714	4,309	3.1
Cultivated	6,592	95	6,746	13,433	9.6
Grazing	21,182	7,700	9,404	38,286	27.3
Private Recreation	518	0	0	518	0.4
Public Recreation	2,962	9,453	4,860	17,275	12.3
Rangeland	15,848	3,517	4,928	24,293	17.4
Forest	6,562	25,730	7,392	39,683	28.3
Other*	1,045	102	1,056	2,204	1.6
Total	57,400	47,500	35,100	140,000	100%

*"Other" lands include reservoirs, lakes, bays, estuaries, wetlands, mixed sparsely vegetated land, and areas that are classified as land on USGS base maps but water on land use maps.

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) 1995.

c. Description of Rural Service Centers

The San Mateo County Coastside has three small, somewhat isolated rural communities designated as "rural service centers" in the San Mateo County General Plan. These have permanent residents and provide important services to the residents and workers of the surrounding agricultural, timber production and recreational lands of the rural area. San Gregorio and Pescadero, located just east of State Highway 1 in the coastal zone, provide services to the predominantly agricultural and recreational economy of the South Coast. La Honda is located in the Santa Cruz Mountains, and provides services to employees of and visitors to the local park areas and the surrounding timber industry (San Mateo County General Plan, Rural Land Use Element). In addition to these rural service centers, there are a number of isolated residential subdivisions, including the Skyline Area, La Honda-Loma Mar, Dearborn Park, Tunitas, Butano, Butano Falls, and Portola Heights subdivisions.

1) San Gregorio

San Gregorio was founded in 1854 as a service center catering to the needs of local farmers. Later, when more visitors came to the area because of the stagecoach trade between the Coast and the Bayside, the San Gregorio House, a small hotel, opened and became the nucleus of the village. It became a popular resort for San Franciscans during the 1880's and 1890's. The community began a general decline in the 1920's when the new Coast Highway bypassed it by a mile to the west. The San Gregorio House is still standing, although now in use as a private residence, and the community's general store provides services for nearby farmers and the many visitors to the coastal parks and beaches.

The amount of land within the San Gregorio rural service center boundary is minimal, amounting to only 13.5 acres. Some of this land is vacant or in agricultural use. The rest is in neighborhood commercial and low density residential uses, reflecting the presence of the San Gregorio General Store and a few single family homes that comprise the small hamlet (San Mateo County General Plan). San Gregorio is surrounded by grazing, agricultural, and other undeveloped lands. Current zoning within San Gregorio's rural service center boundary is R-1/S-10/DR (one family residential, 20,000 square-foot minimum parcels, subject to Design Review), or C-1/S-7/DR (Neighborhood Commercial, 5,000 square-foot minimum parcels, subject to Design Review). The current zoning would allow a buildout of seven residential units (existing plus new). There is presently no vacant land zoned for commercial use (San Mateo County General Plan).

2) Pescadero

The rich soils in the alluvial plain of Pescadero Creek attracted the first house in what is now Pescadero. From the 1860's until the turn of the century, Pescadero also prospered as a resort community, attracting vacationers to nearby beaches and fishermen to Pescadero Creek. The community now has approximately 400 year-round residents and retains the distinctive, New England style of architecture that makes it a unique visual and cultural resource in the South Coast. It provides a service base of the surrounding agricultural lands, as well as a focal point for visitors to the state beaches in the area.

3) La Honda

As logging on the eastern slope of the Santa Cruz Mountains slowly depleted the best timberlands, the dense redwood forests that cover the western slope attracted the first settlers to the La Honda area. In the early 1860's, John Sears built a store near La Honda Creek to serve the small logging settlements in the region. This store, known as the La Honda Store, served as a stagecoach stop between Redwood City and San Gregorio. As logging diminished in the La Honda vicinity, the surrounding area began to be subdivided for summer cabins. Many of these early vacation cabins now are occupied by year-round residents.

d. Land Use Patterns in the Rural Lands of the Coastal Annexation Area

As stated in the San Mateo County General Plan, agricultural land uses are very sensitive to surrounding land uses. They can work well with recreational and open space uses, provided there are adequate buffers between the two uses. Even cultivated areas can coexist with recreational uses. For example, in certain State parks on the Coast, cultivated agriculture is practiced to the edge of the coastal bluffs, and there are trails through these areas. Use of fencing and strategic setback adequately buffer the agricultural use from recreational visitors. In the Skyline ridge areas, the use of open grassland for grazing blends with the adjacent public open space lands and is compatible with the unique vistas of the area. Timber lands are also very sensitive to the encroachment of non-agricultural uses. Like agriculture, timber harvest operations are greatly dependent upon the resources remaining in large parcels.

The rural recreational experience is often enhanced by a sense of separation from the more urbanized world. The rural area of the County presently offers a variety of recreational experiences, from organized campgrounds and team sports to wilderness hiking and camping. The rural area within the Coastal Annexation Area is unique in that it is so close to very densely populated urban areas, and the County seeks to maintain this separation of urban and rural experiences through its land use planning efforts. To maintain a rural atmosphere, a separation of recreational lands from higher density residential and commercial areas could be promoted. On the other hand, recreational lands can blend in with agricultural uses, particularly grazing lands on open ridges. Recreational lands in forested areas can also co-exist with timber production activities, provided there is adequate visual and noise buffering from areas used by hikers and campers. In certain cases, isolated commercial uses that provide services to visitors can fit with recreational uses.

**Table IV-A-2
Existing Rural Land Use Categories**

Land Use Category	Description
Residential/ Commercial (urban)	Lands which are residential or commercial. Includes but is not limited to retail, education, hospitals, military installations, public institutions, offices, hotels, industrial, infrastructure for communication, transportation and utilities, airports, cemeteries, mines, quarries, gravel pits.
Agricultural: Cultivated	Lands which are harvested, idle and cultivated cropland, including both irrigated and non-irrigated croplands, farmsteads, other agricultural lands, greenhouses and floriculture.

Land Use Category	Description
Agricultural: Grazing	Lands which contain vegetative material that is suitable for the grazing or browsing of livestock including herbaceous rangeland, shrub and brush rangeland, mixed rangeland and pastures.
Private Recreation	Commercial outdoor recreation, golf courses, botanical gardens, leisure parks, zoological parks and other private recreational uses or open space.
Public Recreation	Beaches and lands owned or managed by the County Parks and Recreation Department, the State of California parks system, the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, and the U.S. Government that are specifically intended for public recreational use.
Coastal scrub/ chaparral	Lands dominated by coastal scrub and chaparral vegetation.
Mixed evergreen forest	Forested areas in which evergreen trees predominate (redwood, Douglas fir, pine, mixed evergreens).
Other	Reservoirs, lakes, bays, estuaries, wetlands, mixed sparsely vegetated land, and areas that are classified as land on USGS base maps but water on land use maps.

Source: San Mateo County General Plan, 1986

**Table IV-A-3
Ownership Status**

Land Use		Area (acres)			
		Northern Watersheds	Skyline	Southern Watersheds	Total
Public	State Parks	2,139	4,272	9,208	15,619
	County of San Mateo	826	7,521	458	8,804
	City of Half Moon Bay	83	0	0	83
	Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	149	145	0	294
	Subtotal Public	3,198	11,937	9,665	24,800
Private	Private	33,952	27,670	15,292	76,914
	Private Land Trust	8,607	1,704	5,068	15,380
	Urban/Small Parcels	11,643	6,189	5,074	22,906
	Grand Total	57,400	47,500	35,100	140,000

Notes: "Private Land Trust" includes Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) and Trust for Public Land (TPL).
"Urban/Small Parcels" are all parcels less than 40 acres.

Source: San Mateo County Assessor, analysis by Terrabytes Digital Mapping, TRA

2. Applicable Land Use and Recreation Policies and Regulations

Any future acquisition, operation and management of lands and easements within the Coastal Annexation Area must conform to the policies and regulations of the San Mateo County General Plan and the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP). The District would be able to purchase lands within the City of Half Moon Bay after the proposed annexation takes

place¹, however, as stated in Chapter III, Plan Consistency, the District's strategic emphasis is to use its resources to primarily acquire or preserve land outside Urban Service Area boundaries of cities (District Basic Policies, p.2). Since the City of Half Moon Bay is located within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area, it is still relevant to ensure that the District's annexation mission is consistent with the City of Half Moon Bay's LUP. This discussion is found in Chapter III. The District may purchase land within the City of Half Moon Bay for a field staff office and ranger facilities. Therefore, only policies that are relevant to the acquisition, operation and maintenance of these facilities are listed in this section.

The Draft Service Plan for the Coastal Annexation Area also contains relevant policies specific to the proposed project area. Relevant County and LCP policies are listed below by number and title. Relevant Draft Service Plan policies are attached with this document and are one of the topics of analysis in this chapter found in Section 4. *Impacts and Mitigation Measures*.

a. City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program and Use Plan (1993)

The purpose of the LCP is to formulate resource protection and development policies that, together with the Land Use Plan Maps, will indicate in sufficient detail the kinds, location, and intensity of land uses in the City of Half Moon Bay. The most significant planning issues involve (1) adequate sites for the development of housing to meet the City's share of existing unmet and projected regional housing needs, (2) actions the City should take to encourage the achievement of Coastal Act goals, including the preservation of prime agricultural, open space, and recreational lands in the unincorporated areas of the San Mateo County coastside, by concentrating development within the boundaries of the City in accordance with Sections 30250, 30007.5, 30241, and 30242 of the Coastal Act, and (3) limiting future residential population growth to a maximum annual increase of 1% (per Measure D in 1999). Relevant policies of the Land Use Plan that the District would need to be in conformance with in providing District facilities are listed here:

Policy 2-8 Priority of Recreational Uses on Ocean Front Lands

1) Parks and Recreation Element (1995)

The Goals and Policies of the Parks and Recreation Element of the General Plan, in addition to recreation policies in the City's Land Use Plan (LUP) are applicable. This element is consistent with the LUP and provides a more detailed level of planning for park and recreation facilities. The element was first adopted in July, 1990 and was updated in August 1995. The relevant policy from the Parks and Recreation Element is listed Below.

Goal 4: Operation and Maintenance

b. San Mateo County General Plan

¹ The Draft Service Plan states that "parcels of 40 or more acres will typically be considered for purchase, however some smaller parcels may be sought for acquisition. These may include parcels that are key habitat, trail routes, inholdings, or parcels needed for service access." Typically, these parcels do not occur within the City of Half Moon Bay.

The San Mateo County General Plan policies listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on land uses.

VEGETATIVE, WATER , FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES POLICIES

- 1.35 Protect the Productive Use of Timber Resources
- 1.36 Protect the Productive Use of Water Resources
- 1.41 Encourage Public Agencies and Private Groups to Acquire Significant Sensitive Habitats

PARK AND RECREATION RESOURCES POLICIES

- 6.10 Locate Suitable Park and Recreation Facilities in Rural Areas
- 6.11 Coastal Recreation and Access
- 6.12 Minimize Agricultural Land Use Conflicts
- 6.13 Development Plans
- 6.14 Site Planning for Public and Private Facilities
- 6.15 Building Materials and Service Technology for Public and Private Facilities
- 6.16 Prioritizing Facility Development
- 6.17 Techniques for Providing Park and Recreation Facilities
- 6.20 Consider Land Banking
- 6.21 Transfer of Unused School Land
- 6.29 Protection, Operation and Maintenance
- 6.30 Minimize Traffic and Litter Problems
- 6.35 Coordinate Services
- 6.38 Trail System Coordination
- 6.39 Consider Alternative Acquisition Methods
- 6.40 Alternative Revenue Sources
- 6.47 Role of the Midpeninsula Open Space District

RURAL LAND USE POLICIES

- 9.4 Land Use Objectives for the Rural Lands
- 9.23 Land Use Compatibility in Rural Lands
- 9.26 Coastal Zone Priorities
- 9.28 Encourage Existing and Potential Agricultural Activities

- 9.30 Development Standards to Minimize Land Use Conflicts with Agriculture
- 9.31 Protection of Agricultural Lands
- 9.32 Encourage Existing and Potential Timber Production Land Uses
- 9.34 Development Standards to Minimize Land Use Conflicts with Timber Production Lands
- 9.35 Encourage Existing and Potential Public Recreation Land Uses
- 9.36 Development Standards to Minimize Land Use Conflicts in Public Recreation Lands
- 9.37 Ensure Land Use Compatibility Between Private and Public Recreation Lands
- 9.38 Encourage Private Recreation Land Uses
- 9.39 Development Standards to Minimize Land Use Conflicts in Private Recreation Lands
- 9.40 Maintenance of the Open Space Character of Lands Designated as General Open Space
- 9.42 Development Standards for Land Use Compatibility in General Open Space Lands

c. San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP)

The San Mateo County LCP policies (1998) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on Land Uses:

LOCATING AND PLANNING NEW DEVELOPMENT

1.8 Land Uses and Development Densities in Rural Areas

RECREATION/VISITOR-SERVING FACILITIES COMPONENT

- 11.4 Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities Permitted in the Coastal Zone
- 11.9 Oceanfront Land in Urban and Rural Areas
- 11.10 Upland Locations in Urban and Rural Areas
- 11.11 Agricultural Areas
- 11.12 Sensitive Habitats
- 11.13 Trails
- 11.14 Development Standards for Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities
- 11.16 Posting [signage]
- 11.17 Parking
- 11.18 Sensitive Habitats
- 11.19 Agriculture
- 11.20 Utilities
- 11.22 Encourage Facility Development by the Private Sector
- 11.26 Requirements for Trails and Recreational Development

APPENDIX 11.A DEFINITIONS, STANDARDS, AND MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES FOR RECREATION AND VISITOR-SERVING FACILITIES

- Park Planning and Management Guidelines
- Natural Preserve Standards, Planning and Management Guidelines and Appropriate Locations
- Wild Area Standards, Planning and Management Guidelines and Appropriate Locations

3. Significance Criteria

The project would be considered to have a significant effect on land uses if it would:

- LU-1** Conflict with existing land uses on adjacent properties, such as agriculture or timber harvesting;
- LU-2** Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of the jurisdiction in which the project is located adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
- LU-3** Physically divide an established community;
- LU-4** Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan;
- LU-5** 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; or
- LU-6** Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

- LU-7** Displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

4. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

- LU-1** **Would the project conflict with existing land uses on adjacent properties, such as agriculture or timber harvesting?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact LU-1 Land uses and users adjacent to any property that the District may acquire within the Coastal Annexation Area could pose significant health hazards to future preserve users. For example, timber harvesting could occur adjacent to future preserves, thereby causing potential hazards from falling trees, limbs and/or debris. Mitigation LU-1a will reduce this potentially significant effect to a less than significant level.

The Coastal Area Annexation project could result in new trails or facilities adjacent to private property or existing dwellings. The Draft Service Plan includes the following policies that will avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts related to land use compatibility:

Policy	Description
Guideline G.3.2	Improvements or public uses located upon open space lands other than agriculture shall be located away from existing prime agricultural lands toward areas containing non-prime agricultural lands, unless such location would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient use of an area.
Guideline G.6.3	Inherent in the preservation of open space resources is the protection of: rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species; ecological systems; water quality; visual resources; and the unique cultural resources in the Coastal Annexation Area, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources. Therefore, prior to making any lands available to low-intensity public recreational access, the District shall prepare and adopt a site-specific resource management and public access plan for any lands acquired by the District or managed through contract for other public or private non-profit property owners. The development of plans will include opportunities for public involvement.
Implementation Action G.6.A(i)	Upon completion of the annexation process and with public involvement through local groups, the District shall conduct hearings to develop its Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area. These hearings shall address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agriculture and timber production; inter-agency relationships; and public information. <i>See also Implementation Actions G.5.C(i) and G.5.E(i)</i>

Potentially significant impacts could remain. Implementation of Mitigation LU-1b would reduce potentially significant impacts related to land use compatibility to a less than significant level.

Mitigation LU-1a In areas where trails would pass potentially hazardous adjacent land uses (e.g., timber operations), trail structures such as fences, barriers, and signs shall be used to deter trail users from leaving the trail and encountering unsafe conditions. Temporary trail

closures shall be employed during intermittent operations, such as agricultural spraying, that would jeopardize the safety of an otherwise safe trail.

Mitigation LU-1b The following measures will be included in every future Use and Management Plan for parcels within the Coastal Annexation Area:

1. In areas where trail routes are immediately adjacent to private property, fencing shall be employed as necessary to deter users from leaving the trail. Specific fence, gate, and crossing designs will be determined in consultations with adjacent affected property owner(s) at the Use and Management Plan stage.
2. All new trails/facilities will be sited away from the edges of new preserves.
3. All new trails/facilities will be designed to preserve existing vegetation within new preserves and at the property lines so that preserve users will not be able to view land uses in adjacent properties.
4. Trail uses will be consolidated where safe within the same trailway, depending on the steepness, available right-of-way, safety, user frequencies, and other conditions. A type of use on a trail may be prohibited for safety or environmental reasons, such as erosion and water quality. Where a trail is restricted to a particular type of user, the trail shall be clearly designated as such and shall be equipped with use signs and appropriate barriers to discourage unauthorized use.
5. Trails shall be sited as far away from occupied dwellings as practical. Trails not within planned road rights-of-way shall be set back a minimum distance from occupied dwellings in accordance with Table IV-A-4 (below). Where setbacks specified in Table IV-A-4 are not feasible, potential noise and privacy impacts must be evaluated for any subsequent District action and shall be reduced by use of berms, fencing, landscaping, and other feasible and compatible means, if necessary.

Table IV-A-4
Recommended trail setbacks from occupied dwellings

Land Use	Recommended Setback
Residential	50 feet
Agricultural	50 feet
Timber Production	50 feet

LU-2 **Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of the jurisdiction in which the project is located adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact LU-2 The project may result in a conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations of the jurisdiction in which the project is located (County of San Mateo and City of Half

Moon Bay). To ensure that District's actions do not result in conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation, the Draft Service Plan policies contains the following:

Policy	Description
Guideline G.7	In implementing any specific management or public access plans, the District shall obtain all necessary permits from appropriate Federal, State, and local land and resource regulatory agencies. Such agencies include, but are not limited to, San Mateo County, the City of Half Moon Bay, and the California Coastal Commission.
Permanent Policy P.2	Within the Coastal Zone, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.
Permanent Policy P.3	The District shall secure County and other required agency permits on lands it owns or manages for open space and visitor-serving low-intensity recreation uses and for staff facilities. Such uses shall comply with all applicable County land use policies and regulations.

Therefore, the annexation project will be in conformance with all San Mateo County and San Mateo County Local Coastal Plan land use policies listed in this section with the implementation of this Draft Service Plan Guideline and Policies.

However, Permanent Policy 2 from the Draft Service Plan, as listed above, contains provisions for only the Coastal Area and does not include the Skyline Area. Therefore, the following mitigation is proposed to reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. Permanent Policy 2 shall be revised to include all of the Coastal Annexation Area. Underline text represents new text, and ~~strikeout~~ text signifies text that will be deleted as a result of this mitigation measure.

Mitigation LU-2 Permanent Policy 2 in the Draft Service Plan shall be modified to state:

“Within the Coastal Annexation Area, ~~Coastal Zone~~, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.”

LU-3 Would the project physically divide an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact LU-3 As stated in the Project Description, if the Annexation project is approved, subsequent District actions within the Coastal Annexation area will be subject to the District's Open Space Use and Management Planning Process. Project-specific CEQA documentation will be prepared on each easement acquisition and Use and Management Plan.

It is the District's goal to purchase parcels typically greater than 40 acres in size. The District's main acquisition interests in large, underdeveloped or sparsely developed parcels of land. Therefore, acquiring a large parcel of land for open space conservation and low-intensity recreational purposes in an area of mostly open spaces would not physically divide an established community. No mitigation is necessary.

LU-4 Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact.

Impact LU-4 The proposed Coastal Annexation Area does not contain areas subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. Annexing the Coastal Area into the District's boundaries and Sphere of Influence will implement the District's objectives of land preservation, habitat enhancement and stewardship, thus furthering the basic concepts of habitat conservation plans. No mitigation is necessary.

LU-5 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?

No Impact.

Impact LU-5 The proposed annexation project, once approved, would enable the District to acquire, operate and manage preserves in the Coastal Annexation Area. These preserves would be used for light recreation and would not result in a permanent population increase in the Coastal Annexation Area. The proposed project would instead be likely to lessen the intensity of use in existing nearby parks in the Coastal Annexation Area by offering additional hiking and equestrian opportunities. No mitigation is necessary.

LU-6 Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact LU-6 The proposed project would allow key links to existing District and other public open space lands, and provides specific opportunities for visitor access and low-intensity recreation. The annexation project will result in the District constructing or expanding existing light-intensity recreational facilities in the Coastal Annexation Area. Mitigation measures included in this EIR will reduce all impacts to less than significant levels.

LU-7 Would the project displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact LU-7 The project could displace existing residents on parcels that the District may acquire as open space preserves. However, the Draft Service Plan states that "Should the District acquire lands that contain existing structures, these structures may be maintained and improved for uses such as staff or caretaker housing or for rental to others (such as farm laborers). Rental preference would be provided to other open space or recreation providers, such as the San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Department, where use of such facilities would benefit public recreation or open space programs. Existing residents may also continue to live on the land through life estates. Structures may or may not be retained depending on their condition and potential for compatible use. If retained, structures would likely not be expanded."

Conformance to this policy will ensure that the proposed annexation project will not displace existing housing. No mitigation is necessary.

B. Agricultural Resources

The purpose of this section is to evaluate potential impacts associated with project impacts upon agricultural resources, including grazing and timber. The District's existing policies ensure that the District sustains and encourages agricultural viability consistent with public use while minimizing impacts on the natural environment. Proposed policies contained in the Draft Service Plan will ensure that no significant permanent loss of agricultural land, including important farmlands, would occur under the Coastal Annexation Program.

The Coastal Annexation Area contains Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance as designated by the California Department of Conservation. Some parcels acquired by the District would likely contain lands with one or more of these designations. Acquisition of these lands by the District would not in and of itself convert the lands to non-agricultural use. With the exception of the potential development of a field office and maintenance facilities, acquired lands would be utilized for open space and low-intensity recreation. Much of land acquired would likely be former or existing agricultural land (e.g., row crops, grazing), and active agriculture would continue depending on site specific resource characteristics and District policies developed with the input of the local coastal community.

Implementation of the Guidelines and Implementation Actions proposed in the Draft Service Plan and the proposed mitigation measures would ensure that District actions within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area would not result in a significant conversion of Farmland or other agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses. By allowing for agricultural uses where appropriate and preventing the encroachment of development, the District would be a resource helping sustain agricultural viability in the Coastal Annexation Area.

1. Existing Agricultural Setting

Much of the flat land within the Coastal Annexation Area between the Pacific Ocean and the Santa Cruz Mountains, including lands extending up into the area's valleys, has good agricultural soils that have been farmed for many years. For purposes of this EIR, agricultural production in the Coastal Annexation includes three major categories: cultivation of crops, livestock grazing, and timber. Greenhouses are a special case of cultivation. This setting discussion describes the important farmlands within the Coastal Annexation Area, gives an overview of these three categories of agricultural production, summarizes some of the challenges facing agriculture in the Coastal Annexation Area, and provides a brief discussion of agricultural preserves.

a. Important Farmlands

Map 12 shows the Important Farmland Map for the Coastal Annexation Area (FMMP 2000). Important Farmland maps are compiled using information from USDA-Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Surveys and current land use information. Using this classification system, the most productive agricultural lands of the Coastal Annexation Area can be divided into five categories: Prime Farmland, Statewide Importance, Local Importance, Unique, and Grazing. The "Other" classification also includes some productive soils, such as lands suitable for timber. Table IV-B-1 provides the acres of lands within the various Farmland and other categories. Urban lands and water shown on Map 12 and Table IV-B-1 are not considered productive farmlands. Except where noted, the minimum mapping unit is 10 acres. These six productive mapping categories are defined as follows:

Prime Farmland—Land with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long-term production of agricultural crops. This land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. The land must have been in production of irrigated crops at some time during the two updated cycles prior to the mapping date. The San Mateo County LCP provides a broader definition of Prime Farmland based largely on the Williamson Act definition, which takes into account soils, specific crops, livestock carrying capacity, and the cash value of crops grown. For example, it includes somewhat poorer soils that are capable of growing artichokes or Brussels sprouts. Thus, Prime Farmland as defined by the LCP extends beyond that shown on Map 12; LCP-defined Prime Farmland is shown on Map 13.

Farmland of Statewide Importance—Farmland similar to Prime Farmland but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or with less ability to hold and store moisture. The land must have been used for the production of irrigated crops at some time during the two update cycles prior to the mapping date.

Unique Farmland—Farmland of lesser quality soils used for the production of the state's leading agricultural crops. This land is usually irrigated, but it may include nonirrigated crops such as orchards. The land must have been cropped at some time during the two update cycles prior to the mapping date.

Farmland of Local Importance—Land of importance to the local agricultural economy, as determined by the County's Board of Supervisors and a local advisory committee. In San Mateo County, such lands are defined as Farmlands other than Prime, Statewide, or Unique that produce the following crops: oats, Christmas trees, pumpkins, dryland pasture, other grains, and Baylands. These lands are not irrigated.

Grazing Land—Land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock. The minimum mapping unit for Grazing Land is 40 acres.

Other Land—Land that does not meet the criteria of any other category but includes some productive soils. In this area, most of these lands include productive timberlands.

b. Cultivation of Crops

Large acreages of agricultural soils and a unique coastal microclimate make the lands in the coastal terraces and valleys suitable for raising different crops, including a number of specialty crops (San Mateo County 1986). Flower and nursery crops, including Christmas trees, are by far the most valuable agricultural commodities produced in San Mateo County (San Mateo County 1999b). Much of this crop is grown in soil, but protected by a greenhouse structure. Mushrooms are the leading vegetable crop in the Coastal Annexation Area in terms of total dollar value (San Mateo County 1999b), and these are also grown in an enclosure. The high value crops benefit from excellent road and air cargo transportation. Of lesser total economic value but occupying many more acres and of great agricultural significance, farms along the coastal plain within the Coastal Annexation Area are among the nation's leading suppliers of artichokes and Brussels sprouts (San Mateo County 1986).

Table IV-B-1
Important Farmland Acreage

Category	Acres
Prime Farmland	2,641
Farmland of Statewide Importance	178
Unique Farmland	2,602
Farmland of Local Importance	3,809
Grazing Land	40,514
Other Land	86,232
Urban/Water (no productive soils)	4,023
Total	140,000

Source: *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program 2000, TRA May 2002*

c. Livestock Grazing

In the Santa Cruz Mountains area of the Coastal Annexation Area, the steep terrain and very narrow alluvial valleys of the perennial streams preclude most of the agricultural uses found in the Coastal Zone. In this area, grazing is the predominant agricultural use. Significant grazing activity also occurs in the foothills that rise just east of the coastal plain. Cattle production is the main livestock activity in both number of head sold and total dollar value, but sheep and pigs are also raised (San Mateo County 1999b).

d. Timber

The annexation area includes some 41,300 acres mapped as Redwood Forest (see Map 15, Vegetation and Tabular Analysis), although much of this land is not in timber production. Over 4.5 million board feet of timber was produced within San Mateo County in 1999 (San Mateo County 1999b). The percentage of this harvest that came from within the Coastal Annexation Area is not known; however, the bulk of the lands identified in the General Plan as having soils suitable for timber are located in the southeastern portion of the county south of State Route 92, in the Santa Cruz Mountains (San Mateo County 1986). Much of this area is included within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area (see also Map 4). Redwood is the most widely harvested species. No timber production occurs within Half Moon Bay.

According to the County Assessor's Office, over 23,000 acres of San Mateo County timberlands are held in timberland preserves (Frank Newell, pers. comm.). A map showing the location of these preserves was not available.

e. Agricultural Preserves

Map 13 shows the lands within San Mateo County that were under Williamson Act Contracts in 1997. The exact acreage of land under contract varies from year to year as lands are put in or withdrawn from preserves. As of the April 2001, approximately 46,872 acres of land in San Mateo County were under such contracts (Frank Newell, pers. comm.). The extent of such lands within the Coastal Annexation Area was not determined, but as shown on Map 13, the vast majority of Williamson Act lands occur within the Coastal Annexation Area.

f. Agricultural Challenges in the Coastal Annexation Area

Loss of productive agricultural lands to urbanization is an ongoing statewide problem. Agricultural lands are affected both by direct conversion to non-agricultural uses, such as housing development, and by indirect pressures, such as loss of service providers to the agricultural community, urban demands for water, and complaints from residential neighbors. According to the San Mateo County Agricultural Economic Viability Project (UCCE 1989), although the total number of commercial farm units in San Mateo County declined and total agricultural acreage decreased from 1961 to 1986, acreage in intensive crop production and production values increased during that time. The vast bulk of farm income is now produced from a very small portion of the agricultural acreage [UCCE 1989]. Surveys conducted by the California Department of Conservation determined that the overall amount of Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland in San Mateo County actually increased between 1992 and 2000, but the acreage of Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, and grazing land declined during that period. Urban and built-up land gained the greatest acreage during that period (FMMP 2000b and 1994) in all of San Mateo County, not just the coastal area.

Nursery crops are the most economically viable crops within the Coastal Annexation Area and make the greatest dollar contribution towards total agricultural sales, with livestock contributing the least. Because livestock uses much more acreage, however, maintaining livestock uses can help preserve the greatest amount of open space in the County, and grazing generally has lower water needs and a less intensive effect on those lands than does crop production (UCCE 1989). The Viability Project concluded that San Mateo County would need to devote additional resources to agriculture to maintain viability. The report suggested that the coastal grazing land was particularly vulnerable due to marginal returns on those lands. According to the report, if the goal of the County is to retain these lands as open space, it may be appropriate to change their land use designation from agriculture to open space or acquire some of these lands or easements on them for protection of open space (UCCE 1989).

In its 1993 analysis of agriculture within the City of Half Moon Bay, the LCP described how the viability of all of the existing food and field flower operations in the City had been severely limited by urban conflicts (City of Half Moon Bay 1993). Conflicts included trespass, theft, vandalism, and pesticide restrictions. Other problems included the lack of agricultural services, financing, and high land and water costs. The LCP concluded that the use of land within the City for food crops was no longer feasible and the long-term prospects for field flower and greenhouse/potted plant production were poor (City of Half Moon Bay 1993).

2. Applicable Agricultural Policies and Regulations

a. San Mateo County General Plan

The San Mateo County General Plan policies (1986) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on agricultural resources:

VEGETATIVE, WATER, FISH, AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES POLICIES

1.35 Protect the Productive Use of Timber Resources

SOIL RESOURCES POLICIES

- 2.5 Minimize Depletion of Productive Soil Resource in Agricultural Areas
- 2.18 Encouragement of Soil Protective Uses
- 2.19 Preferred Uses in Areas With Productive Soil Resources

PARK AND RECREATION RESOURCES POLICIES

- 6.12 Minimize Agricultural Land Use Conflicts

RURAL LANDS POLICIES

- 9.28 Encourage Existing and Potential Agricultural Activities
- 9.30 Development Standards to Minimize Land Use Conflicts with Agriculture
- 9.31 Protection of Agricultural Lands
- 9.32 Encourage Existing and Potential Timber Production Land Uses
- 9.34 Development Standards to Minimize Land Use Conflicts with Timber Production Lands
- 9.35 Encourage Existing and Potential Public Recreation Land Uses
- 9.36 Development Standards to Minimize Land Use Conflicts in Public Recreation Lands
- 9.42 Development Standards for Land Use Compatibility in General Open Space Lands

b. San Mateo County Local Coastal Program

The San Mateo County LCP policies (1998) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on agricultural resources:

AGRICULTURE COMPONENT

Open Field Agriculture

- 5.5 Permitted Uses on Prime Agricultural Lands Designated as Agriculture
- 5.6 Permitted Uses on Lands Suitable for Agriculture Designated as Agriculture
- 5.8 Conversion of Prime Agricultural Land Designated as Agriculture
- 5.10 Conversion of Land Suitable for Agriculture Designated as Agriculture
- 5.15 Mitigation of Land Use Conflicts

RECREATION/VISITOR-SERVING FACILITIES COMPONENT

- 11.11 Agricultural Areas
- 11.19 Agriculture

c. San Mateo County Zoning Regulations

San Mateo County Zoning Regulations include the designation of Planned Agricultural District (PAD), which is designed to preserve and foster existing and potential agricultural operations in San Mateo County and minimize conflicts between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses (San Mateo County 1999c). Parks, recreation areas, natural preserves, wild areas, and trails are all included under the definition of "Public Recreation" (§ 6351). Public recreation is a conditionally permitted use on lands in a PAD subject to issuance of a planned agricultural permit (§ 6353). Zoning Regulations section 6355 provides permit issuance criteria for the Conversion of Prime Agricultural Lands (subdivision D) and for the Conversion of Lands Suitable

for Agriculture and Other Lands (subdivision F). The criteria relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program mirror LCP Policies 5.8 and 5.10 summarized above, with the exception that the requirements specific to recreational facilities listed in Policy 5.8 (b) only apply to land owned by a public agency before the effective date of the zoning ordinance (i.e., 1999). Note that the Zoning Regulations criteria extend to all lands within a PAD.

San Mateo County Zoning Regulations also include the designation of Timberland Preserve Zone (TPZ), which is designed to foster a viable timber economy while giving consideration and protection to the public's need for watershed protection, fisheries and wildlife, and recreational opportunities (San Mateo County 1999c). Proposed uses within a TPZ that the Planning Director determines to be compatible uses and that do not constitute development as defined in Section 6710.3 do not require a permit (§ 6750). Pursuant to the Zoning Regulations, management of lands for wildlife habitat, recreation, and outdoor education are all deemed compatible uses within a TPZ (§ 6710.1). Compatible uses that do constitute development require Minor or Major Development Permits (§§ 6750 *et seq.*).

d. State of California–Williamson Act

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965—commonly referred to as the Williamson Act—enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments that are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. Local governments receive an annual subvention of forgone property tax revenues from the state via the Open Space Subvention Act of 1971. Agricultural preserves allowed under the Williamson Act include areas devoted to agricultural, recreational, or open-space use (Cal. Govt. Code § 51201).

3. Significance Criteria

A project could have a significant effect on agricultural resources if it would:

- AGR-1** Directly convert substantial 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;
- AGR-2** Conflict with a Williamson Act contract or existing zoning for agricultural use; or
- AGR-3** Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in substantial conversion of Farmland or other agricultural lands to non-agricultural use.

4. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

AGR-1 Would the project directly convert substantial Farmland to non-agricultural use?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact AGR-1 As noted above, the Coastal Annexation Area contains Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance. Some parcels acquired by the District would likely contain lands with one or more of these designations. Acquisition of these lands by the District would not in and of itself convert the lands to non-agricultural use. Acquired lands would be utilized for open space and low-intensity recreation. Much of the land acquired would

likely be former or existing agricultural land (e.g., row crops, grazing), and land in agricultural production would likely continue as such depending on site specific resource characteristics.

The Draft Service Plan includes a number of policies and Guidelines oriented toward protecting and promoting agriculture in the Coastal Annexation Area. Policy P.1 provides that the District shall not exercise the power of eminent domain in the Coastal Annexation Area and shall only acquire lands or interests in lands from willing sellers. This policy ensures that eminent domain cannot be used to acquire agricultural lands and allow their subsequent conversion to non-agricultural uses. As to lands that are acquired from willing sellers, the Draft Service Plan provides that management of those lands will proceed in accordance with applicable General Plan and zoning requirements and will maintain agricultural uses except in circumstances where it is not feasible to do so. The key policies and guidelines are:

Policy	Description
P.1	Within the Coastal Annexation Area, the District shall only acquire lands or interests in lands from willing sellers. The power of eminent domain will not be exercised by the District within the Coastal Annexation Area. This policy is a Basic Policy for the Coastal Annexation Area.
P.2	Within the Coastal Zone, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.
P.3	The District shall secure County and other required agency permits on lands it owns or manages for open space and visitor serving low intensity recreation uses and for staff facilities. Such uses shall comply with all applicable County land use policies and regulations.
G.3.1	The District shall conduct its land management practices such that they do not have an adverse significant impact on the physical and economic integrity of prime agricultural lands on or contiguous to properties owned or managed by the District (e.g., establishing appropriate buffers on District lands, etc.).
G.3.2	Improvements or public uses located upon open space lands other than agriculture shall be located away from existing prime agricultural lands toward areas containing non-prime agricultural lands, unless such location would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient use of an area.
G.3.A(i)	In acquiring lands and preparing site assessments, the District shall recognize that agriculture in the marketplace is dynamic and that agricultural use practices must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, relative to current marketplace conditions. On a case-by-case basis, the District shall determine how best to continue agricultural uses consistent with protection of rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species and their habitat. See also Guideline G.6.3
G.3.B(i)	The development of agricultural policies, preparation of site assessments and preparation of access plans for low-intensity public recreation by the District affecting prime agricultural lands shall include consultation with local agricultural interests such as the San Mateo County Agricultural Advisory Committee, the Resource Conservation District, and the local Farm Bureau, and will be subject to public review. See also Guidelines G.6.3 and G.7

G.3.C(i)	Where the District acquires conservation easements on agricultural lands, the District will consider as a term of the easement on a case-by-case basis allowing all agricultural uses permitted by San Mateo County.
----------	--

The District activities with the greatest potential to convert a substantial amount of Farmland to non-agricultural uses are the ranger office/maintenance facility and the several staging areas contemplated by the Draft Service Plan. Although no plans for the ranger office/maintenance facility have yet been prepared, the District’s existing Skyline Preserve Ranger office provides an example of the type of facility that could be developed. Using that model, approximately 4300 square feet of office and shop space, plus additional parking and storage, may eventually be acquired. The staging areas would be unpaved. Although the policies described above would discourage siting such facilities on Farmland in agricultural use, they would not prohibit it. Implementation of Mitigation AGR-1a would avoid this potential impact.

District trails and habitat preservation programs will involve relatively small amounts of land and will not convert a substantial amount of Farmland in agricultural use to non-agricultural use. In order to ensure that any such conversions are minimized, however, Mitigation AGR 1b and 1c described below should be adopted to reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. (Note too that recreation and habitat preservation uses could conflict with, and thus indirectly cause conversion of, agricultural uses. The change in use from agriculture to recreation and the potential for indirect impacts on Farmland and other agricultural resources are described in AGR-2 and AGR-3.)

Implementation of the policies, guidelines and implementation actions proposed in the Draft Service Plan together with the mitigation measures proposed in this section would ensure that District actions within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area would not result in direct conversion of a substantial amount of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. By allowing for agricultural uses where appropriate and preventing the encroachment of development, the District would be a resource benefitting agricultural viability in the Coastal Annexation Area.

Mitigation AGR-1a No new buildings or staging areas shall be located on prime agricultural lands as defined in the Draft Service Plan that are being used for agricultural purposes. In order to avoid conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, the Draft Service Plan should be revised to provide that the ranger office/maintenance facility and the staging areas may not be located on Farmland in agricultural use.

Mitigation AGR-1b Trails and habitat preservation areas shall either be located to avoid prime agricultural lands or traverse such lands in a manner that does not result in interference with agricultural activities or substantially reduce the agricultural potential of those lands. Operators of active agricultural activities shall be consulted to identify appropriate routes on lands they cultivate. The agricultural activities and the agricultural potential of traversed lands shall be protected and buffered from trail user impacts by means of distance, physical barriers (i.e., sturdy fences), or other non-disruptive methods.

Mitigation AGR-1c The District shall adopt Draft Service Plan Policy P.1 by ordinance. This policy reads as follows: “Within the Coastal Annexation Area, the District shall only acquire lands or interests in lands from willing sellers. The power of eminent domain will not be exercised by the District within the Coastal Annexation Area. This policy is a Basic Policy for the Coastal Annexation Area.”

AGR-2 Would the project conflict with Existing Williamson Act Contracts and Agricultural Zoning?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact AGR-2 Subsequent to annexation, the District would likely acquire some parcels subject to Williamson Act contracts. Under the Williamson Act, recreational and open space uses are allowable uses on lands subject to contract. District acquisition of Williamson Act lands for such uses would thus not conflict with the contract or related agricultural preserve designation. If the District acquires lands under Williamson Act contracts, such contracts would be suspended due to the District’s status as a public agency, but suspension of the contract would not compromise the goals of the contract because the District would be acquiring the lands to protect the open space values, thus serving one of the purposes of the Williamson Act.

The District would also likely acquire lands designated as Agriculture (i.e., zoned PAD) that have prime agricultural land or other land suitable for agriculture as well as lands designated as Timberland Preserve (i.e., zoned TPZ). Under the LCP and San Mateo County zoning regulations, public recreation is a conditionally permitted use on PAD lands. The LCP and zoning limit conversion of PAD lands to conditionally permitted uses. Under Zoning Code section 6710.1, management of lands for wildlife habitat, recreation, and outdoor education are all deemed compatible uses within TPZ lands. District acquisition of PAD or TPZ lands, absent further action, would not convert lands to non-agricultural or non-timber uses. If the District proposed opening up a PAD or TPZ area for public recreation, the District would seek necessary permits, such as a Planned Agricultural Permit, as required in conformance with the LCP and zoning regulations. Draft Service Plan Permanent Policy P.3 requires the District to obtain permits for all regulated activities on District lands. Draft Service Plan Permanent Policy P.2 articulates District policy to conform to existing zoning designations within the Coastal Zone. These policies are part of the proposed project and therefore are not listed as mitigation.

Policy	Description
Policy P.2	Within the Coastal Zone, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.
Policy P.3	The District shall secure County and other required agency permits on lands it owns or manages for open space and visitor-serving low-intensity recreation uses and for staff facilities. Such uses shall comply with all applicable County land use policies and regulations.

Mitigation AGR-2 Policy P.2 as currently drafted does not apply outside of the Coastal Zone. Mitigation LU-2 ensures that Policy P.2 would apply outside of the Coastal Zone. This modification would further ensure that the District would not initiate any activities that would conflict with applicable zoning. Implementation of the policies proposed in the Draft Service Plan, as modified by Mitigation LU-2, would ensure that District actions within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area would not conflict with Williamson Act contracts or existing zoning for agricultural uses. No additional mitigation would be necessary.

AGR-3 Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland or other agricultural lands?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact AGR-3 The discussion in AGR-1 above describes the project's potential direct effects on Farmland. This criterion assesses the potential for indirect effects on Farmland and on agricultural viability in general. It assesses whether conflicts between District lands and agricultural lands could be such that agricultural production on adjacent lands would be significantly affected.

The District would likely acquire agricultural lands, including lands with timber resources, and property immediately adjacent to such lands. Agriculture and timber production is very sensitive to surrounding land uses, especially residential encroachment. District acquisition would preclude residential development and thus prevent encroachment. This is a beneficial impact of the project.

The Draft Service Plan contains a number of policies oriented towards sustaining and encouraging agricultural viability. The Draft Service Plan allows for agricultural use consistent with resource protection. Under the Draft Service Plan, the District would only acquire lands from willing sellers and would consider the potential sale or lease of District-owned lands for agricultural uses after conservation or public access easements or conditions are applied to the property based on the site-specific resource characteristics of the property. As noted in the discussion of impact Mitigation AGR-1, open space and recreational areas would only be subject to minimal improvements (e.g., gravel parking areas and natural surface trails). Although any acreage taken out of agricultural production would add to the overall cumulative losses of agricultural production in San Mateo County, the District's commitment to agriculture in the Coastal Annexation Area based on the Service Plan policies would ensure that such direct losses are minimal and do not affect the viability of agriculture.

The land uses likely to occur on District lands will generally be consistent and not interfere with adjoining agricultural uses. Most of the District's current land on the Bayside was formerly used for agricultural production, primarily grazing, and many past agricultural uses substantially altered the natural systems on that land (MROSD 1994). Some land requires active management to restore it to a natural condition, but the District has found that properly managed agricultural uses can further District goals by providing wildlife habitat and maintaining scenic or heritage resources (MROSD 1994). Agriculture can also be used for public education and to reduce fire hazards (MROSD 1994). Within the Coastal Annexation Area the District would follow the San Mateo County LCP and General Plan policies preventing recreational uses from having adverse impacts on agriculture.

District acquisitions in the Coastal Annexation Area would also likely include lands that are or are adjacent to lands with the potential for timber production. Consistent with General Plan Policy 9.36c, the Draft Service Plan provides that in limited circumstances the selective removal of trees is in the best interest of managing the ecological health and public safety conditions of a site. Lands acquired by the District would not be proposed for commercial timber production. The second growth timber land in the annexation area usually needs some active management such as pre-commercial or commercial thinning to promote stand development. The District does not currently utilize this form of timberland management. District acquisition of timber land thus could result in some of these lands being removed from production, but this amount would not be

substantial. The District would follow the San Mateo County General Plan policies minimizing conflicts between timber production and public recreation.

The following Guidelines and Implementation Actions included in the Draft Service Plan are intended to keep lands suitable for agriculture in agricultural production, to minimize conflicts between agricultural and non-agricultural issues, and to guide District management of any timber resources it may acquire. These policies are part of the proposed project and therefore are not listed as mitigation.

Policy	Description
P.1	Within the Coastal Annexation Area, the District shall only acquire lands or interests in lands from willing sellers. The power of eminent domain will not be exercised by the District within the Coastal Annexation Area. This policy is a Basic Policy for the Coastal Annexation Area.
P.2	Within the Coastal Zone, the District will not initiate any activities that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change.
P.3	The District shall secure County and other required agency permits on lands it owns or manages for open space and visitor-serving low-intensity recreation uses and for staff facilities. Such uses shall comply with all applicable County land use policies and regulations.
Guideline G.3.1	The District shall conduct its land management practices such that they do not have an adverse significant impact on the physical and economic integrity of prime agricultural lands on or contiguous to properties owned or managed by the District (e.g., establishing appropriate buffers on District lands, etc.).
Guideline G.3.2	Improvements or public uses located upon open space lands other than agriculture shall be located away from existing prime agricultural lands toward areas containing non-prime agricultural lands, unless such location would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient use of an area.
Implementation Action G.3.A(I)	In acquiring lands and preparing site assessments, the District shall recognize that agriculture in the marketplace is dynamic and that agricultural use practices must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, relative to current marketplace conditions. On a case-by-case basis, the District shall determine how best to continue agricultural uses consistent with protection of rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species and their habitat.
Implementation Action G.3.B(i)	The development of agricultural policies, preparation of site assessments and preparation of access plans for low-intensity public recreation by the District affecting prime agricultural lands shall include consultation with local agricultural interests such as the San Mateo County Agricultural Advisory Committee, the Resource Conservation District, and the local Farm Bureau, and will be subject to public review.
Implementation Action G.3.C(i)	Where the District acquires conservation easements on agricultural lands, the District will consider as a term of the easement on a case-by-case basis allowing all agricultural uses permitted by San Mateo County.
Guideline G.4.1	The District shall not propose commercial harvest of timber on District-owned property except in the limited cases described in Guideline G.4.3 below
Guideline G.4.2	On a case-by-case basis, the District may purchase property or an easement that includes approved timber harvest plans.

Policy	Description
Guideline G.4.3	On rare occasions, the District may permit limited tree removal on District-owned property where a timber harvest plan does not previously exist, if such actions are shown to be in the best interest of managing the ecological values, protecting public safety, or controlling disease within the property or watershed. In such cases, the timber may be sold.

Notwithstanding the foregoing policies that are a part of the project, future public recreation at new preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area may conflict with existing agricultural and timber uses on and adjacent to District lands if trails and other recreation areas are not designed and managed in a manner that avoids such conflicts whenever feasible. Such conflicts could indirectly cause indirect conversion of agricultural uses. Implementation of Mitigation AGL-3a-f would reduce this potential significant impact to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the Guidelines and Implementation Actions proposed in the Draft Service Plan, as modified by mitigation in this section, would ensure that District actions within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area would not result in an indirect conversion of substantial Farmland or other agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses. By allowing for agricultural uses where appropriate and preventing the encroachment of development, the District would be a resource benefitting agricultural viability in the Coastal Annexation Area.

Mitigation AGL-3a Guideline 3.2 in the Draft Service Plan should be modified to state: “Improvements or public uses located upon open space lands other than agriculture...shall be located away from existing prime agricultural lands toward areas containing non-prime agricultural lands, unless such location would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient use of an area. To the extent feasible, all trails and other public facilities should be located so as not to fragment agricultural operations. While trails that bisect grazing lands would not be likely to fragment grazing operations, trails that bisect cultivated crops could adversely affect the vitality of agricultural operations and should be avoided where feasible. If trails must traverse cultivated lands then adequate buffers, signs, and other measures necessary to ensure that trail use does not interfere with the agricultural operations shall be implemented.”

Mitigation AGL-3b The District shall provide private property signs where appropriate and provide trail users information regarding private property rights to minimize public/private use conflicts and trespassing. The District shall clearly sign trails adjacent to active agriculture and provide trail users with information regarding property rights to minimize trespassing and conflicts with agricultural users.

Mitigation AGL-3c Trails shall either be located to avoid prime agricultural lands or traverse such lands in a manner that does not result in interference with agricultural activities or substantially reduce the agricultural potential of those lands. Operators of active agricultural activities on lands owned by or under easement to the District shall be consulted to identify appropriate routes on lands they cultivate. Operators of active agricultural activities on lands adjacent to District lands used for non-agricultural purposes shall be consulted to identify routes that will avoid adverse effects on agricultural operations. The agricultural activities and the agricultural potential of traversed lands shall be protected and buffered from trail user impacts by means of distance, physical barriers (i.e., sturdy fences), or other non-disruptive methods.

Mitigation AGL-3d The District lands or easements that comprise the trail setting shall provide width sufficient for management and/or buffer space from adjacent uses so as not to preclude the viability of those uses. In addition, implementation of Mitigation LU-2 will ensure that

the proposed project and subsequent actions will not preclude the reliability of adjacent uses.

Mitigation AGR-3e Where herbicides are used for vegetation control, including control of noxious weeds, they must be handled, applied, and disposed of in such a manner that they do not adversely affect adjacent agriculture. Herbicide use shall be guided by label restrictions and any advisories published by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR) or the County Agricultural Commission. These chemicals shall only be applied by a person who is properly trained in their application.

Mitigation AGR-3f The District shall conduct its land management practices such that they do not have an adverse significant impact on the physical and economic integrity of timberland preserves on or contiguous to properties owned or managed by the District and so that the safety of visitors to District preserves is not compromised by timber harvesting (e.g., establishing appropriate buffers on District lands).

C. Public Services & Infrastructure

This section of the EIR addresses the project impacts upon public services and infrastructure, including transportation, traffic, utilities, and other service systems. Acquisition of lands by the District would not in and of itself affect public services and infrastructure. With the exception of the potential development of a field office and maintenance facilities, acquired lands would be utilized only for open space and low-intensity recreation. These uses would not generate significant needs for or impacts to transportation, traffic, utilities, and other service systems.

The proposed annexation and subsequent acquisition of land would not result in an increased demand on public services. There would be no water, wastewater or solid waste services extended to District lands except through the potential development of the field office and maintenance facilities. There would be no increase in population to place demands on public facilities outside of District lands, such as on public schools and parks. Development of a field office, infrastructure and low intensity recreation has the potential to create police and fire protection service calls from the District lands. The additional demand for these services would not be significant.

Opening up areas to the public could cause a slight increase in fire risk. Any fires would likely receive response from California Department of Forestry (CDF). The County Sheriff's Department also anticipates a need for additional responses to preserves. Both agencies require access to future preserves. The lack of adequate emergency access would be a significant impact. This section recommends adding an Implementation Action to the Service Plan to ensure adequate emergency access.

Compliance with the proposed Draft Service Plan Guidelines, Policies and Implementation Actions and with mitigation measures proposed in this section would ensure that District actions within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area would not result in significant impacts to public services and infrastructure.

1. Existing Setting

Fire protection within the Coastal Annexation Area is provided by local fire departments and the California Department of Forestry (CDF), which provides fire protection in the rural majority of the area (see Map 11). Fire protection services are supplemented by volunteer fire companies (San Mateo County 1986). The City of Half Moon Bay Police Department serves the City, and the County sheriff's office serves the unincorporated areas of the Coastal Annexation Area. The California Highway Patrol responds to vehicular accidents, including those involving pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians. State and county park rangers provide law enforcement within state and county parks, respectively.

State Route 1 runs the entire length of the Coastal Annexation Area and is the primary roadway linking the area to the rest of the greater Bay Area (Map 11). State Route 92, intersecting Route 1 in Half Moon Bay, provides the primary lateral access to Interstate 280 and is the main route used by weekday commuters to the Bayside and recreational visitors to the Coastal Annexation Area (Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County 1998). For several decades, a rugged stretch of Route 1 between Pacifica and the Coastal Annexation Area known as Devil's Slide has repeatedly failed, causing road closures and effectively severing access to

the area from the north. A highway tunnel bypassing Devil's Slide is now in the planning stages. State Route 84, a narrow, windy road intersecting Route 1 at San Gregorio, connects the area with route 35 (Skyline Boulevard) and Interstate 280 (Map 11). The San Mateo County Transit Authority (SamTrans) operates bus service to and within the region.

The Coastal Annexation Area has congested peak-hour traffic (Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County 1998). Peak periods of use occur on weekdays during the morning and evening commute hours and on weekends and holidays during mid-day and early evening hours (Half Moon Bay 1993). In addition to limited road capacity, other factors contributing to current and projected increases in congestion include a jobs-housing imbalance, limited access to transit alternatives, and a strong preference for driving alone to work (Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County 1998). The level of service (LOS) of a road is designated by a letter ranging from A to F, with LOS A representing free flow conditions with little or no delay and LOS F representing completely jammed conditions with excessive delays. The LOS on key segments of Routes 1 and 92 has been operating at LOS E during commute periods, characterized by rapidly fluctuating speeds and flow rates, low maneuverability, and low driver comfort. By 2010 or sooner, segments of the roads are projected to be at LOS F during peak commute periods, which is characterized by heavily congested and stop-and-go traffic flows (Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County 1998). Little, if any, direct conflict exists between visitor and commuter travel since they occur during different periods (Half Moon Bay 1993).

Almost all of the water supplies in the Coastal Annexation Area is provided by streams, creeks, and groundwater. These sources are entirely dependent upon rainfall for replenishment (San Mateo County 1986). Water from these streams and creeks is often diverted by private property owners and water companies for domestic, agricultural, and livestock use. Numerous small, private reservoirs provide some storage capacity. Coastside County Water District is the only provider of public water services in Half Moon Bay and also serves the El Granada, Miramar, and Princeton areas. Citizens Utility Company is the water provider serving Coastal Annexation Area communities north of El Granada. Numerous other mutual and private water companies serve the Coastal Annexation Area, including the Cesta La Honda Guild, Butano Canyon Mutual Water Company, and the Loma Mar Mutual Water Company (San Mateo County 1986). Water service is limited and the majority of suppliers cannot accommodate a significant number of additional service connections. For example, Citizens Utility Company currently lacks water capacity for additional development (Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County 1998).

Two methods of wastewater treatment and disposal are used in the Coastal Annexation Area: sewerage and on-site wastewater systems. Sewers connected to water treatment facilities serve the urbanized areas around Half Moon Bay, whereas the rural remainder of the Coastal Annexation Area is served by individual on-site systems, primarily septic systems. Half Moon Bay is served by the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM), which also operates the water treatment plant. This plant also receives wastewater from the Granada Sanitary District (which provides wastewater facilities to that part of the City north of Frenchman Creek) and the Montara Sanitary District. The water treatment plant was recently expanded (Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County 1998).

2. *Applicable Policies and Regulations*

The public services section addresses wastewater, storm drainage, water supply, traffic/parking/access, fire and police services, schools, parks, and solid waste. The following policies are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects related to public services. Conformance with these policies will avoid or minimize adverse impacts. The Use and

Management Plans subsequently prepared by the District will include review for consistency with these policies.

a. City of Half Moon Bay

1) Half Moon Bay General Plan Circulation Element

The City of Half Moon Bay General Plan Circulation Element (1992) goals and policies listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on public services and infrastructure:

- Goal 2 Maintain Safe and Convenient Vehicle Access
Goal 3 Encourage Alternative Modes of Transportation

2) Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan

The City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan policies (1993) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on public services and infrastructure:

- 10-22 Sanitary sewer connections shall be limited to areas designated for urban development
10-25 Level of Service C on Highways 1 and 92, except during the peak two-hour commuting period and the ten-day average peak recreational hour when Level of Service E will be acceptable.
10-30 City and Caltrans to adjacent facilities for bicycles and pedestrians.

b. San Mateo County

1) San Mateo County General Plan

The San Mateo County General Plan policies (1986) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on public services and infrastructure:

- 8.39 Parking Requirements
10.7 Park and Recreation Water Supplies
10.9 Potential Water Sources
10.15 Water Suppliers in Rural Areas
10.18 Aquifer Studies and Management
11.10 Wastewater Management in Rural Areas
12.12 Recreational Traffic to the Coastside
12.23 SamTrans Service
12.24 Recreational Service
12.34 Bicycle Routes
12.35 Bicycle Trails in Rural Areas
12.37 Bicycles on Transit
13.25 Locating Rubbish Collection Points
15.10 Designation of Fire Hazard Areas
15.13 Abatement of Natural Hazards
15.31 Standards for Road Access for Fire Protection Vehicles to Serve New Development

- 15.36 Encourage Pre-Fire Planning Efforts
- 15.37 Support Efforts to Reduce the Extent of the Fire Hazards
- 15.38 Encourage Coordination Between the County and Fire Protection Agencies

2) San Mateo County Local Coastal Program

The San Mateo County LCP policies (1998) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on public services and infrastructure:

- 2.49 Desired Level of Service
- 2.50 Route 1 and Route 92 Phase I Capacity Limits
- 2.51 Route 84 Phase I Capacity Limits
- 2.56 Improvements for Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails
- 2.57 Protecting Road Capacity for Visitors
- 2.59 Increased Recreational Transit Use

3. Significance Criteria

A project could have a significant effect on public services and infrastructure if it would:

- PSI-1** Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- PSI-2** Result in inadequate emergency access;
- PSI-3** Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities;
- PSI-4** Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections);
- PSI-5** Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;
- PSI-6** Result in inadequate parking capacity;
- PSI-7** Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks);
- PSI-8** Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board;
- PSI-9** Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- PSI-10** Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- PSI-11** Require new or expanded entitlements for water supplies to serve the project;
- PSI-12** Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments;

- PSI-13** Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs;
- PSI-14** Fail to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

4. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

- PSI-1 Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact PSI-1 Annexation and subsequent acquisition of land, absent further land use changes, would not affect traffic safety. Access to preserves eventually acquired after annexation could slightly increase use of winding, steep roads that could become hazardous depending on the amount and type (trucks, cars, motorcycles, etc.) of traffic. Under Policy 2b of the *Basic Policy of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District* (1999), the District may delay or limit access due to factors including potential safety hazards. Unsafe access to a preserve would be such a potential hazard that would be considered by the District in planning use of open space preserves, but the existing policy does not definitively state that such hazards must be avoided. Implementation of Mitigation PSI-1a would reduce this potential significant effect to a less than significant level.

Significant hazards to pedestrians and equestrians could occur as a result of excessive speed of cyclists on trails. Current District regulations include a 15 mile per hour speed limit and signage, which based on the District's experience have been effective in controlling speed hazards over a variety of trails. Therefore, the Mitigation PSI-1b would reduce the potential for hazards from excessive speeds to a less than significant level.

In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-1b will further ensure that the proposed project and subsequent actions will not substantially increase hazards to trail users. For a complete discussion of other potential hazards not related to public services and infrastructure, please see Chapter IV.D. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Mitigation PSI-1a The District will not permit access in places where the access would create a hazard due to a design feature such as a sharp curve or dangerous intersection.

Mitigation PSI-1b A maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be placed on all trails that permit cyclists and other trail users (e.g., pedestrian, equestrian). Signs shall be located at trail entrances that indicate that a speed limit is in effect.

- PSI-2 Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact PSI-2 As discussed above, opening up areas to the public could cause a slight increase in fire risk. Any fires would likely receive response from CDF. The County Sheriff's Department also anticipates a need for additional responses to preserves. Both agencies require adequate access to future preserves to allow for sufficient emergency response. The Coastal Annexation Area is covered by an extensive system of roads that would provide access

by fire prevention vehicles to most areas. In the event of a lack of adequate emergency access there would be a significant impact because it may preclude adequate response time by public safety agencies. Implementation of Mitigation PSI-2 would reduce this potential significant impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation PSI-2 The following Implementation Action G.6.E(i) shall be added to the Draft Service Plan to ensure adequate emergency access:

Policy	Description
G.6.E(i)	As a part of planning for public safety, the District will ensure that each preserve has adequate emergency access land and the paths and roadways of an open space area are documented and maps are distributed to local fire and police stations prior to opening a preserve to the public.

PSI-3 Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-3 The Coastal Annexation Area is located within an area characterized by CDF as a “wildland area that may contain substantial forest fire risks and hazards.” As a result, property owners including the District are subject to the maintenance requirements of Section 4291 of the Public Resources Code, which require a property owner to maintain a firebreak along property lines, and adjacent to all buildings and structures.

Acquisition of land, absent further land use changes, would not affect public safety, including the need for additional fire protection. Once preserves are opened up to public use, however, the fire risk may increase slightly. With the exception of one backpack camp, which allows camp stoves, camping, outdoor cooking, and fires are not allowed at any time in District open space preserves. A slight increase in the risk of fire from arson and cigarettes could occur (although smoking is prohibited in the District’s Preserves); however, this slight risk would not require construction of additional fire stations. The Coastal Annexation Area is covered by an extensive system of roads that would provide access by fire protection vehicles to most areas. The District intends to routinely patrol lands it manages or owns with District rangers equipped with pump trucks capable of providing limited, but immediate first response to a fire. These District rangers, who are trained in wildland fire suppression, patrol all existing District parcels on a regular basis and would patrol all new parcels acquired or managed under this project. San Mateo County also provides fire protection within unincorporated areas of the county. In addition, whenever CDF declares an extreme fire hazard, the District adheres to a policy of closing its open space preserves by posting notices at all known entrances.

The San Mateo County Sheriff’s Department provides police protection services to the unincorporated areas of San Mateo County. District rangers, who are sworn peace officers, would also routinely patrol any newly acquired parcels as part of this project an average of once a day on weekdays and twice a day on weekends. District rangers respond to emergency situations on existing District lands 24 hours a day. Although the Sheriff’s Department expects that the number of service calls on District acquired or managed parcels would increase under the project due to increased public access, the Sheriff’s Department anticipates that an active management program by the District will help reduce the overall service impact on the

Department. The Department does not anticipate the need to hire additional staff as a result of the annexation (see the Fiscal Analysis).

Neither the District annexation of Coastal Annexation Area into District boundaries or subsequent acquisition or management of properties would change the public agencies presently providing services to the site. For example, if CDF is providing fire protection services to a given parcel, that arrangement will remain unchanged.

The proposed project would not generate any residents directly or indirectly because the District is a public agency that acquires and manages open space preserves. Existing housing on acquired properties may be retained, but no new housing or any other action that would increase the number of school children living in the Coastal Annexation Area will be proposed on newly acquired lands as part of this project. The proposed project would therefore not impact nearby schools or create a need for new school facilities. Likewise, purchase of properties by the District will eventually allow public access to existing trails but would not result in need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, other than the proposed field office. No other public facilities would be impacted by the proposed project.

PSI-4 Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-4 Annexation and acquisition of land, absent further land use changes, would not affect traffic. Once preserves are opened up to public use, however, the majority of visitors would arrive via car. The District expects that the majority of preserve visitors would come from the Bayside via State Routes 1, 92, and, to a lesser extent State Route 84. Based on the District's experience at its other open space preserves, additional traffic would be limited primarily to weekends. This traffic would be somewhat dispersed throughout the day. The average hiker, based on the District experience with its other open space preserves, would stay an estimated four hours. Visitation occurs throughout the day, beginning at sunrise and ending at sunset. The number of hikers would depend on weather conditions. Although traffic on the main arterial (State Routes 1 and 92) can be extremely heavy on peak weekends, the small number of anticipated open space visitors in comparison to the much greater number of visitors generated by the Coastal Annexation Area's beaches and other attractions would generate an insignificant amount of additional traffic at these peak times.

To better determine the potential increase in traffic associated with future preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area, traffic counts were taken by Hexagon Transportation Consultants during the weekend of July 7 and 8, 2001, at two of the District's existing preserves: Windy Hill (1,132 acres) and Purisima Creek (2,633 acre; see Table IV-C-1). These two preserves were chosen because they are representative of the predominant land types and staging areas that would be typical of the Coastal Annexation Area. (Windy Hill has grasslands and chaparral and a large staging area, whereas Purisima Creek has deep canyons with redwood forest and a small staging area.) This weekend was chosen because it represented a high use summer weekend and thus allowed for assessment of peak-use impacts. The 1,132 acre Windy Hill Open Space Preserve generated a total of 34 trips per peak hour¹ (1 trip represents 1 car going both in and out of the parking lot) , an average of 1 trip per roughly 33 acres. The 2,633 acre Purisima Creek

¹ 1 hour between 12 PM and 3 PM
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
San Mateo Coastal Area Annexation

Open Space Preserve generated a total of 83 trips per peak hour, an average of 1 trip per roughly 31 acres of preserves.

Based on this data, the current trip generation for preserves was assumed to be 1 trip per 32 acres. If 12,000 acres² were added today, the total trip generation for that acreage would be 383 trips, spread out amongst all the existing roadways. Table IV-C-2 is a Summary of Existing Saturday Peak Hour Traffic Volumes. Generation of an additional 383 trips would not cause a substantial increase in traffic such that the LOS would worsen at any intersection within the Coastal Annexation Area. The project would not cause traffic volumes to exceed the LOS levels deemed acceptable by the City of Half Moon Bay (LOS C except during the 2-hour commuting period and the 10-day average peak recreational hour when LOS E is acceptable) and the County (LOS E during recreation peak periods). Based on existing traffic volumes, the projected number of trips generated by land and easement acquisition over the next 15 years in the Coastal Annexation Area, and the LOS standards set by the City of Half Moon Bay and the County, the project would not cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to existing traffic loads and street capacity.

Table IV-C-1
Summary of Saturday Peak Hour Traffic Counts

Location	Trips		
	In	Out	Total
Windy Hill N Entrance	6	8	14
Windy Hill E Entrance	6	4	10
Spring Hill Entrance	6	4	10
Total, Windy Hill	18	16	34
Purisima Creek N Entrance	18	22	40
Purisima Creek E Entrance	8	4	12
Purisima Creek W Entrance	12	19	31
Total, Purisima Creek	38	45	83

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, 2001

Table IV-C-2
Summary of Saturday Peak Hour Traffic

Road	Location	Existing Traffic Volume*	Capacity**
Route 1	Route 84 - Tunitas Creek Road	1002	2800
	Main Street - Half Moon Bay Road	1297	2800
Skyline Blvd.	Alpine Road - Woodside Dr.	191	2800
	Kings Mountain Road - State Route 92	180	2800
	State Route 92 - Interstate 280	443	2800

² Based on a cumulative total of 12,000 acres after 15 years. See Table II-1 for more information.

Road	Location	Existing Traffic Volume*	Capacity**
State Route 84	Skyline Blvd. - Woodside	469	2800
	Woodside - Portola Road	387	2800
	Kings Mountain Road - Whiskey Hill Road	794	2800
State Route 92	Whiskey Hill Road - Interstate 280	2108	2800
	Route 1 - Half Moon Bay	1677	2800
	Half Moon Bay - Skyline Blvd.	1995	2800
	Skyline Blvd. - Interstate 280	1591	2800

Note– All counts were done between March - August 2001.

*Existing traffic volumes are combined traffic volumes in both directions of travel.

**Maximum standard total capacity of a typical two-lane, undivided road.

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, 2001

PSI-5 Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-5 See response above.

PSI-6 Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-6 Adequate parking would be provided for all new preserves acquired under this project. It is anticipated that two minor staging areas (12 to 20 parking spaces) and two major staging areas (40 to 60 parking spaces) would be constructed over a 15 year period. Nine miles of new trails would be constructed during this 15 year period. In addition, roadside pullouts are used at some preserves to provide parking. Based on a visitor survey conducted at two existing District Open Space facilities, 30 cars can be typically expected during a peak weekend hour.³ Many preserve visitors would be expected to stay for more than an hour. The proposed number of parking spaces, then, would be adequate to handle the expected number of visitors.

³ The summary of Saturday Peak Hour Traffic Counts (Table IV-C-1) shows that two existing preserves generated between 34 and 83 total trips during the peak hour. The total of this number, divided by 2 [2 preserves] equals the median trips for these two preserves, which is 59. Therefore, the median trip generation for typical existing open space preserves is 59. One car accounts for two trips [in and out], so the actual median number of cars is 30 [59 divided by 2]. Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, 2001. For full report, see Appendix E .

The traffic count was performed during a the afternoon on a peak summer weekend [July 7 and 8, 2001], at two current preserves: Windy Hill and Purisima Creek. While these preserves are different in character and staging area size, they represent lands typical of the Coastal Annexation Area.

PSI-7 Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-7 When opened to the public, lands acquired under the proposed project would not conflict with adopted polices supporting alternative transportation.

PSI-8 Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-8 Annexation and acquisition of land, absent further land use changes, would not affect wastewater. There would be no new sources of wastewater beyond the new field office and maintenance facilities under the proposed project, which would contribute an insignificant amount of wastewater to existing treatment systems. All new preserves acquired under the proposed project will have self-contained (chemical) toilets.

PSI-9 Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-9 There would be no new hookups of water service beyond the field office and maintenance facilities under the proposed project. The effects of providing water service to the new field office and maintenance buildings would not be significant, as the demands of these buildings will be minimal. Any visitor-serving facilities on new preserves would not have water hookups; therefore, the project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

PSI-10 Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-10 Annexation and acquisition of land, absent further land use changes, would not affect drainage. Opening up preserves to the public would not require construction or expansion of major storm drainage facilities such as pipelines, pumping stations, or other public infrastructure. The District would propose only low intensity use of its preserves, which would not require installation of impervious surfaces but may require installation of culverts to direct water away from staging areas and trailheads. Such improvements would not involve construction of public infrastructure and would not constitute significant impacts to public storm water drainage facilities. The impacts of the minor storm drainage improvements, such as culverts, on hydrological resources and mitigation for those impacts are addressed in Mitigation Measures HYD-1 through HYD-2 in Chapter IV-H Hydrology.

PSI-11 Would the project require new or expanded entitlements for water supplies?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-11 Water would not be supplied at staging areas. The small number of staff that might be located in the Coastal Annexation Area at the new District field office and maintenance facility would only add a de minimus amount of increased demand for water. Any restoration activities or agricultural operations that might occur on District parcels would be conducted in accordance with existing water rights. The proposed project would not require additional water entitlements.

PSI-12 Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-12 The proposed project would not require a wastewater treatment provider, because each preserve would use either vault or self-contained (chemical) toilets.

PSI-13 Would the project be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-13 The District does not provide trash cans at its preserves to minimize the accumulation of trash that can attract rodents and create an eyesore. Trail users are expected to pack out their garbage. The small number of staff that might be located in the Coastal Annexation Area would only add a de minimus amount of increased demand for landfill capacity. Therefore the project would be expected to generate only an insignificant increase in solid waste in the area.

PSI-14 Would the project fail to comply with statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact PSI-14 The District does not provide waste collection services. Any solid waste generated by District staff would be disposed of in accordance with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations.

D. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The purpose of this section is to evaluate potential hazards to the public from implementation of the annexation or to staff and visitors to MROSD managed land in the annexation area.

Overall, the risk is small: the District uses hazardous materials such as petroleum fuels and pesticides under specifically regulated circumstances and external hazards can be managed fully with site-specific facilities planning. The biggest public hazard in the Coastal Annexation Area is wildland fires; however, the Coastal Annexation Area is generally cooler and more humid than the inner ranges and is moderate (the lowest category) to high fire risk.

Factors contributing to higher risk are frequency of critical fire weather, slope and fuel load; there have been few wildland fires in this area. The Coastal Annexation Area is generally cooler and more humid than the inner ranges and has a low frequency of critical fire weather. Terrain in the skyline area is steep, frequently in the 40 to 60% range, which is a higher risk factor. Roughly one quarter of the annexation area is in brush or woodland (see Map 15, Vegetation). Of these, the chaparral is the more prone to wildland fire; redwood woodland is not generally a high fire risk forest type.

Hazard from petroleum fuels is avoided by routine good housekeeping practices and vehicle maintenance. Hazard from pesticides is avoided by existing District policies which require selection of low toxicity products and application in accordance with a prepared integrated pest management plan. Further, any pesticide use would be in compliance with state and federal law, would be done only in accordance with the label and any safety and environmental restrictions, and per State Law, would be done under a site-specific prescription from a licensed Pest Control Advisor, and usage would be reported to the County Agricultural Commissioner monthly.

Mitigation of other hazards discussed in this section would include adequate survey and remediation of hazards. Typically, this would be done in a so-called "Phase I" real estate report prior to land purchase. Generally, the Districts conducts a Phase I report either by retaining a qualified consultant, or by performing an equivalent study using experienced in-house staff. Such a report looks at historical use in areas prone to accumulation of hazardous materials (barns, tanks, vehicle storage areas, gas wells and pipelines, etc.) to identify any hazards. Since the Coastal Annexation Area project contemplates the purchase of large tracts of open space, the presence of hazardous waste is rare, and, when it does occur, is very minor (e.g. a small underground gas storage tank or small amounts of paint cans or debris). Preparation of a Phase I report would thus reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

The one airport in the Coastal Annexation Area would not represent a likely safety hazard to the typical low intensity recreational uses that would be allowed on District lands. Conversely, the District would not build tall buildings, towers, or other aircraft hazards.

1. Existing Setting

The Coastal Annexation Area has never been subject to the level of industrial development experienced on the Bayside, and consequently, the presence of hazardous materials is inherently lower. Coastal Annexation Area agriculture uses petroleum products, fertilizers, and pesticides. Some active or abandoned agricultural sites may have hazardous materials present

in containers, tanks, or as soil contamination. The Coastal Annexation Area has several active and several abandoned oil and gas wells.

The County operates an airport two miles north of Half Moon Bay, just west of Highway 1. No other airstrip is shown for the annexation area on the Federal Aviation Administration San Francisco VFR Terminal Area Chart.

Wildland fire also poses a public hazard. The Coastal Annexation Area is generally cooler and more humid than the inner ranges and is moderate (the lowest category) to high fire risk (California Department of Forestry of Fire Protection 2002). There have been few wildland fires in this area. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection fuel hazard ranking methodology assigns ranks based on expected fire behavior for combinations of topography and vegetative fuels. The methodology is incorporated in the County General Plan supporting study on Natural Hazards, Table 15.3. Factors contributing to higher risk are frequency of critical fire weather, slope and fuel load. The Coastal Annexation Area has a low frequency of critical fire weather. Terrain in the skyline area is steep, frequently in the 40 to 60% range, a higher risk factor. Roughly one quarter of the annexation area is in brush or woodland (see Map 13, Vegetation). Of these, the chaparral is the more prone to wildland fire; redwood woodland is not generally a high fire risk forest type.

2. Applicable Policies and Regulations

a. Regulatory Definition

A material is considered hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a federal, state, or local agency, or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency. Chemical and physical properties cause a substance to be considered hazardous, including the properties of toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, and reactivity. These properties are defined in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Sections 66261.20-66261.24. A "hazardous waste" is any hazardous material that is discarded, abandoned, or to be recycled. The criteria that render a material hazardous also make a waste hazardous (California Health and Safety Code, Section 25117).

According to this definition, fuels, motor oil, and lubricants at a typical construction site and pesticides in concentrated form could be considered hazardous. Excavation may expose buried hazardous materials resulting from prior use of the proposed site or adjacent property.

Wildland fire hazard is defined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. See discussion under San Mateo County General Plan, below.

b. Regulations from Other Agencies and Jurisdictions

The following policies are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects related to hazards and hazardous materials. Conformance with these policies will avoid or minimize adverse impacts. The Use and Management Plans subsequently prepared by the District will include review for consistency with these policies.

1) Half Moon Bay General Plan

The City's General Plan Chapter 4 addresses hazards from the perspective of siting urban development. The concern is for minimizing risk to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.

2) San Mateo County General Plan

The County General Plan includes Policy 7.6, Natural and Man-made Hazards, "Designate land uses in order to minimize the danger of natural and man-made hazards to life and property." The Plan specifically addresses airport safety (policies 16.35 through 16.46) and hazardous materials (policies 16.47 through 16.67) of which, policy 16.59 is most relevant.

16.59 Regulate Against Environmental Contamination Resulting From Rural Development, Agriculture and Oil and Gas Well Operations

3. Significance Criteria

A project would be normally considered to have a significant hazardous effect if it would:

- HAZ-1** Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through:
- the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
 - reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
 - hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or
 - being located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
- HAZ-2** Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death; involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands;
- HAZ-3** Expose people to any other significant health or safety hazards.
- HAZ-4** Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area where the project is 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, or
 - within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- HAZ-5** Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;

4. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

HAZ-1 Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through:

- **the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;**
- **reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;**
- **hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or**
- **being located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5?**

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact HAZ-1 Annexation itself will have no environmental effect, although subsequent actions could have potential impacts. Open space and recreational uses per se typically do not entail use of hazardous materials. District management of lands may involve construction of support facilities and trails, and ongoing use of petroleum fuels and in some circumstances, pesticides. The district employs integrated pest management, which may include the use of herbicides along with non-herbicide methods for controlling noxious weeds and invasive non-native plant species.

Hazard from petroleum fuels is avoided by routine good housekeeping practices and vehicle maintenance. Hazard from pesticides is avoided by existing District policies which require selection of low toxicity products and application in accordance with a prepared integrated pest management plan. Further, any pesticide use would be in compliance with state and federal law, would be done only in accordance with the label and any safety and environmental restrictions, per State Law, would be done under a site-specific prescription from a licensed Pest Control Advisor, and usage would be reported to the County Agricultural Commissioner monthly. These practices will ensure the pesticide use has no adverse affect on lands within the Coastal Annexation Area.

While undeveloped lands typically do not contain hazardous wastes, acquired lands could contain hazardous materials such as leaking fuel storage tanks, agricultural chemicals, asbestos, or abandoned oil or gas wells. If such a site is not properly remediated, the public, including students at nearby schools, and the environment could be exposed to hazardous materials. Under certain circumstances, this exposure would be a significant impact.

Mitigation of other hazards discussed in this section would include adequate survey and remediation of hazards. Typically, this would be done either in a so-called Phase I real estate report prior to land purchase, or an equivalent analysis conducted by District staff. The goal of a Phase I would be to identify any hazards. Generally, the District conducts a Phase I report either by retaining a qualified consultant or, by performing an equivalent study using experienced in-house staff. Such a report looks at historical use in areas especially prone to accumulation of hazardous materials and waste (barns, tanks, vehicle storage areas, gas wells and pipelines, etc.). If present, further work would be done under Phases II and/or III (mechanisms for development and implementation of a remediation plan that would comply with applicable laws and policies). Implementation of Mitigation HAZ-1 would reduce the potential significant adverse effects from hazardous materials to a less than significant level.

Mitigation HAZ-1 The District shall complete the equivalent of a Phase I real estate report. The report shall identify by reviewing local, state, or federal government hazardous sites lists prior to acquiring a property to determine if the area is a hazardous materials site. The following resources and agencies can be consulted:

- Federal and state database information
- Water Quality Control Board (San Francisco Bay Region)
- San Mateo County Health Services Agency

If a parcel is found to contain a hazardous materials site, trails, staging areas, or other facilities will not be constructed on the parcel until plans can be developed and implemented to either remediate the hazard or ensure that the public will not have access to hazardous areas.

HAZ-2 Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact HAZ-2 District acquisition or management of land alone would not increase fire risk or expose the public to risk. Once preserves are opened up to public use, however, the fire risk may increase slightly. With the exception of one backpack camp, which allows camp stoves, camping, outdoor cooking, and fires are not allowed at any time in District open space preserves. A slight increase in the risk of fire from arson and cigarettes could occur (although smoking is prohibited in the District's Preserves).

Based on the District's existing management of 45,000 acres of steep and heavily vegetated lands on the Bay side of the Peninsula, public access to District-managed lands does not present a significant risk of loss, injuries, or death as a result of wildland fire. While fire protection within the current District boundaries is provided by local fire departments and the California Department of Forestry (CDF), the District works cooperatively with these departments to reduce fire risk and respond quickly and effectively to wildland fires. The District maintains fire breaks to slow or arrest the spread of wildland fires, and a system of District maintained fire roads ensures improved access to remote areas. District lands are patrolled routinely by trained staff members in vehicles equipped with wildland fire fighting tools and equipment, often providing first response or augmenting CDF or local fire districts' wildland fire suppression efforts (also see discussion under Section IV.C. Public Services). The addition of District staff presence will result in an increased capacity to detect and respond to fires early. District action under Resource Management Policy 3.3, "Restore fire to a more natural role in preserving ecosystems", is relevant in the Coastal Annexation Area. Over the life of the project, District presence would provide a net reduction in area wildland fire risk.

Although the project would not expose the public to significant risk from fire, it would increase the need for coordination with other agencies in fire suppression. This coordination is necessary to ensure swift and adequate response to wildland fire. Implementation of Mitigation HAZ-2a-c would ensure that potential impacts from wildland fires would be less than significant.

Mitigation HAZ-2a During preparation of plans for specific facilities, the District shall:

1. Review, in conjunction with the local fire protection services, available water sources.

2. Select indigenous plant materials and/or seed mixes utilized at staging areas or along trails for their low maintenance and drought and fire resistant characteristics to minimize additional fuel available to wildland fires to the extent feasible.

Mitigation HAZ-2b Where compatible with other trail characteristics, planners shall locate trail alignments and access points to allow trails to also serve as emergency access routes for patrol or emergency medical transport. Where feasible for more remote areas, emergency helicopter landing sites shall be provided.

Mitigation HAZ-2c The District shall coordinate with appropriate agencies such as the County and California Department of Forestry (CDF) to formalize mutual aid agreements.

HAZ-3 Would the project expose people to any other significant health or safety hazards?

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact HAZ-3 District acquisition or management of land alone would not increase public exposure to other significant health or safety hazards. However, use of future District facilities, including trails, could adversely affect trail users. For example, new trails in areas of active timber harvesting or agriculture production could cause hazards to trail users; natural hazards, such as fires or heavy storms, may make trail conditions hazardous; or trail users may get lost or disoriented, or may need emergency services. Application of the following mitigation measures will reduce these effects to less than significant levels:

Mitigation HAZ-3a The District shall routinely monitor trails and provide regular maintenance to avoid public exposure to hazardous conditions. Trails or other facilities shall be closed for construction or repair, or when another hazardous condition exists (e.g. landslide during flooding or extremely wet weather) that renders trail use especially hazardous, or where adjacent land uses may present unsafe conditions that could affect open space users. Where use limitations or closures are in place, the area shall be clearly designated and shall be equipped with use signs and appropriate barriers to discourage unauthorized use. Missing or damaged signs, gates, fences, and barriers shall be repaired or replaced as soon as possible. Closure notices shall include the reason(s) for the closure, an estimate of how long the facility will be closed, and a telephone number to call for further information.

Mitigation HAZ-3b District preserve maps for the public shall be kept up-to-date to the extent feasible. Trail maps shall also provide trail use rules, emergency information, trail accessibility, other pertinent safety information and shall be available at all staging areas.

See also Mitigation Measures LU-1a and LU-1b, which specify that trail structures such as fences, barriers, and signs be used to deter trail users in areas where trails would pass potentially hazardous adjacent land uses (e.g. timber operations).

HAZ-4 Would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area where the project is 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, or**
- **within the vicinity of a private airstrip?**

No Impact.

Impact HAZ-4 Only one airstrip, at Half Moon Bay, is in the area. This airport would not represent a safety hazard to the typical low intensity recreational uses that would be allowed on District lands. Conversely, the District would not build tall buildings, towers, or other aircraft hazards.

HAZ-5 **Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

No Impact.

Impact HAZ-5 The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Coastal Annexation and resulting low-intensity recreational use would only bring small numbers of additional people into areas that are now closed to the public. This small number of recreational users would not significantly impair emergency response or evacuation.

E. Noise

This section considers potential impacts of existing noise on open space use objectives of the District and of potential for open space use itself to increase noise.

For the few major highways, traffic levels are such that the 60 CNEL level is exceeded closer than distances of 500 feet; for most rural roads, levels drop below 60 CNEL after only a few hundred feet. (CNEL is a time-weighted average sound level with noise in the evening [7:00 to 10:00 pm] and at night [10:00 pm to 7:00 am] counted more by adding a 5 dB and 10 dB “penalty” respectively.) Aircraft overflights are less frequent in the Coastal Annexation Area than on the Bayside and do not contribute materially to elevated ambient noise levels. The Half Moon Bay County Airport is used only for light, propeller general aviation aircraft and experiences relatively low usage compared with commercial airports on the Bayside.

There are no directly applicable noise standards for open space use in either District, City or County plans. Interpreting the spirit of the District objectives, open space could be considered a “noise sensitive land use” per the County definition and would be impaired where noise levels exceed 60 CNEL. This means that the open space enjoyment would be less in areas close to the busy highways: State Highway 92 and 1. While an open space acquisition may adjoin these highways, the majority of the acquisition would likely extend farther than the approximately 500 feet which marks the 60 CNEL contour. The higher noise near access points and staging areas would not significantly impact the overall recreational value of the open space.

Recreational use on District lands has limited noise potential: motor vehicles are prohibited and recreation is low intensity trail use. The greater potential for noise would come from staging areas with increased vehicular access, but here too, the numbers involved are low and usage is confined to daytime so that noise impact would not be significant.

1. Existing Setting

The noise environment of the coastal area is influenced by human activity: noise levels are higher near heavily traveled roads and are sporadic around agriculture. On the whole, the low density of development and low intensity use makes the area quiet.

For the few major highways, traffic levels are such that the 60 CNEL level is exceeded closer than distances of 500 feet; for most rural roads, levels drop below 60 CNEL after only a few hundred feet. Aircraft overflights are less frequent than on the Bayside and do not contribute materially to elevated ambient noise levels. The Half Moon Bay County Airport is used only for light, propeller general aviation aircraft and experiences relatively low usage compared with commercial airports on the Bayside.

2. Applicable Policies and Regulations

a. Half Moon Bay General Plan

The City General Plan defines the relationship between land uses and acceptable community noise exposure and establishes a series of policies directed at incorporating noise considerations

into land use planning decisions, and reducing traffic and other noise sources. In specifying noise standards for land use, the City does not set a quantitative noise level for open space as it does for other land uses.

b. San Mateo County General Plan

The County General Plan Policy, 16.7 Definition of Noise Sensitive Land Uses, does not specifically identify open space as a noise sensitive land use. The County defines quiet areas as areas with perceived low ambient noise levels and Noise Impact Areas as those areas experiencing noise levels of 60 CNEL or greater. The intent is to regulate the distribution of land uses to attain noise compatibility.

3. Significance Criteria

The project would be considered to have a significant effect on noise levels if it would cause:

- NOI-1** Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;
- NOI-2** Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels or a substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
- NOI-3** Exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels where the project is within the vicinity of a private airstrip, 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.

4. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

- NOI-1** **Would the project expose persons to or cause generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

No Impact.

Impact NOI-1 There are no directly applicable standards for open space use in either District, City or County plans. Interpreting the spirit of the District objectives, open space could be considered a “noise sensitive land use” per the County definition and would be impaired where noise levels exceed 60 CNEL. This means that the open space enjoyment would be within a few hundred feet of the busy highways: State Highway 92 and 1. While an open space acquisition may include area proximate to these highways for access, the great majority of the acquisition and the portion of any site used for recreation would be away from the road, beyond the 60 CNEL contour. The higher noise near the access point and staging area would not significantly impact the overall recreational value of the open space.

NOI-2 Would the project expose persons to or cause generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels or a substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact.

Impact NOI-2 Recreational use of the type allowed on District lands has limited noise potential: motor vehicles are prohibited and recreation consists primarily of low intensity trail use. The greater potential for noise would come from staging areas with increased vehicular access, but here too, the numbers involved are low and usage is confined to daytime so that noise impacts would not be significant. District policy requires that noise along with other "good neighbor" matters be considered in the planning of facilities.

The potential for noise from future MROSD Coastside facilities is similar to noise from existing Bayside facilities. Noise and traffic measurements at two existing recreational access points were made to quantify the potential impact. Thomas Reid Associates (TRA) deployed noise meters at Windy Hill and Purisima Creek Redwoods Preserves to measure busy weekend-use noise levels at these parks (from midday Friday, July 6 to midday Monday, July 9, 2001).

The meter at Windy Hill Preserve was placed at the Portola Road entrance, 50 feet from the end of the parking lot and the bathroom, among thistles in the vicinity of the trailhead. The meter at Purisima Creek Preserve was placed at the western entrance accessed from Highway 1, 50 feet upslope from the parking lot, at the foot of a redwood tree, on the hill next to the parking lot, opposite Purissima Creek. The meters were calibrated, synchronized, and set to measure sound levels continuously, recording statistics in one-hour intervals.

The parking lot at the Portola Road entrance to Windy Hill Preserve has space for an estimated 45-50 vehicles, and 8 bicycles. Sounds heard at Windy Hill include a few hikers, a few parking cars, traffic on Portola Road, birds, insects, and the wind blowing through tree leaves.

The smaller parking lot at the western entrance to Purisima Creek Preserve has space for about 7 cars, with additional space on the road passing by the parking lot. There was little traffic on this road during the weekday visits to drop off and retrieve the noise meter, however the parking lot was full during each visit. Sounds include hikers, a school field trip group, the wind in tree leaves, Purissima Creek, passing and parking vehicles, birds, and insects.

Average sound levels (one hour Leq) show a common pattern throughout the day at both sites: rising in the morning to the 42 dBA to 46 dB range and diminishing in the evening to the 37 dB to 42 dB range. Windy Hill was on average 2 dB noisier than Purisima Creek. Part of the daytime noise rise is from human activity, notably traffic, and the levels recorded correspond to estimates of noise from the relatively light traffic measured for the same period. Natural noise can dominate human sources on windy days, or when animals such as the Pacific tree frog are active. The sound levels observed for these two preserves would be considered compatible for residential use in both City and County General Plans.

Any facilities built would be small, and similar in scope to the paving and construction of a small single family dwelling. Construction impacts would be temporary and typical of minor improvements.

NOI-3 **Would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels where the project is within the vicinity of a private airstrip, 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?**

No Impact.

Impact NOI-3 Noise levels around the Half Moon Bay Airport are not such to preclude open space and recreational use.

F. Air Quality

The purpose of this section is to evaluate potential air quality impacts associated with the project. The annexation area is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), in the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The region is designated as a “non-attainment” area (i.e., currently experiences violations) with respect to state and national ambient air quality standards for ozone, as well as state standards for respirable particulate matter (PM-10).

The project could temporarily affect air quality during grading for access roads and parking areas, which could generate fugitive dust, including PM-10. Dust emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the level and type of activity, silt content of the soil, and the prevailing weather. A large portion of the total dust emissions would result from equipment and motor vehicle traffic over dirt and gravel roads and parking areas. Other sources of fugitive dust may include earth movement, grading, and wind erosion from exposed surfaces. If the District removes structures, demolition could also temporarily affect air quality. The principal concern would be PM-10. Older buildings may also include materials containing asbestos, which could be disturbed during demolition and released into the atmosphere. These temporary impacts could be significant. Mitigation measures can be applied to reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Potential emissions from use of District open space or from vehicular access is insignificant. Construction of district improvements such as trails and parking areas may require heavy equipment. Some of this equipment would be diesel. The odor of the exhaust would be considered objectionable. Other than the workers involved in the construction, however, only a limited number of people would likely be exposed to the exhaust. Due to the temporary nature of the emissions and the limited number of people who would be exposed, the diesel odors would be a less than significant effect.

1. Existing Setting

The Coastal Annexation Area enjoys good air quality due to the ventilation of the prevailing westerly wind and the lack of large point sources or heavy transportation corridors. PM10 levels reflect dust from soil disturbance in agriculture and along paved and unpaved roads, smoke from wood fires, and aerosol from ocean spray. Internal combustion engines and vehicular use are minor contributors.

The annexation area is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), in the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The region is designated as a “non-attainment” area (i.e., currently experiences violations) with respect to state and national ambient air quality standards for ozone, as well as state standards for respirable particulate matter (PM-10). The Bay Area is also designated as a “maintenance” area with respect to carbon monoxide standards. The “maintenance” designation corresponds to areas that had once been designated as “non-attainment” for a given pollutant, but have since been re-designated in recognition of having achieved the standard.

Dust, mist, ash, smoke and fumes are some of the liquid or solid particles found in the atmosphere. In many parts of the world, natural particles like dust and pollens are the principal source of air pollution; in industrialized regions, particulate emissions caused by human activities predominate. Smoke, composed of carbon and other products of incomplete combustion, is the

most obvious form of particulate pollution. Open fires, incinerators, petroleum refining, and fuel burning in vehicles and aircraft all produce these highly visible particulates.

Almost 70 percent of the Bay Area's carbon monoxide comes from motor vehicles. A substantial amount also comes from burning wood in fireplaces and woodstoves. State and federal controls on new cars and voluntary efforts to reduce woodburning have been implemented to prevent carbon monoxide from reaching adverse levels. The Bay Area has not exceeded the national or state standard for carbon monoxide for several years and is now formally recognized as an attainment area for CO.

2. Applicable Policies and Regulations

a. Bay Area Air Quality Management District

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) was created by the California Legislature in 1955. The District's jurisdiction encompasses all of seven counties—Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Napa, and portions of two others—southwestern Solano and southern Sonoma. BAAQMD monitors and enforces District, State of California and Federal air quality standards. The Bay Area is in attainment for all national standards set forth in the federal Clean Air Act, but is in non-attainment for California standards for two pollutants, ozone and fine particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM¹⁰). All other pollutants are designated as “attainment” or “unclassified” for federal standards and as an “attainment” area for the state standard.

b. Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan

As required by Health and Safety Code Sections 40924 and 40925, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (District) has prepared the Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan (2000 CAP). The 2000 CAP is a minor modification and update of the 1991 Clean Air Plan, a strategy to reduce emissions of ozone precursors in order to attain State ambient air quality standards for ground-level ozone in the San Francisco Bay Area. The 2000 CAP continues the air pollution reduction strategy established by the 1991 CAP. The 2000 CAP is the third triennial update to the 1991 CAP, following previous updates in 1994 and 1997.

3. Significance Criteria

The project would be considered to have a significant effect on air quality if it would:

- AIR-1** 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);
- AIR-2** Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, violate any air quality standard, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- AIR-3** Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

4. **Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

AIR-1 **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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact AIR-1 The project could temporarily affect air quality during grading for access roads and parking areas, which could generate fugitive dust, including PM-10. Consistent with BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines, air emissions from construction were not quantified. Dust emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the level and type of activity, silt content of the soil, and the prevailing weather. A large portion of the total dust emissions would result from equipment and motor vehicle traffic over dirt and gravel roads and parking areas. Other sources of fugitive dust may include earth movement, grading, and wind erosion from exposed surfaces. If the District removes structures, demolition could also temporarily affect air quality. The principal concern would be PM-10. Older buildings may also include materials containing asbestos, which could be disturbed during demolition and released into the atmosphere. PM¹⁰ emissions from construction sites are considered to be cumulatively significant enough to require that standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) be employed to minimize these emissions. (BAAQMD 1996, pp.12-14). These temporary impacts could be significant. The following mitigation measures can be applied to reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Over the long-term, the project would affect air quality through generation of motor vehicle trips as parcels are opened to the public. Such trips result in combustion products, including reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides, that are precursors to regional ozone and PM-10 formation. The pollutant of concern with respect to local traffic is carbon monoxide. However, based on the District's experience with open space preserves, changes in peak traffic volumes would be minor and overall use levels are low compared to intensively developed recreational facilities. None of the roadways or intersections on the coastside remotely approach the density of vehicles that could result in concentrations of carbon monoxide approaching the State standard.

Mitigation AIR-1 The District shall insure that the following measures are included in all future construction contracts to control fugitive dust emissions:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to existing land uses shall be kept damp at all times, or shall be treated with non-toxic stabilizers or dust palliatives;
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials and/or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas for construction sites;
- Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites;
- Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets;
- Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas;

- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to any exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.);
- ◻ Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.;
- ◻ Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways;
- ◻ Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible;
- ◻ Suspend excavation and grading activity whenever the wind is so high that it results in visible dust plumes despite control efforts.

AIR-2 Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, violate any air quality standard, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

No Impact.

Impact AIR-2 Except for PM10 discussed in AIR-3 below, potential emissions from use of District open space or from vehicular access are insignificant and would not obstruct the Bay Area attainment plan. The attainment plan is predicated on a substantial amount of automobile use for business, commuting, and personal travel. As discussed in this EIR section IV-C Public Services, the incremental effect of MROSD open space on the coastside is negligible in comparison with other traffic sources. It is reasonable to conclude that the small and uncertain project contribution would not materially alter the substance of the air quality plan.

AIR-3 Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No Impact.

Impact AIR-3 Potential emissions from use of District open space or from vehicular access is insignificant. Construction of district improvements such as trails and parking areas may require heavy equipment. Some of this equipment would be diesel. The odor of the exhaust would be considered objectionable. Other than the workers involved in the construction, however, only a limited number of people would likely be exposed to the exhaust. Due to the temporary nature of the emissions and the limited number of people who would be exposed, the diesel odors would be a less than significant effect.

G. Aesthetics

This section addresses the effect the project would have on the numerous scenic roadways and on unique visual resources found in the agricultural and open space lands of the Coastal Annexation Area. The District, City of Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, and the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program all recognize the unique scenic resource values that exist in the Coastal Annexation Area; indeed, acquiring more open space in the Area will ensure that more visual resources will be preserved in perpetuity.

Many of the policies listed in this section refer to development of rural lands within the Coastal Annexation Area. While managing natural resources and providing limited visitor-serving facilities for low-intensity public recreation is not "development" in the usual sense, these activities have the potential to adversely affect the visual resources; therefore, these policies are applicable. Future management of open space areas may involve limited alteration of scenic resources; all future trailheads, staging areas and other low-intensity visitor-serving facilities will comply with applicable General Plan and Local Coastal Program Policies and with the San Mateo County Grading Ordinance. Mitigation is provided that would reduce all potentially significant aesthetic impacts to a less than significant level.

Many San Mateo County residents have been vigilant in urging San Mateo County to adopt strict policies in its Local Coastal Program that control and direct urban development and so help retain the rural character of these areas. The District would take advantage of the cumulative knowledge of these residents concerning the land, its resources, and its agricultural heritage, and the District would work with them in developing specific policies and stewardship programs for the Coastal Annexation Area.

1. Existing Setting

San Mateo County is part of the San Francisco Peninsula: a narrow strip of land with the Pacific Ocean on the west and San Francisco Bay on the east. The densely forested Santa Cruz Mountains, a portion of the Coastal Range, extend north and south through the middle of the County, forming a backbone for the Peninsula. This ridge separates the County into two distinctive parts--the Bayside and the Coastside. Each part has different physical characteristics, climates, flora, and fauna. This geography, which impresses itself so dramatically upon the eye, has also made a profound impression upon the history of the area.

The Coastside is a region of wild rugged beauty isolated physically and culturally by the Santa Cruz Mountains. These mountains create barriers to the construction of major transportation arteries. They also capture the ocean fog when it spreads over the undulating coastal plain, making the Coastside a cool, damp, gray place. The Coastside's narrow fertile valleys are separated from one another by steep ridges, making travel along the coast by land difficult. The ocean provides no easy alternative. Precipitous coastal cliffs, treacherous currents and reefs threaten the sailor. Although the Coastside was settled early in the American period of San Mateo County, physical isolation and climatic conditions slowed its social and economic development. The entire coastal region remained sparsely settled until the early 1970's when urban growth began to develop in the Mid-Coast area of Half Moon Bay and the small communities of Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada to the north (An Approach to Developing A

Protection Program for the San Mateo County Coastal Zone, Prepared by the Department of Environmental Management, Planning Division, San Mateo County, Redwood City, California. September 1980).

2. Applicable Policies and Regulations

This section lists applicable policies and regulations from the three main documents that have jurisdictional authority over the Coastal Annexation Area: the policies and regulations of the San Mateo County General Plan, the Skyline Area Plan and the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP). As stated elsewhere in this document, the District would be able to purchase lands within the City of Half Moon Bay after the proposed annexation takes place, however, the District's strategic emphasis is to use its resources to primarily acquire or preserve land outside Urban Service Area boundaries of cities (District Basic Policies, p.2). Since the City of Half Moon Bay is located within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area, it is still relevant to ensure that the District's annexation mission is consistent with the City of Half Moon Bay's LUP. This discussion is found in Chapter III. The District may purchase land within the City of Half Moon Bay for a field staff office and ranger facilities. Therefore, only policies that are relevant to the operation and maintenance of these facilities are listed in this section.

Many of the policies listed in this section refer to development of rural lands within the Coastal Annexation Area. While managing natural resources and providing limited visitor-serving facilities for low-intensity public recreation is not "development" in the usual sense, these activities have the potential to adversely affect the visual resources; therefore, these policies are applicable.

a. Half Moon Bay General Plan

The City of Half Moon Bay has scenic resources of substantial importance to the satisfaction of its residents, the pleasure afforded visitors, and the economy of the City. The Coastal Act Policy reinforces the City's own determination to protect these resources for its future well-being and the value they have for those living in and visiting the City.

Policy 7-9: Siting new development to minimize destruction or significant alteration of significant existing plant communities

b. San Mateo County General Plan

The County has policies for the conservation of scenic values of rural open lands and to limit development impacts on the scenic resources of hillsides, ridgelines, vegetation, scenic transportation corridors, major county entryways, stream environments, and other areas designated as being of special scenic significance within the County:

<u>4.1</u>	<u>Protection of Visual Quality</u>
<u>4.3</u>	<u>Protection of Vegetation</u>
<u>4.21</u>	<u>Scenic Corridors</u>
<u>4.22</u>	<u>Forest Lands</u>
<u>4.25</u>	<u>Earthwork Operations</u>
<u>4.26</u>	<u>Water Bodies</u>
<u>4.27</u>	<u>Ridgelines and Skyline</u>
<u>4.28</u>	<u>Trees and Vegetation</u>
<u>4.39</u>	<u>Scenic Roads</u>

<u>4.46</u>	<u>Regulation of Development in Scenic Corridors</u>
<u>4.47</u>	<u>Topography and Vegetation</u>
<u>4.48</u>	<u>Scale</u>
<u>4.51</u>	<u>Colors and Materials</u>
<u>4.52</u>	<u>Height</u>
<u>4.55</u>	<u>Building Setbacks</u>
<u>4.57</u>	<u>Tree and Vegetation Removal</u>
<u>4.58</u>	<u>Views</u>
<u>4.60</u>	<u>Roads and Driveways</u>
<u>4.61</u>	<u>Parking and Paved Areas</u>
<u>4.66</u>	<u>Fences</u>

c. San Mateo County Local Coastal Plan

The San Mateo County LCP policies (1998) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on Aesthetic values:

NATURAL FEATURES–LANDFORMS

<u>8.5</u>	<u>Location of New Development</u>
<u>8.6</u>	<u>Streams, Wetlands and Estuaries</u>
<u>8.7</u>	<u>Development on Skylines and Ridgelines</u>
<u>8.9</u>	<u>Trees</u>
<u>8.10</u>	<u>Vegetative Cover</u>
<u>8.17</u>	<u>Alteration of Landforms; Roads and Grading</u>
<u>8.18</u>	<u>Development Design</u>

SCENIC ROADS AND SCENIC CORRIDORS

<u>8.28</u>	<u>Definition of Scenic Corridors</u>
<u>8.29</u>	<u>Designation of Officially Adopted State Scenic Roads and Corridors</u>
<u>8.30</u>	<u>Designation of County Scenic Roads and Corridors</u>
<u>8.31</u>	<u>Regulation of Scenic Corridors in Rural Areas</u>

d. San Mateo County Grading Ordinance

This ordinance establishes minimum standards for grading projects in order to control erosion and the production of sediment, as well as to control other regulated environmental damage such as the de-stabilization and/or scarring of hillsides. It regulates the construction and maintenance of cuts and fills and the clearing of vegetation. It also requires the revegetation of cleared areas and the provision of proper drainage control to minimize instability.

e. Scenic Easements

Lands not owned by the County may be subject to scenic easements held by state or federal agencies. For example, the National Park Service holds a scenic and recreation easement over portions of land owned by the San Francisco Water Department. Typically, these easements require review and concurrence by the easement holder of activities that might affect scenic resources.

3. **Significance Criteria**

A project would be considered to have a significant effect on aesthetics and scenic resources if the project would:

- AES-1** Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
- AES-2** Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area; or
- AES-3** Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

4. **Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- AES-1** **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Application.

Impact AES-1 Scenic views are an important resource within the Coastal Annexation Area. The topography, coastline, and relatively undeveloped nature of the area create abundant and diverse vistas. Limited improvement of open space areas for recreational use after the proposed annexation project is approved could include trails, parking areas, self-contained sanitary facilities, fencing, and signs. The District may also develop a field office and maintenance facilities. These developments could create a significant effect on scenic vistas. Implementation of the following Mitigation AES 1a-e will reduce these potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Numerous state and county designated scenic roads and scenic corridors occur within the Coastal Annexation Area (see Map 16, Scenic Corridors). The policies in the Draft Service Plan would require that District signage comply with ordinances regulating signs located within scenic roads and corridors. Future management of open space areas may involve limited alteration of scenic resources; all future trailheads, staging areas and other low-intensity visitor-serving facilities will comply with applicable General Plan, Local Coastal Program Policies and with the San Mateo County Grading Ordinance. Implementation of mitigation measures AES-1a-e will reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Due to public safety concerns, in limited circumstances historical structures or trees may need to be removed. Some of these actions could be visible from scenic roads and corridors. Adherence to relevant plans and policies as listed in this section, including adherence to the listed Draft Service Plan policies, will avoid or reduce all substantial adverse visual effects related to removal of historic structures or trees to less than significant levels.

Mitigation AES-1a Trail alignments and their associated facilities shall be sited and designed to be in harmony with surrounding natural and cultural settings and to retain natural appearances and values.

Mitigation AES-1b Trail alignments across the face of open hillsides and near the top of ridgelines shall be sited to avoid creating new, permanent, noticeably visible lines on the existing landscape when viewed from points looking up at or perpendicular to the trail. Conditions to be considered when siting trails include, but are not limited to, avoiding excessive cuts in slopes that could not be effectively revegetated, and presence of native soil to support revegetation.

Mitigation AES-1c Screening berms, perimeter planting, and parking area trees that provide a canopy shall be used at major staging areas to visually buffer views into the staging area from sensitive view points.

Mitigation AES-1d All structures proposed that are located in scenic corridors shall be screened using native landscaping with plants indigenous to the localized area.

Mitigation AES-1e Any utilities constructed within a State scenic corridor for District facilities shall be underground.

AES-2 Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact AES-2 Staging areas at future preserves in the Coastal Annexation Area would not have lighting, so therefore would not introduce light or glare in the area. The field office or maintenance facilities may require lighting for security or safety. Lights from these facilities could affect nighttime views in the area. Mitigation measures can be applied to reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation AES-2 Any new lighting as part of the proposed project will have light shields and other devices to ensure that no new light or glare will impact sensitive receptors.

AES-3 Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact AES-3 As stated in the Draft Service Plan, the District is most interested in obtaining and/or managing "open space" properties. These are properties that typically have few or very limited existing improvements. Temporary field staff offices will be provided in existing buildings that will be acquired by the District after annexation. Adherence to relevant plans and policies and mitigation measures in AES-1 thru AES-5 will avoid or reduce all substantial adverse visual effects to less than significant levels.

The District will also be providing services for visitor-serving facilities for public low-intensity recreation as defined in Chapter II, Project Description. None of the services will involve the use of overhead wires (typically used for electricity and/or telephone service). If the District does provide either electricity or telephone service to any future staging areas, trailheads or other facilities within the Coastal Annexation Area, the wires will be buried.

H. Hydrology and Water Quality

This section evaluates potential impacts of the annexation project on the area's surface and subsurface hydrology and water quality. As stated in other sections in this Chapter, environmental analysis in this section finds that the Coastal Annexation project by itself will not cause significant environmental impacts. However, the annexation project has the potential to cause indirect hydrological and water quality environmental impacts from future activities. These impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels with application of mitigation measures listed in this section.

1. Existing Setting

Annual rainfall can be heavy within much of the project area. The Santa Cruz Mountains are known for intense rainfall with large volume flows through creeks and drainages. The annexation area is windward of incoming storms and would receive intense rainfall that are capable of eroding and destabilizing project area trails.

Nineteen watersheds originate or drain the Coastal Annexation Area (see Map 14, Watersheds). From north to south they include: San Pedro, San Vicente, Denniston, Frenchman's, El Granada Creek, Arroyo de en Medio, Pilarcitos, Arroyo Canada Verde, Purisima, Lobitos, Tunitas, San Gregorio, Pomponio, Pescadero, Butano, Arroyo de los Frijoles, Yankee Jim Gulch, Gazos and Cascade. These watersheds contain steep ridges and deep canyons typical of the Santa Cruz Mountains. The sources of surface water, runoff and groundwater are precipitation, coming as rain mostly between November and April, and springs. The area has an average annual rainfall of about 25 inches. Many smaller creeks are intermittent, reflecting this seasonal distribution of rainfall. Winter flows are higher, especially during and immediately following storms.

An important climactic feature is the occurrence of storms of extreme intensity and duration that are responsible for periodic flooding in the area. The area is characterized by high geologic activity, including uplifting in the upper reaches of the creeks, especially in the Southern Watersheds.

A major concern in the Pescadero-Butano watershed is the intensive aggradation of the stream channels and the debris and log jams in the streams which inhibit natural streamflow processes. This condition has prompted the formation of the Pescadero-Butano Coordinated Resource Management Plan (CRMP) and the solicitation of grants for the long term management of the environmental health of the watershed.

2. Applicable Policies and Regulations

a. Half Moon Bay General Plan

The City's General Plan Chapter 4 addresses hazards from the perspective of siting urban development. The concern is for minimizing risk to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard. Within the City of Half Moon Bay, extensive runoff from the coastal hills results in drainage problems where natural contours, swales, and gullies, or channelized areas are unable to handle runoff concentration and protect existing undeveloped areas. Since the

District may build a field staff office and ranger facilities in Half Moon Bay after annexation, relevant policies of the Hazards chapter of the Land Use Plan are listed here:

Policy 4-9

Policy 4-9 states all development shall be designed and constructed to prevent increases in runoff that would erode natural drainage courses. Flows from graded areas shall be kept to an absolute minimum, not exceeding the normal rate of erosion and runoff from that of the undeveloped land. Storm water outfalls, gutters, and conduits discharge shall be dissipated.

b. San Mateo County General Plan

San Mateo County's General Plan (1986) lists a number of policies that are applicable in the Coastal Annexation Area. Many of these policies list standards for proposed development and include standards for proposed open space land uses adjacent to existing agricultural uses. These policies are listed below:

<u>1.25</u>	<u>Protect Water Resources</u>
<u>1.36</u>	<u>Protect the Productive Use of Water Resources</u>
<u>1.49</u>	<u>Support Resource Management Efforts of Other Agencies</u>
<u>10.21</u>	<u>Agricultural Surface Water Sources</u>

c. San Mateo County Local Coastal Plan

The San Mateo County LCP policies (1998) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on Hydrology and Water Quality; the full text of the General Plan Policies is found in Appendix A:

<u>7.7</u>	<u>Definition of Riparian Corridors</u>
<u>7.8</u>	<u>Designation of Riparian Corridors</u>
<u>7.9</u>	<u>Permitted Uses in Riparian Corridors</u>
<u>7.10</u>	<u>Performance Standards in Riparian Corridors</u>
<u>7.11</u>	<u>Establishment of Buffer Zones</u>
<u>7.12</u>	<u>Permitted Uses in Buffer Zones</u>
<u>7.13</u>	<u>Performance Standards in Riparian Corridors</u>
<u>7.14</u>	<u>Definition of Wetland</u>
<u>7.15</u>	<u>Designation of Wetlands</u>
<u>7.16</u>	<u>Permitted Uses in Wetlands</u>
<u>7.17</u>	<u>Performance Standards in Wetlands</u>
<u>7.18</u>	<u>Establishment of Buffer Zones</u>
<u>7.19</u>	<u>Permitted Uses in Buffer Zones</u>

d. Surface Runoff Management Plan

This plan was adopted in 1977, primarily to address erosion and sedimentation problems in the County. It includes a program to improve erosion and runoff controls especially those due to land management practices and new development.

e. San Mateo County Excavating, Grading, Filling and Clearing Regulations Ordinance

This ordinance was adopted in 1982 and establishes standards and requirements for grading activities, including water impoundment construction and land development. This ordinance requires a land clearing permit for vegetation removal when either (a) the land area to be cleared exceeds 5,000 square feet within any two year period, or within Scenic Corridors, if vegetation removal exceeds 1,000 square feet; (b) the existing slopes are greater than 20 percent; and/or), the land area to be cleared is in a sensitive habitat or buffer zone identified in the County General Plan.

f. San Mateo County Topsoil Ordinance

This ordinance was adopted in 1970, and governs the removal of topsoils. It includes erosion and sedimentation control provisions, requiring slope stabilization and surface drainage control measures. Requests to remove topsoil may include additional erosion control measures as required by the County Planning Commission.

g. Water Quality Control Plan, San Francisco Bay Basin

Adopted in 1995, this document presents objectives and policies as established by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board). The mission of the Regional Board is to develop and enforce water quality objectives and implementation plans that will best protect the beneficial uses of the State's waters, recognizing local differences in climate, topography, geology and hydrology. Regional Boards develop "basin plans" for their hydrologic areas, issue waste discharge requirements, take enforcement action against violators, and monitor water quality.

Specific to hydrology and water quality, the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan), by defining the resources, services, and qualities of aquatic ecosystems to be maintained, provides a basis for the Regional Board to establish or revise waste discharge requirements and for the State Board to establish or revise water rights permits.

The Basin Plan establishes conditions (discharge prohibitions) that must be met at all times. The intent of this comprehensive planning effort is to provide positive and firm direction for future water quality control. However, adequate provision must be made for changing conditions and technology. The Regional Board reviews the Basin Plan at least once every three years. Unlike traditional plans which often become obsolete within a few years after their preparation, the Basin Plan is updated as deemed necessary to maintain pace with technological, hydrological, political, and physical changes in the region.

h. General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit

Any construction project which disturbs an area of five acres or more must obtain coverage under the General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit (General Construction Permit) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for storm water discharges associated with construction activity. To obtain coverage under the General Construction Permit, a Notice of Intent must be filed with the SWRCB. The General Construction Permit requires the preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must

identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges from construction activities.

Projects which disturb less than five acres must conform to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit regulations. These regulations require using BMPs to reduce storm water pollution. BMPs include both temporary, construction related measures and permanent, post-construction related measures. The primary concerns during the construction phase of a project are to minimize erosion and prevent other construction-related pollutants from entering the storm drainage system. Construction BMPs including the use of straw bales, flow dissipaters, silt fences and hydroseeding. These temporary measures are typically removed after the completion of construction.

After construction, permanent measures must be used for proper storm water management. These Post-Construction BMPs can include structural controls such as inlet filters, oil/sediment separators and the use of porous paving materials. Post-Construction BMPs can also include design features such as grass swales, filter strips and detention/ retention ponds. In addition, plans for the handling and storage of hazardous materials, recycling and community education efforts are considered valuable Post-Construction BMPs.

3. Significance Criteria

The project would be considered to have a significant effect on hydrology if it would:

- HYD-1** Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality;
- HYD-2** Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site or place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows;
- HYD-3** Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted);
- HYD-4** 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;
- HYD-5** 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; or
- HYD-6** Cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

4. **Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

HYD-1 Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact HYD-1 Annual rainfall can be heavy within much of the project area. The Santa Cruz Mountains are known for intense rainfall with large volume flows through creeks and drainages. The annexation area is windward of incoming storms and would receive intense rainfall capable of eroding and destabilizing project area trails. Roads and trails that are not properly designed and maintained could cause substantial erosion or siltation on or off site. Implementation of Mitigation HYD-1a-d would reduce potentially significant impacts from erosion or siltation to a less than significant level.

No effluent waste would be discharged due to the proposed annexation project. Future toilet facilities would be self-contained at preserves, or connected to existing sewer systems, as in the case of the District developing a field office and maintenance facilities in the Coastal Annexation Area. Overall, the project should be beneficial due to protection of watersheds and associated water quality.

Mitigation HYD-1a Trails shall be sited to minimize potential water pollution and stream bank erosion. Trails shall not be sited parallel to “blue line” streams (as mapped on USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle maps) and major drainages (determined during the preparation of individual trail design) within 150 feet of the streambank in watersheds of drinking supply reservoirs. Where trails must cross streams or major drainages in water supply watersheds, the trail shall be sited perpendicular to the stream (to the extent allowed by topography and vegetation) through the 300-foot buffer zone (150 feet on each side). Trails shall not be located within 150 feet of the high water line of a drinking water reservoir. These measures may be modified on a case-by-case basis upon the advice of a qualified biologist or water quality specialist and the concurrence of the applicable regulatory agency.

Mitigation HYD-1b Storm water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) as listed in this section shall be implemented to reduce potential water quality impacts. BMPs include:

1. Flow of runoff from drainage structures will be directed to vegetated areas, away from creeks and drainages as is practical.
2. Conduct any trail maintenance work during low flow periods
3. Use erosion and sediment control measures to minimize water quality impacts and ensure no sediment at heavily traveled trails flows into creeks. These measures include:
 - Silt Fences
 - Straw Bale Barriers
 - Brush or Rock Filters
 - Storm Drain Inlet Protection
 - Sediment Traps
 - Sediment Basins

- Erosion Control Blankets and Mats
 - The District shall prevent erosion on steep slopes by using erosion control material according to manufacturer's specifications.
4. If soil is to be stockpiled for any reason at creeksides, no run-off will be allowed to flow back to the creek.

Mitigation HYD-1c When acquiring new property, the District shall carefully evaluate existing roads and trails before adopting a Preliminary Use and Management Plan and opening them to the public to ensure that their design is compatible with resource protection and recreational uses. In some cases, the District may close and restore poorly designed roads and trails to restore the land to its natural conditions. Where roads exist in area of geologic sensitivity (areas prone to landslides or earth movement), the District may conduct a roads assessment to identify corrective actions necessary to reduce sediment input into streams.

Trail surfaces appropriate to intended use shall be selected so as to minimize runoff and erosion problems. Trail designs shall conform to the County Surface Runoff Management Plan, County Excavating, Grading, Filling, and Clearing Regulations Ordinance, and the County Topsoil Ordinance, as defined in this chapter. Surface water shall be diverted from trails by outsloping the trail tread 3% where feasible. Where necessary, shallow ditches or water bars shall be used to divert water on running slopes greater than 5%. Other trail drainage techniques may include rolling dips, culverts, or ditches on sides of trails. Erosion control plans shall comply with erosion control policies in the County General Plan and Local Coastal Program.

Mitigation HYD-1d No large-scale grading shall be used for trail construction. The degree of cut allowed on a slope depends on the soil type, hardness, and surrounding natural resources. Ultimate cuts shall be contoured to blend with the natural slope. Steep areas shall be handled by limited terracing to avoid large-scale grading. Surface soil disturbance shall be kept to a minimum to reduce erosion and maintenance problems. Only those rocks, stumps, and roots that interfere with safe passage shall be removed.

HYD-2 **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 substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site or place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact HYD-2 The annexation project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area. Trails, roads, bridges and parking areas in future preserves in the Coastal Annexation Area would not be covered in impervious surfaces such as asphalt. Parking and staging areas would be covered with gravel. The project thus would not overall increase flooding potential, although there is a possibility that future projects could increase localized flooding. Application of the mitigation measures listed in this section will avoid or reduce impacts resulting from changes in drainage patterns to less than significant levels.

The proposed annexation project would not place any structures within a 100-year floodplain that might impede flood flows, however, culverts or weirs may be installed in the future within the acquired preserves in Coastal Annexation Area to minimize erosion or restore riparian and

aquatic habitat. All construction within the 100-year floodplain of any creek within the Coastal Annexation Area will conform to all policies and standards listed in this section, (e.g., Surface Runoff Management Plan, San Mateo County Grading and Topsoil Ordinances, General Construction Activity Stormwater Permits and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans, as applicable). All construction within the 100-year floodplain will also comply with standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) for both construction and operation to reduce potential water quality impacts related to discharges, as listed in the *California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook*, published by State Water Resources Control Board. Application of the mitigation measures in this section will avoid or reduce flooding or water quality impacts in floodplains to less than significant levels.

Mitigation HYD-2 Culverts shall be designed so that they do not limit the ability of debris to pass. Structures over water courses shall be carefully placed to minimize disturbance and should be located 2 feet above the 100-year flood elevation or 2 feet above the Flood Hazard Flood Insurance Rate Map flood elevation. Maintenance of culverts and drainage structures shall be performed as needed to ensure proper functioning.

HYD-3 **Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

No Impact.

Impact HYD-3 The annexation project and future subsequent projects will not involve the pumping of groundwater. Water is not provided at District starting areas or on District trails.

HYD-4 **Would the project 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?**

No Impact.

Impact HYD-4 Trails, roads, and parking areas would not be covered in impervious surfaces. The project would not increase runoff water or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.

HYD-5 **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?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact HYD-5 It is possible that trail systems for areas acquired under the proposed project could pass through flood zones of creeks. Intense precipitation could result in high creek levels, thereby posing potential flood risks to District personnel or public users. This is an

inherent risk to preserve users choosing to enter natural stream areas, especially during significant storm events. Flood waters are an obvious risk; the proposed project would not create any conditions that would increase the exposure of people to flooding risks. Per its standard practices, the District would use its patrols, signage, and barricades to reduce the possibility that the project would expose persons to significant flood risks.

HYD-6 Would the project cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact HYD-6 Mudflows are possible in the project area due to intense precipitation of significant durations typical of the Santa Cruz Mountains. Saturated soil conditions in steeply sloped areas can cause surficial movement of soil as debris or mud flows. These flows are a result of a loss of soil tension due to the over-saturation of the soil profile from extended or intense storm events. Debris or mud flows could expose District personnel and the public to a life-threatening event if a flow occurred within the project area where public access would be allowed. The low probability of such an event and the limited likelihood of District personnel or the public to be in harm's way during an intense storm necessary to precipitate such an event reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

I. Biological Resources

This section of the EIR addresses biological impacts of the proposed Coastal Annexation project. The Coastal Annexation Area harbors an abundance of biological resources. This abundance is attributed to the interaction of climate, topography, soils, and the limited development that has occurred in the area. Given its proximity to a large, rapidly growing metropolitan population, the Coastal Annexation Area represents a unique biological resource of significance to the Bay Area and the entire state.

The following general plant types and communities are found in the Coastal Annexation Area: Agricultural Land, Chaparral, Scrub, Coastal Prairie, Non-native Grassland, Redwood Forest, and Non-redwood Forest. Numerous sensitive habitats occur within the Coastal Annexation Area. Those habitats that are based on physical and vegetative characteristics include 1) perennial and intermittent streams and associated riparian habitat, 2) marshes, wetlands, ponds, and lakes, 3) sea cliff faces, and 4) sand dunes. Other sensitive habitats include 5) any with "rare and endangered" species, 6) coastal and offshore areas providing migratory bird reeding, resting, or feeding habitat, 7) areas used for scientific study of fish and wildlife, and 8) existing game and wildlife refuges/ reserves. Due to its more developed nature, most sensitive habitats in Half Moon Bay are related to streams and the coastal bluff and forerun area.

The District would focus preservation and management in part on lands that contain special-status species habitat. Overall, protecting open space lands should benefit special-status species habitat and wildlife, allowing for movement and breeding. The limited improvements proposed by the District would not interfere with the movement of migratory wildlife species. Depending on the nature of the structure, stream crossings for new trails, however, could impede movement of anadromous fish. Additionally, wildlife nursery sites could be present on acquired parcels. Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect nursery sites or wildlife movement. In addition to the Draft Service Plan Guidelines and Policies that would benefit special-status wildlife species and sensitive habitats, Policy 5.3 of the District's Resource Management Policies and Implementation Measures (MROSD 1994) requires that the District minimize fragmentation of interior habitat, reduce barriers to wildlife movement within preserves, identify and protect established wildlife crossings to allow movement across existing roads, remove unnecessary fences and barbed wire from preserves, and seek to reduce barriers to wildlife movement on a more regional basis. Additionally, mitigation is proposed to reduce remaining significant effects to a less than significant level. Assuming implementation of these existing and proposed Policies and Guidelines, adverse impacts would be less than significant.

1. Biological Setting

The Coastal Annexation Area harbors an abundance of biological resources. This abundance is attributed to the interaction of climate, topography, soils, and the limited development that has occurred in the area. Given its proximity to a large, rapidly growing metropolitan population, the Coastal Annexation Area represents a unique biological resource of significance to the Bay Area and the entire state. This setting section provides some background

on the natural characteristics of the area affecting biotic resources, vegetative communities, sensitive habitats, and special-status plant and wildlife species found within the Coastal Annexation Area.

a. Background

The northern spur of the Santa Cruz Mountain Range, which essentially defines the eastern edge of the Coastal Annexation Area, ends in the north at San Pedro and Montara Mountains, where steep, rugged terrain descends nearly two thousand feet to the Pacific Ocean. This mountainous terrain provides a natural barrier between Pacifica and the Coastal Annexation Area, where gently sloping foothills eventually give way to the nearly level coastal terraces of Half Moon Bay (Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County 1998; see Map 3).

The Coastal Annexation Area has cool, foggy summers and relatively wet winters. The average annual temperatures are about 55 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), with average minimum and maximum temperatures deviating only 7-9°F (San Mateo County 1986). About three-fourths of the total annual precipitation in San Mateo County occurs from December through March. The Santa Cruz Mountains are a key rainfall influence. By acting as a rain shield, the mountains cause moist air moving from the ocean to condense and deposit most of its moisture as rain or fog into the higher, colder mountains.

b. Biotic Communities

Table IV-I-1 shows the total area of primary biotic communities found within the Coastal Annexation Area. The total acres of these communities are listed in Table IV-I-1. This information is based on Gap Analysis mapping data provided by CDFG. The biotic communities used in the Gap Analysis are based upon terrestrial natural communities as described in Holland (1986). The minimum mapping unit in upland community types is 100 hectares (247 acres). Due to this large area, the map cannot illustrate the habitat complexities that occur within each mapping unit. The Gap Analysis data itself accounts for these mosaics of communities by assigning each map unit up to three community types, each of which has to be >10% of the map unit area. The Gap Analysis mapping of Central Western California, which includes the Coastal Annexation Area, was based on a variety of sources. Such sources include mapping of hardwood forests and woodlands prepared for CDF in the late 1980's, field surveys conducted specifically for the Gap Analysis project, and color infrared aerial photos from the 1980's to the early 1990's (CDFG 1995).

Table IV-I-1
Biotic Communities in the Coastal Annexation Area

	Northern Watersheds	Skyline	Southern Watersheds	Total
Agricultural Land	2,470	0	3,694	6,163
Chaparral	2,383	1,699	970	5,052
Coastal Prairie	10,413	2,344	4,984	17,740
Non-native Grassland	0	6,099	0	6,099
Redwood Forest	1,943	31,113	8,241	41,297
Non-Redwood Forest	1,458	4,162	2,077	7,697
Scrub	27,309	2,080	14,005	43,395
Urban	11,425	2	1,128	12,555
Total	57,400	47,500	35,100	140,000

Notes: Represents acres of land covered by the primary cover type based on Holland 1986; because the minimum mapping unit is 100 acres, the primary land cover may be as low as 30% where multiple vegetative or land cover types are present.

Source: California Gap Analysis Project; TRA

1) Agricultural Land

The agricultural land designation primarily includes row crops, such as artichokes, Brussel sprouts, pumpkins, flowers, orchards, and some irrigated pasture. Areas subject to intensive cultivation provide limited wildlife habitat value due to extensive and repetitive disturbance, use of chemicals, and the monoculture that defines intensive cultivation. Irrigated pasture and fallow fields can provide good quality wildlife habitat, both for foraging and nesting, depending on the nature and frequency of disturbance. California ground squirrels (*Spermophilus beecheyi*), Botta's pocket gophers (*Thomomys bottae*), and other efficient burrowers can be abundant on the periphery of such fields. These small mammals, and other species such as black-tailed hares (*Lepus californicus*) provide a prey base for red-tailed hawks (*Buteo jamaicensis*) and other raptors. Barn swallows (*Hirundo rustica*) and Brewer's blackbirds (*Euphagus cynocephalus*) are some of the other species that forage in this habitat.

2) Chaparral

The chaparral communities shown on Map 15 include blue brush chaparral and scrub oak chaparral. Both chaparral communities tend to occur on moister sites than other chaparral. The dense vegetation can grow up to 20 feet tall. Plant species include chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*), Eastwood manzanita (*Arctostaphylos glandulosa*), deerbrush (*Ceanothus integerrimus*), chaparral whitethorn (*C. leucodermis*), blue-blossom (*C. thrysiflorus*), mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus betuloides*), California ash (*Fraxinus dipetala*), toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), chaparral pea (*Pickeringia montana*), holly-leaf cherry (*Prunus ilicifolia*), scrub oak (*Quercus berberidifolia*), California coffeeberry (*Rhamnus californica*), chaparral current (*Ribes malvaceum*), and poison oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*). Other communities found intermixed with the chaparral on Map 15 include tan-oak forest, scrub, coastal prairie, Douglas fir forest, non-native grassland, interior live oak forest, redwood forest, lacustrine, and mixed evergreen forest. Wildlife commonly found in chaparral include western scrub-jays (*Aphelocoma californica*), California thrasher (*Toxostoma redivivum*), California quail (*Callipepla californica*), woodrats (*Neotoma* sp.), mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), and bobcats (*Lynx rufus*).

3) Scrub

The scrub communities shown on Map 15 include central coastal scrub, central dune scrub, northern coastal scrub, and Ventura coastal sage scrub. These communities grow much lower than chaparral—no more than 6 feet tall. Plant species include coastal sagewort (*Artemisia pycnocephala*), coastal mugwort (*A. suksdorfia*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), common lessingia (*Corethrogyne filaginifolia*), mock-heather (*Ericameria ericoides*), seaside daisy (*Erigeron glaucus*), seaside woolly sunflower (*Eriophyllum staechadifolium*), salal (*Gaultheria shallon*), Douglas iris (*Iris douglasiana*), chamissoi bush lupine (*Lupinus chamissonis*), bush monkey flower (*Mimulus aurantiacus*), and California coffeeberry. Other communities found intermixed with the scrub on Map 15 include coastal prairie, blue brush chaparral, agricultural land, central coast arroyo willow riparian forest, northern coastal scrub, urban or built-up land, and buck brush chaparral. Common wildlife species include western fence lizards (*Sceloporus*

occidentalis), gopher snakes (*Pituophis melanoleucus*), spotted towhees (*Pipilo maculatus*), wrentits (*Chamaea fasciata*), western scrub-jays, and turkey vultures (*Cathartes aura*).

4) Coastal Prairie

The coastal prairie shown on Map 15 is described by Holland (1986) as coastal terrace prairie. Other communities found intermixed with the coastal prairie on Map 15 include central coastal scrub, northern coastal scrub, agricultural land, and blue brush chaparral. This community is a dense, tall grassland (up to 3 feet tall) dominated by both sod and tussock-forming perennial grasses. Most stands are quite patchy and variable in composition, reflecting local differences in soil moisture. Characteristic plant species include thrift (*Armeria maritima californica*), Pacific reed grass (*Calamagrostis nutkaensis*), *Danthonia californica*, Pacific hair grass (*Deschampsia caespitose holciformis*), California fescue (*Festuca arundinacea*), and common velvet grass (*Holcus lanatus*).

5) Non-native Grassland

Non-native grasslands are dominated by introduced annual grasses, such as wild oats (*Avena barbata*), soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), and wild barley (*Hordeum brachyantheum*). Non-native grasslands are often associated with numerous species of showy-flowered, annual wildflower. Yellow star-thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), an exotic pest plant, is a common invader in non-native grasslands. Other communities found intermixed with the non-native grasslands on Map 15 include upland redwood forest, coast live oak woodland, mixed evergreen forest, northern coastal scrub, and coastal prairie. The grassland habitats provide foraging habitat for herbivorous and predatory animals. Herbivorous animals include house finches (*Carpodacus mexicanus*), California voles (*Microtus californicus*), Botta's pocket gophers, western harvest mice (*Reithrodontomys megalotis*), black-tailed jackrabbits, and black-tailed deer. Predatory animals include red-tailed hawks, red-shouldered hawks, great horned owls (*Bubo virginianus*), barn owls (*Tyto alba*), American kestrels (*Falco sparverius*), shrikes (*Lanius* sp.), gopher snakes, gray foxes (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*), bobcats, coyotes (*Canis latrans*), and mountain lions (*Felis concolor*).

6) Redwood Forest

Natural groves of coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) forest are found in areas that receive considerable annual rainfall and are exposed to frequent heavy fog during the dry season. Coast redwoods can easily exceed 300 feet in height. These forests are found in the Santa Cruz Mountains, and most are second or third growth (i.e., they are regrowing subsequent to logging). Characteristic plants species plants, in addition to redwoods, include big-leaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), chinquapin (*Chrysolepis chrysophylla*), salal, tan oak (*Lithocarpus densiflorus*), western sword fern (*Polystichum munitum*), Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), rosebay (*Rhododendron macrophyllum*), blackberries and thimbleberries (*Rubus* spp.), (*Torreya californica*), California bay (*Umbellularia californica*), and evergreen huckleberry (*Vaccinium ovatum*). Other communities found intermixed with the redwood forests on Map 15 include scrub, coastal prairie, chaparral, mixed evergreen forest, and urban/built-up land. Wildlife species commonly found in redwood forests include Steller's jays (*Cyanocitta stelleri*), winter wrens (*Troglodytes troglodytes*), ruby-crowned kinglets (*Regulus calendula*), western gray squirrels (*Sciurus griseus*), and mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*).

7) Non-redwood Forest

The non-redwood forest communities shown on Map 15 include a diverse assembly of hard and softwood forest, including eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.), tan oak forest, upland douglas-fir forest, Central Coast arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), riparian forest, coast live oak woodland (*Quercus agrifolia*), mixed evergreen forest, and Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*) forest. These communities are intermixed with scrub, coastal prairie, freshwater marsh, chaparral, coast live oak forest, and non-native grassland. The forest lands provide cover, water, and food for many species. Mammals include raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*), dusky-footed wood rats, black-tailed deer, bobcats, coyotes, and possibly Mountain lions. Bird species using these forests include orange-crowned warblers (*Vermivora luciae*), yellow warblers (*Dendroica petechia*), Townsend's warblers (*D. townsendi*), Wilson's warblers (*Wilsonia pusilla*), Swainson's thrush (*Catharus ustulatus*), varied thrush (*Ixoreus naevius*), ruby-crowned kinglets, brown creepers (*Certhia americana*), song sparrows (*Melospiza melodia*), and many others.

8) Urban/Built-up

This community provides the poorest quality habitat for wildlife species. Urban/built-up land is primarily interspersed with agricultural land, although some of it is mapped with scrub and coastal prairie. Plant species generally comprise ornamental landscaping and ruderal species around homes and businesses and along roadsides. The wildlife species most often associated with urban/built-up lands are those that are most tolerant of human disturbances and the primarily non-native mix of vegetation. Such wildlife includes introduced species, such as European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*), rock doves (*Columba livia*), house mice (*Mus musculus*), and Norway rats, and more tolerant native species, such as western fence lizards, American robins (*Turdus migratorius*), mourning doves (*Zenaida macroura*), house finches, California ground squirrels, opossums, and striped skunks (*Mephitis mephitis*). Feral cats often occur in urban and built up lands.

c. Sensitive Communities/Habitats

Numerous sensitive habitats occur within the Coastal Annexation Area. Those habitats that are based on physical and vegetative characteristics include 1) perennial and intermittent streams and associated riparian habitat, 2) marshes, wetlands, ponds, and lakes, 3) sea cliff faces, and 4) sand dunes. Other sensitive habitats include 6) any with "rare and endangered" species, 7) coastal and offshore areas providing migratory bird breeding, resting, or feeding habitat, 8) areas used for scientific study of fish and wildlife, and 9) existing game and wildlife refuges/ reserves. Due to its more developed nature, most sensitive habitats in Half Moon Bay are related to streams and the coastal bluff and foredune area. Sensitive habitats 1-4 are described below:

Perennial and intermittent streams and associated riparian habitat are commonly found in the valleys of the Santa Cruz Mountains, from where streams such as Pescadero and Butano Creeks originate. Riparian habitats are found adjacent to many rivers and streams. The withdrawal of water from stream courses for agricultural use has created a heavy drain on stream flow, particularly in the summer months (City of Half Moon Bay 1993). Restricted stream flow may inhibit fish migration, lower water quality, and impact riparian vegetation.

Wetlands in the Coastal Annexation Area include coastal salt marsh, freshwater marsh, and seasonal wetlands. Tidelands extend down the length of the Coastal Annexation Area, but the

extent and nature of the vegetation found in tidelands depends on topography and soils. Salt marshes are generally found around the flat edges of bays and river mouths, where little wave action occurs and fine sediments accumulate. Estuarine habitats occur on periodically or permanently flooded substrates and open water portions of semi-enclosed coastal waters where flowing fresh water dilutes tidal seawater. The Pescadero Marsh is an example of such habitat within the Coastal Annexation Area. Freshwater marshes form around the edges of ponds, lakes, and slow-moving, shallow streams. Freshwater marshes most commonly occur on level to gently rolling topography with predominately silt or clay soils. Lacustrine habitats include ponds and lakes. Bean Hollow Lake is an example of such habitat within the Coastal Annexation Area (San Mateo County 1999d).

Sea cliff faces provide special habitats for nesting birds such as the common murre (*Uria aalge*) and the pigeon guillemot (*Cephus columba*). Vegetation along the face of these areas is limited to hardy grasses, certain succulents, and other adapted herbs and shrubs that can withstand constant wind, ocean salt spray, and steep slopes. Vegetation reinforces slope stability; root systems bind the face and help protect it from the erosive force of waves, wind, and rain (City of Half Moon Bay 1993).

Dunes are structurally fragile environments that provide permanent or temporary habitats for a variety of species. The plant species of dunes are well adapted to the shifting sands of dune formations (City of Half Moon Bay 1993).

d. Special-status Species

As described above, federal and state endangered species laws give certain plant and animal species special status. In addition, CDFG and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) maintain lists of additional sensitive species. The CDFG has produced three lists (amphibians and reptiles, birds, and mammals) of "Species of Special Concern" (CSSC). Species on these lists are either of limited distribution or the extent of their habitats has been reduced substantially, such that threat to their populations may be imminent. These species do not have protection under CESA but do receive consideration under CEQA review. Likewise, vascular plants listed as rare or endangered by CNPS (CNPS List 1B) but that have no designated status under FESA or CESA also receive consideration under CEQA review. These species are collectively referred to as "special-status" species and include:

- plants and animals listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered under FESA or CESA
- animals listed as "protected" or "fully protected" in the Fish and Game Code (Sections 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515)
- animals designated by CDFG as CSSC
- plants listed as rare or endangered in the *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California* (5th edition, electronic version, 2000).

Table IV-I-2 identifies the special-status plant and animal species potentially occurring within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area. This species list is based upon data from the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB 2000), California Wildlife Habitat Relationships species notes (CDFG 1988, 1990a, 1990b), and TRA staff biologists. In addition, the San Mateo County LCP (1998) and LCP Sensitive Habitats maps (1979) identify "rare and endangered" and "unique" species. Many of these species are not considered "special-status" as defined above,

but because of their inclusion in County planning documents they are also included on Table IV-I-2.

As shown on Table IV-I-2, four plant species listed under FESA and/or CESA potentially occur within the Coastal Annexation Area. These 4 species and 12 additional plant species are CNPS List 1B species. Table IV-I-2 includes 13 animal species that are listed under FESA and/or CESA and an additional 20 species that are not listed but that are CSSC and/or Protected under the Fish and Game Code. For each species, the table also lists any USGS quadrangles in the Coastal Annexation Area that have CNDDDB records. These records indicate that a species was observed in a quadrangle at a particular time and thus give an indication of where species may currently occur. The species may also occur elsewhere or may no longer be present in the particular quads listed.

**Table IV-I-2
Special-status species and other sensitive resources potentially occurring within the Coastal Annexation Area**

Species/Resource ¹	Status	Habitat	USGS Quads with CNDDDB Records ²
Plants			
Blasdale's bent grass <i>Agrostis blasdalei</i>	CNPS List 1B	Coastal dunes, coastal bluff scrub, coastal prairie. Includes <i>agrostis blasdalei</i> var. <i>marinensis</i> , state-listed rare. Sandy or gravelly soil close to rocks; often in nutrient-poor soil with sparse vegetation. 5-150m.	Franklin Pt.
Santa Cruz manzanita <i>Arctostaphylos andersonii</i>	CNPS List 1B	Broadleaved upland forest, chaparral, north coast coniferous forest. Open sites, redwood forest. 180-800 m. Known only from the Santa Cruz Mtns.	La Honda, Woodside
Montara manzanita <i>Arctostaphylos montaraensis</i>	CNPS List 1B	Chaparral, coastal scrub. Slopes and ridges. 150-500 m. Endemic to San Mateo County.	Montara Mtn.
San Francisco Bay spineflower <i>Chorizanthe cuspidata</i> var. <i>cuspidata</i>	CNPS List 1B	Coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, coastal prairie, coastal scrub. Sandy soil on terraces and slopes. 5-550 m. Closely related to <i>C. pungens</i> .	Montara Mtn., Woodside
Western leatherwood <i>Dirca occidentalis</i>	CNPS List 1B	Broadleaved upland forest, chaparral, closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland, n. coast coniferous forest, riparian forest, riparian woodland. On brushy slopes, mesic sites; mostly in mixed evergreen & foothill woodland communities. 30-550 m.	La Honda, Mindego Hill, Montara Mtn., Woodside
Ben Lomond buckwheat <i>Eriogonum nudum</i> var. <i>decurrens</i>	CNPS List 1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest. Ponderosa pine sandhills. 50-800m. Currently known only from Contra Costa and Santa Cruz Counties. Nearest record mapped at the head of Oil Creek in Santa Cruz County (east of Portola State Park).	Mindego Hill
San Mateo woolly sunflower <i>Eriophyllum latilobum</i>	FE, SE, CNPS List 1B	Cismontane woodland, often on roadcuts; found on and off of serpentine. 45-150 m. Endemic to San Mateo County.	La Honda

**Table IV-I-2
Special-status species and other sensitive resources potentially occurring within the Coastal Annexation Area**

Species/Resource¹	Status	Habitat	USGS Quads with CNDDDB Records²
Coast wallflower <i>Erysimum ammodophilum</i>	CNPS List 1B	Chaparral (maritime), coastal dunes, coastal scrub. Sandy openings. 0-130m.	Año Nuevo, Franklin Pt.
California wild (= beach) strawberry <i>Fragaria chiloensis</i>	SMLCP U, HMLCP U	Ocean beaches, grassland; <200 m.	Not included in CNDDDB.
Fragrant fritillary <i>Fritillaria liliacea</i>	CNPS List 1B	Coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, coastal prairie. Often on serpentine; various soils reported though usually clay, in grassland. 3-410m.	Montara Mtn., Woodside
San Francisco gumplant <i>Grindelia hirsutula</i> var. <i>maritima</i>	CNPS List 1B	Coastal scrub, coastal bluff scrub, valley and foothill grassland. Sandy or serpentine slopes, sea bluffs. 15-400 m.	Montara Mtn.
Point Reyes meadowfoam <i>Limnanthes douglasii</i> ssp. <i>sulphurea</i>	SE, CNPS List 1B	Freshwater marsh, vernal pools, coastal prairie, meadows & seeps, cismontane woodland. Vernal wet depressions in open, rolling coastal prairies & meadows; typically in dark clay soil. 10-120 m. Only known from San Mateo and Marin Counties.	Franklin Pt.
Robust monardella <i>Monardella villosa</i> ssp. <i>globosa</i>	CNPS List 1B	Openings in chaparral, cismontane woodland. 30-300m.	Mindego Hill
Dudley's lousewort <i>Pedicularis dudleyi</i>	SR, CNPS List 1B	Chaparral, north coast coniferous forest, valley and foothill grassland. Deep shady woods of older coast redwood forests; also in maritime chaparral. 100-490 m.	Big Basin, Mindego Hill
Monterey pine <i>Pinus radiata</i>	CNPS List 1B; SMLCP U	Closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland. Three primary stands are native to California. Dry bluffs and slopes. 25-185 m.	Año Nuevo, Franklin Pt.
Hickman's cinquefoil <i>Potentilla hickmanii</i>	FE, SE, CNPS List 1B	Coastal bluff scrub, closed-cone coniferous forest, meadows and seeps, marshes and swamps. Freshwater marshes, seeps, and small streams in open or forested areas along the coast. 5-125m.	Montara Mtn.
Santa Cruz microseris <i>Stebbinsoseris decipiens</i>	CNPS List 1B	Broadleafed upland forest, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal prairie, coastal scrub. Open areas in loose or disturbed soil, usually derived from sandstone, shale, or serpentine, on seaward slopes. 10-500 m.	Franklin Pt.
Animals			
Globose dune beetle <i>Coleus globosus</i>	SMLCP RE, HMLCP RE	Inhabitant of coastal sand dune habitat. Inhabits foredunes and sand hummocks; it burrows beneath the sand surface and is most common beneath dune vegetation.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area.

Table IV-I-2
Special-status species and other sensitive resources potentially occurring within the Coastal Annexation Area

Species/Resource ¹	Status	Habitat	USGS Quads with CNDDDB Records ²
San Francisco tree lupine moth <i>Grapholitha edwardsiana</i>	SMLCP RE, HMLCP RE	Inhabits dune areas along the coast where the tree lupine is found. Endemic to the San Francisco Bay region.	Not included in CNDDDB.
San Bruno elfin butterfly <i>Incisalia mossii bayensis</i>	FE	Coastal, mountainous areas with grassy ground cover, mainly in the vicinity of San Bruno Mountain; colonies are located on steep, north-facing slopes within the fog belt. Larval host plant is <i>Sedum spathulifolium</i> . Critical habitat proposed but never finalized.	Montara Mtn.
Mimic tryonia (=California brackishwater snail) <i>Tryonia imitator</i>	SMLCP RE, HMLCP RE	Inhabits coastal lagoons, estuaries and salt marshes. Found only in permanently submerged areas in a variety of sediment types; able to withstand a wide range of salinities.	San Gregorio
Coho salmon—Central California ESU <i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>	FT, SE	Require beds of loose, silt-free, coarse gravel for spawning. Also need cover, cool water, & sufficient dissolved oxygen. No critical habitat designated.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area.
Steelhead—Central California Coast ESU <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</i>	FT	Require beds of loose, silt-free, coarse gravel for spawning. Also need cover, cool water, & sufficient dissolved oxygen. Coastal streams in Coastal Annexation Area included within designated Critical Habitat.	Big Basin, Franklin Pt., Half Moon Bay, La Honda, Mindego Hill, Montara Mtn., Pigeon Pt., San Gregorio
Tidewater goby <i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i>	FE (FPD), CSSC	Brackish water habitats; found in shallow lagoons and lower stream reaches, they need fairly still but not stagnant water & high oxygen levels. Critical habitat does not include San Mateo County.	Pigeon Pt., San Gregorio
California red-legged frog <i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>	FT, CSSC, SP	Lowlands & foothills in or near permanent sources of deep water with dense, shrubby or emergent riparian vegetation. Requires 11-20 weeks of permanent water for larval development. Must have access to estivation habitat. Critical habitat Unit 14 encompasses the entire Coastal Annexation Area.	Franklin Pt., Half Moon Bay, La Honda, Mindego Hill, Montara Mtn., San Gregorio, Woodside
Foothill yellow-legged frog <i>Rana boylei</i>	CSSC	Partly-shaded, shallow streams, & riffles with a rocky substrate in a variety of habitats. Need at least some cobble-sized substrate for egg-laying and at least 15 weeks to attain metamorphosis.	La Honda
Western pond turtle <i>Clemmys marmorata</i>	CSSC	A thoroughly aquatic resident of ponds, marshes, rivers, streams & irrigation ditches with aquatic vegetation. Need basking sites and suitable (sandy banks or grassy open fields) upland habitat for egg-laying.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.

Table IV-I-2
Special-status species and other sensitive resources potentially occurring within the Coastal Annexation Area

Species/Resource ¹	Status	Habitat	USGS Quads with CNDDB Records ²
San Francisco garter snake <i>Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia</i>	FE, SE; SMLCP RE, HMLCP RE	Vicinity of freshwater marshes, ponds and slow moving streams; prefers dense cover & water depths of at least one foot. Upland areas near water are also very important. No critical habitat designated.	Año Nuevo, Franklin Pt., Half Moon Bay, La Honda, Mindego Hill, Montara Mtn., Pigeon Pt., San Gregorio
Brown pelican <i>Pelecanus occidentalis</i>	FE, SE	Estuarine, marine, subtidal, and marine pelagic waters. Usually rests on water or inaccessible rocks, but also uses mudflats, sandy beaches, wharves, and jetties.	No CNDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
White-tailed kite <i>Elanus leucurus</i>	SP	Nests in tall shrubs and trees; forages in grasslands, marshes, and ruderal habitats.	No CNDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Northern harrier <i>Circus cyaneus</i>	CSSC	Forages in marches, grasslands, and ruderal habitats; nests in extensive marshes and wet fields.	No CNDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Cooper's hawk <i>Accipiter cooperi</i>	CSSC	Breeds in oak woodlands, coniferous forests, and deciduous riparian areas. Forages in a variety of woodland and edge habitats; during the winter, Cooper's hawks utilize a wider variety of habitat types for foraging.	No CNDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Sharp-shinned hawk <i>Accipiter striatus</i>	CSSC	Winter migrant in coastal San Mateo County. Forages and roosts in oak woodlands, coniferous forests, and deciduous riparian areas.	No CNDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Golden eagle <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	CSSC, SP	Breeds on cliffs or on large trees or structures; forages in open habitats.	No CNDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Merlin <i>Falco Columbarius</i>	CSSC	Frequents coastlines, open grasslands, savannahs, woodlands, lakes, wetlands, edges, and early successional stages.	No CNDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but winter migrants presumed to occur.
American peregrine falcon <i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>	SE, SP	Breeds mostly in woodland, forest, and coastal habitats near water on high cliffs, sometimes tall buildings, bridges. Forages over a variety of habitats.	No CNDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
California black rail <i>Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus</i>	ST, SP	Mainly inhabits salt-marshes bordering larger bays. Occurs in tidal salt marsh heavily grown to pickleweed; also in fresh-water and brackish marshes, all at low elevation. CNDDB record at Waddell Creek, just south of the Coastal Annexation Area.	No CNDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but shown on LCP Sensitive Habitats map.

Table IV-I-2
Special-status species and other sensitive resources potentially occurring within the Coastal Annexation Area

Species/Resource ¹	Status	Habitat	USGS Quads with CNDDDB Records ²
Western snowy plover <i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</i>	FT, CSSC	Sandy beaches, salt pond levees, & shores of large alkali lakes. Needs sandy, gravelly, or friable soils for nesting. The critical habitat designation includes Half Moon Bay beaches.	Año Nuevo, Franklin Pt., San Gregorio
Long-eared owl <i>Asio otus</i>	CSSC	Found in riparian bottomlands grown to tall willows and cottonwoods; also, belts of live oak paralleling stream courses. Require adjacent open land productive of mice and the presence of old nests of crows, hawks, or magpies for breeding.	Mindego Hill
Black swift <i>Cypseloides niger</i>	CSSC	Breeds in small colonies on cliffs behind or adjacent to waterfalls in deep canyons and sea-bluffs above surf; forages widely.	Año Nuevo
Loggerhead shrike <i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	CSSC	Wide-ranging resident species occupying open habitats including grassland, scrub, and open woodland communities. Typically nests in densely vegetated, isolated trees and shrubs and occasionally man-made structures.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Bank swallow <i>Riparia riparia</i>	ST	Colonial nester; nests primarily in riparian and other lowland habitats west of the desert. Requires vertical banks/cliffs with fine-textured/sandy soils near streams, rivers, lakes, ocean to dig nesting hole.	Año Nuevo
Yellow warbler <i>Dendroica petechia</i>	CSSC	Dense riparian woodlands, typically dominated by willows.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Saltmarsh common yellowthroat <i>Geothlypis trichas sinuosa</i>	CSSC	Resident of the San Francisco Bay region, in fresh and salt water marshes. Requires thick, continuous cover down to water surface for foraging; tall grasses, tule patches, willows for nesting.	Half Moon Bay, Montara Mtn., San Gregorio
Pallid bat <i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	CSSC	In Central California, pallid bats are usually associated with oak woodland. Forages mostly over open habitats; roosts are generally in trees, but also occur in rock outcrops, bridges, buildings, and mines.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Townsend's western big-eared bat <i>Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii</i>	CSSC	Roosts in caves, mine tunnels, and buildings in a variety of habitats.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Yuma myotis <i>Myotis yumanensis</i>	CSSC	Inhabits a variety of low-elevation regions in California. Roosts in buildings, trees, mines, bridges, and rock crevices. Normally forages directly over the surface of still waters, including ponds, reservoirs, and pools in streams.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.

**Table IV-I-2
Special-status species and other sensitive resources potentially occurring within the Coastal Annexation Area**

Species/Resource¹	Status	Habitat	USGS Quads with CNDDDB Records²
Western (=California) mastiff bat <i>Eumops perotis</i>	CSSC	Forages over many habitats; requires tall cliffs or buildings for roosting.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
San francisco dusky-footed woodrat <i>Neotoma fuscipes annectens</i>	CSSC	Inhabits a variety of habitats, constructing nests, in riparian, oak woodland, and other hardwood forests.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Ringtail <i>Bassariscus astutus</i>	SP	Prefers riparian and heavily wooded habitats near water.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but presumed to occur.
Southern sea otter <i>Enhydra lutris nereis</i>	FT, SP; SMLCP RE, HMLCP RE	Found in nearshore marine environments. Canopies of giant kelp and bull kelp provide important rafting and feeding areas. Prefers rocky substrates with abundant invertebrates. No critical habitat designated.	No CNDDDB records in the Coastal Annexation Area, but the subspecies' range extends south from Half Moon Bay.
Steller (=northern) sea lion <i>Eumetopias jubatus</i>	FT	Needs haul-out & breeding sites with unrestricted access to water, near aquatic food supply & with no human disturbance. Critical habitat boundaries undetermined.	Año Nuevo
Elephant Seal	SP; SMLCP U	Breed in winter in dense rookeries, including on San Mateo County coast at Año Nuevo.	Not included in CNDDDB.
Other Sensitive Resources			
Monarch butterfly (<i>Danaus plexippus</i>) winter roost	none	Winter roosts located in wind-protected tree groves (eucalyptus, Monterey pine, cypress), with nectar and water sources nearby.	Año Nuevo, Franklin Pt., Half Moon Bay, Montara Mtn., Pigeon Pt.
Great blue heron (<i>Ardea herodias</i>) rookery in Pescadero Marsh	none	Colonial nester in tall trees, cliffsides, and sequestered spots on marshes. Rookery sites in close proximity to foraging areas: marshes, lake margins, tide-flats, rivers and streams, wet meadows.	San Gregorio
Champion Monterey cypress	n/a	The LCP declares the Champion Monterey Cypress Tree a Class I Heritage Tree	n/a
Sacramento-San Joaquin coastal lagoon—Mouth of San Gregorio Creek and Pescadero Lagoon	n/a	May include willows, pickleweed, sedge. Wildlife species include tidewater goby, threespine stickleback, prickly and Coastrange sculpin, steelhead, Pacific lamprey, SF garter snakes, red-legged frogs.	San Gregorio

**Table IV-I-2
Special-status species and other sensitive resources potentially occurring within the Coastal Annexation Area**

Species/Resource ¹	Status	Habitat	USGS Quads with CNDDDB Records ²
North central coast California roach/stickleback/steelhead stream—Pescadero and Butano Creeks	n/a	Alder/willow thicket; redwood/mixed conifer riparian in headwaters. Native fishes include steelhead, coho salmon (rare), Pac. Lamprey, Ca. roach, three-spine stickleback, riffle & prickly sculpin.	Big Basin, Franklin Pt., La Honda, Mindego Hill, San Gregorio
North central coast steelhead/sculpin stream—San Gregorio Creek	n/a	Low gradient stream on coastal plain bordered by alder and willow vegetation; high gradient stream shaded by redwood/mixed conifers in headwaters. Native fish include steelhead, Pacific lamprey, sculpin, and three-spine stickleback.	La Honda, Mindego Hill, San Gregorio
Northern maritime chaparral	n/a	Associated plants include Montara manzanita and San Mateo tree lupine.	Montara Mtn.
Valley needle grass grassland	n/a	Associated plants include California oatgrass and purple needle grass.	San Gregorio
Northern coastal salt marsh	n/a	Associated plants include prickle-weed and alkali heath.	Half Moon Bay, Montara Mtn.
Monterey pine forest	n/a	Mosaic w/grassland and Douglas fir.	Año Nuevo, Franklin Pt.
Northern interior cypress forest	n/a	Sandstone derived substrate.	Franklin Pt., Big Basin

Notes:

Status Explanation:

Federal Status:

FE Federal listed as endangered

FT Federal threatened

FPD Federal proposed for delisting

California Status:

SE California listed as endangered

ST California listed as threatened

SR California listed as rare

SP California protected or fully protected

CSSC California Species of Special Concern

CNPS List:

1B = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere

Local Coastal Program:

SMLCP RE = San Mateo County LCP rare and endangered species

SMLCP U = San Mateo County LCP unique species

HMLCP RE = City of Half Moon Bay LCP rare and endangered species

HMLCP U = City of Half Moon Bay LCP unique species

¹Includes “special-status” species, as defined in the DEIR, “Rare and Endangered” and “Unique” species as listed in the San Mateo County LCP, and other sensitive resources included in CNDDDB or the San Mateo County LCP.

²USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle in which species has been observed. All quads covering the Coastal Annexation Area were searched, including: Año Nuevo, Big Basin, Franklin Pt., Half Moon Bay, La Honda, Mindego Hill, Montara Mountain, Pigeon Pt., San Gregorio, and Woodside; only includes CNDDDB records occurring in San Mateo County.

Source: California Department of Fish and Game CNDDDB December 2000; San Mateo County June 1998; San Mateo County 1979; City of Half Moon Bay 1993; TRA April 2001

2. *Applicable Policies and Regulations*

a. Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan

The City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program (LCP) Land Use Plan policies (1993) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on biological resources:

- 3-1 Definition of Sensitive Habitats
- 3-3 Protection of Sensitive Habitats
- 3-4 Permitted Uses

RIPARIAN CORRIDORS

- 3-9 Permitted Uses.
- 3-10 Performance Standard in Riparian Corridors.

SAND DUNES

- 3-15 Permitted Uses.
- 3-16 Development Standards.

SEA CLIFFS

- 3-19 Permitted Uses.
- 3-20 Development Standards.

RARE AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

- 3-22 Permitted Uses.

UNIQUE SPECIES

- 3-33 Permitted Uses.

WEEDY, UNDESIRABLE PLANTS

- 3-38 Public Agency Requirements.
- 3-40 Weedy Thistle Eradication.

b. San Mateo County General Plan

The San Mateo County General Plan goals and policies (1986) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on biological resources:

- 1.1 Conserve, Enhance, Protect, Maintain and Manage Vegetative, Water, Fish, and Wildlife Resources
- 1.2 Protect Sensitive Habitats
- 1.4 Access to Vegetative, Water, Fish and Wildlife Resources
- 1.8 Define a sensitive habitat as any area where the vegetative, water, fish, and wildlife resources provide especially valuable and rare plant and animal habitats that can be easily disturbed or degraded
- 1.9 Definition of Rare or Unique Species
- 1.20 Importance of Sensitive Habitats
- 1.24 Protect Vegetative Resources
- 1.25 Protect Water Resources
- 1.26 Protect Fish and Wildlife Resources
- 1.27 Regulate Development to Protect Sensitive Habitats
- 1.28 Establish Buffer Zones
- 1.29 Uses Permitted in Sensitive Habitats
- 1.31 Regulate the Location, Siting and Design of Development in Sensitive Habitats
- 1.38 Control Incompatible Vegetation, Fish and Wildlife
- 1.39 Minimize Adverse Impacts of Programs Controlling Incompatible Vegetation, and Fish and Wildlife
- 1.40 Encourage Coordinated, Countywide Management of Vegetative, Water, Fish and Wildlife Resources
- 1.41 Encourage Public Agencies and Private Groups to Acquire Significant Sensitive Habitats
- 1.49 Support Resource Management Efforts of Other Agencies

c. San Mateo County Local Coastal Program

The San Mateo County LCP policies (1998) listed below are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects on biological resources:

- 7.1 Define sensitive habitats as any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable and any area which meets one of the following criteria:
- 7.3 Protection of Sensitive Habitats
- 7.9 The following are among the uses permitted within riparian corridors:
- 7.16 The following are among the uses permitted within wetlands:
- 7.23 The following are among the uses permitted within marine and estuarine habitats:
- 7.26 The following are among the uses permitted within dune areas:
- 7.30 The following are among the uses permitted within sea cliffs:
- 7.32 The following are among the uses permitted within habitats of rare and endangered species:
- 7.43 The following are among the uses permitted within habitats of unique species:
- 7.52 Require public agencies, to the point feasible, to remove the undesirable pampas grass and French, Scotch, and other invasive brooms from their lands.

d. California Coastal Commission

The California Coastal Act of 1976 requires protection of land and water resources and avoidance of impacts resulting from land form alteration. The Act imposes restrictions on any

development in Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas, such as wetlands. The Act requires any person proposing to undertake development in the Coastal Zone to obtain a Coastal Development Permit. Much of the CAA is in the Coastal Zone, and any development would be subject to the Act. Because the Half Moon Bay and San Mateo County LCPs are fully certified, the requirements of those LCPs (discussed above) apply to development within the San Mateo County Coastal Zone. The Coastal Commission retains permit jurisdiction over any portion of a project that is in state waters, on land up to the mean high tide line, or on lands subject to the public trust. If development is proposed within these areas, a Commission permit is required. Additionally, a proposed project may be appealable to the Commission under the appeal provisions of Coastal Act Section 30603.

e. San Francisco and Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Boards

The San Francisco Bay RWQCB has jurisdiction over most of the Coastal Annexation Area, but the Central Coast RWQCB has jurisdiction over the southernmost portion. The southern edge of the Butano Creek watershed (see Map 14) provides the boundary between the two regions. The mission of the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) is to develop and enforce water quality objectives and implementation plans that will best protect the beneficial uses of the State's waters, recognizing local differences in climate, topography, geology and hydrology. Regional Boards develop "basin plans" for their hydrologic areas, issue waste discharge requirements, take enforcement action against violators, and monitor water quality. Specific to biological resources, RWQCBs also review and issue, waive, or deny Section 401 Water Quality Certification for projects requiring Corps Section 404 permits for fill of wetlands and other Waters of the U.S. Section 401 refers to the section of the Clean Water Act that gives states the authority to certify that a proposed activity is in conformance with state water quality standards. Requirements of the respective RWQCBs would govern any development, including wetlands disturbance or grading, within the CAA.

f. California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)

The mission of CDFG is to manage California's diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources, and the habitats upon which they depend for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public. Provisions of the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) protect state-listed threatened and endangered species. The Fish and Game Commission is charged with establishing a list of endangered and threatened species. CDFG regulates activities that may result in "take" of individuals (i.e., "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill"). Habitat degradation or modification is not expressly included in the definition of "take" under the California Fish and Game Code, but CDFG has interpreted "take" to include the killing of a member of a species which is the proximate result of habitat modification.

Activities that result in the diversion or obstruction of the natural flow of a stream, or substantially change its bed, channel, or bank, or utilize any materials (including vegetation) from the streambed require that the project applicant enter into a Streambed Alteration Agreement with CDFG, under section 1600-1603 of the California Fish and Game Code. The CDFG potentially extends the definition of stream to include intermittent and ephemeral streams, rivers, creeks, dry washes, sloughs, blue-line streams mapped on USGS quads, and watercourses with subsurface flows. Canals, aqueducts, irrigation ditches, and other means of water conveyance can also be considered streams if they support aquatic life, riparian vegetation, or stream-dependent terrestrial wildlife.

g. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/National Marine Fisheries Service

The Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) establishes a broad public and federal interest in identifying, protecting, and providing for the recovery of threatened or endangered species. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce are designated in FESA as responsible for identifying endangered and threatened species and their critical habitat, carrying out programs for the conservation of these species, and rendering opinions regarding the impact of proposed federal actions on listed species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) are charged with implementing and enforcing the ESA. USFWS has authority over terrestrial and continental aquatic species, and NMFS has authority to over species that spend all or part of their life cycle at sea, such as salmonids.

Section 9 of FESA prohibits the unlawful “take “ of any listed fish or wildlife species. Take, as defined by FESA, means “to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such action.” The USFWS’s regulations define harm to mean “an act which actually kills or injures wildlife.” Such an act “may include “significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding or sheltering” (50 CFR § 17.3). Take can be permitted under FESA under sections 7 and 10. Section 7 provides a process for take permits for federal projects or projects subject to a federal permit, and Section 10 provides a process for incidental take permits for projects without a federal nexus. The ESA does not extend the take prohibition to federally listed plants on private land, other than prohibiting the removal, damage, or destruction of such species in violation of state law.

The USFWS also oversees the implementation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, which prohibits the destruction or possession of individual birds, eggs, or nests without a scientific collecting or special purpose permit from the Service.

h. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The Corps works to provide protection of the nation’s aquatic environment through the regulation of activities in waters of the United States under the federal Rivers and Harbors Act and the Clean Water Act. Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act requires permits for any work or structures in navigable waters of the United States, including wetlands within or adjacent to these waters. Both dredging and filling are regulated activities under the Act. Navigable waters are defined as those waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide, or that are presently, have been, or may be used for transport of interstate or foreign commerce.

The Clean Water Act is a broad statute with the goal of maintaining and restoring waters of the United States. Among many provisions for the control of water pollution, the Act also requires permits for filling of or discharge of dredged materials into waters of the United States. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act establishes a permit program for the discharge of fill or dredged material into waters of the United States. Waters of the United States include navigable waters, interstate waters, and all other waters where the use or degradation or destruction of the waters could affect interstate or foreign commerce, tributaries of any of these waters, and wetlands that meet these criteria or that are adjacent to any of these waters or their tributaries.

3. Significance Criteria

The project will have a significant biological impact if it would:

- BIO-1** Have a substantial adverse effect 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, either directly or through habitat modifications,
 - 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or
 - on any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means;
- BIO-2** Have a substantial adverse effect on 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;
- BIO-3** Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or
- BIO-4** Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

4. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

- BIO-1** **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect 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, either directly or through habitat modifications,**
 - **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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or**
 - **on any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact BIO-1 The Coastal Annexation program involves annexation of the Coastal Annexation Area; specific lands to be acquired by the District have not been identified. The District would focus its preservation and management efforts in part on lands that contain special-status species habitat and sensitive resources such as lands that are critical to protecting watershed integrity, water quality, and special-status species such as steel head. Some acquired lands would thus likely contain sensitive natural communities, such as riparian habitat and wetlands, or special-status plant or animal species. Acquisition of land, absent further changes, would not affect special-status species or sensitive natural communities.

Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive habitats or special species of concern. Under Policy 2b of the *Basic Policy of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District* (1999), among the District's highest priorities is acquiring land to protect natural resources on open space land. Protecting natural resources and providing for public safety may require limits on access to some open space lands. Areas found to be vital wildlife or plant habitats may be designated as refuge areas, and in these areas access will be severely restricted.

Draft Service Plan Guideline G.6.3 and its associated Implementation Action G.6.A requires that the District prepare a site specific resource management and public access plan for each parcel owned or managed by the District in the Coastal Annexation Area. The preparation of a site specific use plan for each parcel would ensure that the impacts of improvement construction and low intensity recreational uses upon sensitive habitat and special status species are minimized or avoided. Implementation of this Guideline and the following measures would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Policy	Description
Guideline G.6.3	Inherent in the preservation of open space resources is the protection of: rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species; ecological systems; water quality; visual resources; and the unique cultural resources in the Coastal Annexation Area, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources. Therefore, prior to making any lands available to low-intensity public recreational access, the District shall prepare and adopt a site-specific resource management and public access plan for any lands acquired by the District or managed through contract for other public or private non-profit property owners. The development of plans will include opportunities for public involvement.
Implementation Action G.6.A(I)	Upon completion of the annexation process and with public involvement through local groups, the District shall conduct hearings to develop its Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area. These hearings shall address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agriculture and timber production; inter-agency relationships; and public information.

Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect sensitive species and or/natural communities.

Implementation of the proposed Draft Service Plan Guideline G.6.3 and Implementation Action G.6.A along with the mitigation measures listed in this section would minimize potential adverse effects on wetlands by avoiding impacts, implementing long-term monitoring, restoring habitat, and ensuring additional protective measures are enacted when necessary. Assuming implementation of these measures, potential impacts to wetlands due to the proposed project would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation BIO-1a Biological resource assessments shall be conducted during preparation of Use and Management Plans. Assessments shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and will include surveys for sensitive habitats and special-status species in the appropriate seasons. These assessments will include recommendations to align potential trails to avoid impacts to sensitive habitats, special-status species, and heritage and significant trees. If any trail alignment

may affect such resources, the District will consult with the appropriate agencies (e.g., CDFG, USFWS, NMFS) to ensure that impacts will be avoided or mitigation is adequate.

Mitigation BIO-1b The District shall protect sensitive habitat areas and other areas where special-status species may be adversely affected when planning trails and other facilities. To the maximum extent feasible, trail alignments and other improvements shall avoid impacts to sensitive habitats, including habitats for special-status plants and animals. All improvements shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by a qualified biologist to identify impact avoidance measures or mitigation measures for biotic impacts. Consideration shall be given to:

- Relocating trails or other improvements
- Periodic closures
- Revegetation prescriptions
- Buffer plantings
- Discrete barrier fencing that accommodates wildlife passage
- Other appropriate measures

Removal of native vegetation shall be avoided as much as possible. The appropriate resource agencies shall be contacted regarding any trail alignments or other improvements that may impact sensitive habitats, special-status species, or their habitat. Plant replacement shall be native to the area and suitable for the site conditions.

Mitigation BIO-1c In special-status species habitat areas, trail use levels shall be limited as appropriate to ensure protection of resources. Techniques for limiting use may include, but are not limited to:

- Physical access controls
- Seasonal or intermittent closures

Mitigation BIO-1d Existing access routes shall be used wherever suitable to minimize impacts of new construction in special-status species habitats. Realignment will be implemented where necessary to avoid adverse impacts on resources.

Mitigation BIO-1e Trail design shall include barriers to control trail use and prevent environmental damage. Barriers may include fences, vegetation, stiles, and/or fallen trees or branches.

Mitigation BIO-1f A particular trail or other facility may need to be closed during seasonal periods critical to special-status species, where overuse threatens resource values, or for other reasons to protect biological resources. Where a trail or surrounding habitat warrants special notice limiting trail use, the trail shall be clearly designated and should be equipped with use signs and appropriate barriers to discourage unauthorized use. Missing or damaged signs, gates, fences, and barriers shall be repaired or replaced as soon as possible. Closure notices shall include the reason(s) for the closure, an estimate of how long the facility will be closed, and a telephone number to call for further information.

Mitigation BIO-1g When parallel to a stream or riparian zone, trails shall generally be set back from the top of bank or from the outside edge of the riparian zone, whichever is greater, except where topographic, resource management, or other constraints or management objectives make such a setback not feasible or undesirable. Riparian setbacks may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis based upon advice of a qualified biologist and with the concurrence of reviewing agencies, where applicable.

Mitigation BIO-1h Trail crossings of streams and drainages shall be designed to minimize disturbance through the use of bridges, fords, or culverts, whichever is least environmentally damaging. Bridges and culverts shall be designed so that they visually and functionally blend with the environment and do not substantially interfere with the movement of native fish. Sufficient depth and velocity of water through the culvert shall exist in fish-bearing streams for passage of native fish and other native aquatic species during high and low flow conditions. Equestrian trail access shall be restricted at fish-bearing streams during critical times, such as during spawning, unless bridges and culverts are provided for horse use.

Mitigation BIO-1i Trails and other improvements shall avoid wetlands and other jurisdictional waters, including seasonal wetlands, seeps, springs, and farm ponds, wherever possible. A wetlands biologist will conduct reconnaissance-level surveys of all improvements in areas with potential wetlands. Any improvements adjacent to wetland areas will be constructed so that fills avoid wetland impacts and minimum setbacks are allowed. Where feasible, setbacks from wetlands and other jurisdictional waters shall be a minimum of 25 feet for trails and 50 feet for staging areas and other improvements. A formal wetland delineation will be required for any improvements that may directly impact wetlands.

Mitigation BIO-1j Revegetation and/or enhancement shall be undertaken where any sensitive habitat or special-status species habitat will be disturbed or destroyed by facility construction. Revegetation work shall be implemented prior to or concurrently with the development. The design of an appropriate revegetation program shall fully compensate for the lost habitat, with no net loss of habitat functions and values. Riparian and wetland habitat impacts will typically be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio for high quality habitat areas and at lower ratios where lower habitat quality justifies a lower ratio. A lower ratio may also be justified if habitat mitigation is implemented and verified as successful prior to the occurrence of impacts. Mitigation shall be based on in-kind replacement of impacted habitat with habitat of equal or better biotic value. The revegetation program shall be designed by a qualified biologist or ecologist and submitted to the appropriate regulatory or trustee agency for approval. At a minimum, the revegetation program shall include a description of project impacts, mitigation calculations, the mitigation site, revegetation techniques, maintenance measures, a long-term monitoring program, and contingency measures. Native plant materials suited to the site will be utilized in all mitigation work.

Mitigation BIO-1k Periodic monitoring of known sensitive habitats adjacent to trails or other facilities shall be conducted to determine if unacceptable soil compaction or other adverse impacts are occurring. If monitoring reveals that undesirable soil compaction or impact to a sensitive habitat is occurring, barriers or other appropriate measures (such as trail rerouting) shall be employed as needed to discourage off-trail use. Brush or other aesthetically acceptable barriers can be used to cover illegal trails, abandoned trails, or shortcuts to discourage use until natural vegetation returns.

Mitigation BIO-1l Should sensitive habitat be impacted such that it necessitates permanently closing a trail or staging area, a management program to rehabilitate the area will be developed. Such a program shall include discing and replanting or other techniques appropriate to the habitat type to return the site to a natural condition and sufficiently blocking the trail with barriers to effectively prohibit use. Management shall include monitoring the site to ensure that it returns to a natural condition without the intrusion of invasive exotic plants. Management shall also include design elements, maintenance, and monitoring to ensure that erosion is minimized.

Construction and maintenance of trails will require the trimming and/or removal of vegetation along the trail route and staging areas.

Mitigation BIO-1m Existing native vegetation shall only be removed as necessary to accommodate the trail clearing width. The minimum horizontal clearing width from physical obstructions varies based on the type of trail but should be no less than two feet from the outer limits of the trail tread and shall be determined on a case by case basis to protect special natural features. Maximum vertical distance from overhanging branches shall be 12 feet on trails open to equestrian or bicycle use. Maximum vertical distance from overhanging branches shall be eight feet on hiking trails. Clearing shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to protect special natural features.

Mitigation BIO-1n Good pruning practices should be followed when vegetation growth must be cleared. Ground cover plants and low shrubs should not be cleared beyond the original construction stand. The construction stand shall be defined as the trail tread width plus 1-2 feet from each side of the edge of the trail tread. Noxious plants (e.g., yellow star-thistle) shall be controlled along trails and the edges of staging areas in a timely manner. Potential adverse impacts on biological resources would also be mitigated by Hyd-1 through Hyd-2.

BIO-2 **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact BIO-2 Overall, protecting open space lands should benefit wildlife by permanently protecting habitat and by providing opportunities for foraging, movement, and breeding. The limited improvements proposed by the District would not interfere with the movement of migratory wildlife species. Depending on the nature of the structure, stream crossings for new trails, however, could impede movement of anadromous fish. Additionally, wildlife nursery sites could be present on acquired or managed parcels. Constructing improvements and introducing recreational uses into areas that are currently closed to public use could adversely affect nursery sites or wildlife movement. In addition to the Guidelines and Policies described above that would benefit special-status wildlife species and sensitive habitats, Policy 5.3 of the District's *Resource Management Policies and Implementation Measures* (MROSD 1994) requires that the District minimize fragmentation of interior habitat, reduce barriers to wildlife movement within preserves, identify and protect established wildlife crossings to allow movement across existing roads, remove unnecessary fences and barbed wire from preserves, and seek to reduce barriers to wildlife movement on a more regional basis. This policy would be applied to the Coastal Annexation Area. Assuming implementation of these existing and proposed Policies and Guidelines, adverse impacts to wildlife movement or nursery sites would be less than significant.

The construction of new fences on lands acquired or managed by the District could restrict wildlife movement within open space areas. The following mitigation would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation BIO-2 The District shall minimize fragmentation of interior habitat, reduce barriers to wildlife movement within preserves, identify and protect established wildlife crossings to allow movement across existing roads, remove unnecessary fences and barbed wire from preserves, and seek to reduce barriers to wildlife movement on a more regional basis. The construction of new fences constructed on District owned or managed lands shall not restrict

wildlife movement. Fence rails shall be designed with openings large enough for native mammals to pass through.

BIO-3 Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact BIO-3 The San Mateo County General Plan and LCP define sensitive habitats and prohibit development that has significant adverse impacts on sensitive habitat areas. The proposed Draft Service Plan Guidelines and mitigation measures described above would minimize potential adverse effects on sensitive habitats. The impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The San Mateo County Ordinance Code also governs the removal and trimming of heritage and significant trees. Such trees may occur on lands acquired by the District. Although acquisition of land, absent further land use changes, would not affect such trees, the planning process for subsequent uses should specifically consider heritage and significant trees. Construction of improvements could result in removal or trimming of such trees in compliance of the code. Implementation of the Guidelines and Implementation Actions proposed in the Draft Service Plan, as modified in this section, would ensure that District actions within the proposed Coastal Annexation Area would ensure that the District would not take actions that conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

Although this impact is not significant, the following mitigation measure would clarify the District’s policy to protect heritage and significant trees.

Mitigation BIO-3 Guideline 6.3 in the Draft Service Plan should be modified to the provision for unique biological resources including heritage and significant trees as follows. Underline text is new text to be added.

Policy	Description
Guideline G.6.3	Inherent in the preservation of open space resources is the protection of: rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species; ecological systems; water quality; visual resources; <u>unique biological resources, including heritage and significant trees</u> , and the unique cultural resources in the Coastal Annexation Area, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources. Therefore, prior to making any lands available to low-intensity public recreational access, the District shall prepare and adopt a site-specific resource management and public access plan for any lands acquired by the District or managed through contract for other public or private non-profit property owners. The development of plans will include opportunities for public involvement.

BIO-4 Would the project conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or other such plan?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact BIO-4 Lands that may be annexed by the District are currently not subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other habitat conservation

plan. Should the District acquire a parcel subject to an HCP, if any are adopted within the Coastal Annexation Area, the Goals and Policies described above would ensure that the District manages lands consistent with any such plan.

J. Cultural Resources

This section identifies potential project impacts to historic and archaeological resources. The potential to affect paleontological resources and human remains is also evaluated. Analysis includes potential effects both to known sites and previously undiscovered resources.

The District's policy on cultural resources states that "Historic structures and sites will be considered for protection by the District where they are associated with lands acquired for overall open space values. Due to the high cost of evaluating, managing, and restoring such facilities, the District depends on grant assistance, public-private partnerships, and outside assistance to support these activities. Sites are evaluated for archaeological resources prior to any new use or improvement which might impact the site. Archaeological resources are evaluated, protected, and made known to the public as appropriate to ensure their preservation.

Specific lands to be acquired by the District have not been identified, but lands acquired may contain historical, cultural, and archaeological resources. Due to public safety concerns, historical structures may need to be removed. Removal or other substantial adverse changes to historical resources would be a significant impact. Ground excavation or other ground disturbance during development of improvements could also impact historical, cultural, and archaeological resources. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures will avoid or reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels.

1. Existing Setting

The following text is excerpted from *Coastside Cultural Resources of San Mateo County An Approach to Developing A Protection Program for the San Mateo County Coastal Zone*. (1980). The area referred to as the San Mateo Coastside contains the Coastal Annexation Area.

"San Mateo Coastside has a rich history. Its early inhabitants--the Costanos, Spanish explorers, early Mexican and Anglo settlers, Yankee immigrants of the gold-rush days, loggers, farmers, ranchers, dairymen, and fishermen--all left historic, architectural, and archaeological remains which remind us of the conditions and lifestyles of the past."

EARLY INHABITANTS

"The earliest inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula predated the first European explorers by thousands of years. It is estimated that Native Americans [Indians] have lived in the area for at least 3,000 years; however, we have little knowledge of these first settlers. The earliest Coastside inhabitants, of which we have knowledge, were Native Americans [Indians] which the Spanish called Costanos, meaning 'Coast People.'"

"The Costanos lived in an area which extended southward from the Golden Gate to Monterey and Soledad, and eastward to the Diablo Range in the East Bay. According to estimates by anthropologists, over 7,000 Costanos may have lived in this territory at the time the first European explorers arrived. "

"Nature on the California Coast, particularly in the Bay Area, was kind to these early

inhabitants. A mild climate required only a minimum of shelter and created no season of scarcity for which people must prepare in order to survive. This resulted in an easy lifestyle of which there are few tangible reminders of a culture that survived for so long.”

“The Costanos were among the first Native Americans [Indians] in California to feel the impact of the European arrival and lose their cultural identity. Seven missions were established in their territory, at which their lifestyles and native culture were discouraged and soon forgotten under the strict rule of the Spanish padres. After the missions were abolished, there followed a whole-sale granting of land to private owners who used the natives as laborers.”

DISCOVERY AND EARLY EXPLORATION

“European explorers had sailed past and charted the San Mateo Coast since the middle of the 16th century. Among the first European place names in California were two along the San Mateo Coast: Pillar Point, charted by the Spanish mariner Francisco de Gali in 1585 and Punta del Ano Nuevo, mapped and named by Sebastian Vizcaino on New Year's day in 1603. Early explorers, including Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo and Sir Francis Drake, all sailed by without landing because of the turbulent coastline with its offshore reefs and fog. It was over 165 years before Europeans actually set foot in what is now San Mateo County.”

“In search of Monterey Bay, in October, 1769, the expedition of Captain Gaspar de Portola first entered the southern end of the County, along the beach at the base of Chalk Mountain. The land party had unknowingly bypassed Monterey Bay. They traveled northward until they were stopped by the great estuary which we know today as San Francisco Bay. The significance of their discovery, one of the greatest harbors in the world, failed to register with Portola and his expedition. To them, it was an obstacle which prevented the party from traveling northward to find Monterey. Discouraged, they returned to San Diego from where they had started.”

“The following year, in 1770, Portola once more set out to locate Monterey Bay; this time he was successful in identifying it. With the establishment of a presidio and mission at Monterey, it became the capital of Alta California and a base for further expeditions to locate and establish other Spanish settlements.”

“In 1774, Captain Fernando Rivera, who had been a member of the Portola expedition, explored the San Francisco Peninsula with a small party. His reports convinced the heads of state in Mexico that the tip of the Peninsula was undoubtedly the place to establish a presidio and mission. The Spanish authorities in Mexico, concerned about rumored British and Russian interest in California, decided to establish a fort and mission to hold San Francisco Bay and to Christianize the local Native Americans [Indians]. Two years later, in 1776, a large party set out from Sonora, Mexico under the command of Juan Bautista de Anza to establish a settlement at what today is San Francisco.”

“On June 27, 1776, the party made camp at the chosen site for the mission. The following day, just five days before the Continental Congress formally adopted the Declaration of Independence 3,000 miles away in Philadelphia, the first Mass was celebrated by the colony at Laguna de los Dolores. This represented the beginning of European development and the start of the Spanish-Mexican Era in the Bay Area.”

THE SPANISH-MEXICAN ERA

“Suitable as it was for military defense, the new settlement at San Francisco lacked construction materials and warm weather for the growing of crops. Looking southward, the Spanish were attracted to the San Mateo Coastside with its warmer valleys and abundance of natural resources.”

“For the construction of needed buildings, logs from the Santa Cruz Mountains were hauled by oxen to the mission and presidio sites. Limestone was also hauled from a quarry at Calera (presently Rockaway Beach in Pacifica) for foundations, trims, and facing of the more important structures at the mission and presidio in San Francisco.”

“Because the principle purpose of the San Francisco Mission was to convert the Native Americans [Indians] to Christianity, the Spanish fathers lost little time in visiting the nearby villages with gifts of trinkets and food in an effort to spread friendship and religion. The padres' glowing accounts of life in the mission with the luxury of better food (served on a regular basis), warm clothing, and better housing brought many converts into the fold.”

“With the increased population to feed, Mission Outposts were established to help provide the additional food required. The first of these outposts was established in 1785 in the San Pedro Valley, now a part of Pacifica, where earlier Portola had camped prior to climbing Sweeney Ridge to first view San Francisco Bay. The fertile valley produced crops so well that soon all the Mission's plantings were transferred there.”

“Herds of both mission and presidio cattle were kept on the Coastside, roaming over the grasslands of the coastal terrace. At round-up time, this stock were herded into corrals near Miramar and then driven the hazardous route over the mountains to San Francisco.”

“The control of the Spanish and the missions over the Native Americans [Indians] and land was relatively short. The harsh, disciplined life of the mission was not compatible with the lifestyle of the Native Americans [Indians], and many escaped to live deep in the mountains away from the ever watchful eye of the padres. The Europeans also brought with them diseases to which the Native Americans [Indians] had no immunity. Severe epidemics of the measles and syphilis, among others, drastically reduced the Native Americans [Indians] population at the missions. In 1821, Mexico won her independence from Spain, and Spanish rule in California came to an end.”

“Under Spanish rule, the ownership of land was vested in the Crown and there were no private holdings. With the establishment of Mexican rule, the pattern of land ownership changed. Vast tracts of land were given to settlers from Mexico and to important men who had aided in the revolution. The best property was divided into ranchos. This began the era of Mexican Ranchos, when vast tracts of land in private ownership were devoted primarily to the raising of cattle.”

“Life for the rancheros was not arduous. Cattle raising, which provided food, hides, and tallow for export, as well as for local use, dominated the economy. The cattle, always identifiable by their brands, ranged freely with little or no watching. Usually a little wheat, beans, and corn were grown for home consumption, but cultivation was kept at a minimum.”

“For a brief decade, the ranchos flourished, but signs of their coming demise increased as the number of foreigners--especially Yankees--appeared on the scene. The outbreak of the

Mexican-American War in 1846 signaled the beginning of the end, and by the time gold was discovered in 1849, the American occupation and control of California were complete.“

THE AMERICAN ERA--THE BEGINNING OF COAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT

“The trickle of Yankees who came to California prior to its acquisition by the United States increased to a mighty flood when gold was discovered in 1849. They initially headed for the mines, but by 1851, many were seeking land for settlement. By 1855, gold-mining had definitely declined and more people were turning to agriculture. San Mateo County, close to the center of the Gold Rush activity, felt the impact sooner and more violently than other parts of the state.“

Land Ownership Disputes

“The rancho's lands were often occupied by squatters who had little or no respect for Mexican ownership. Also, under U.S. laws, the burden of proof was on the one who claimed ownership. This automatically saddled everyone who owned land in California with the heavy burden of litigation. As the rancho boundaries were poorly described by "hills, creeks, trees, or protruding rocks," each case had to be fought in the courts. The rancheros, land-rich but money-poor, were caught in a fatal trap, between the U.S. Government and unscrupulous lawyers and money lenders who were out to take advantage of those who could not defend themselves. In the end, after years of litigation, many rancheros lost most or all of their land to these newcomers under a legal system. The long uncertainty of land titles became a serious obstacle to growth in the new era.“

Establishment of Towns

Spanishtown

“During the Mexican War, many Spanish-speaking families had moved from San Francisco to the Coastside for refuge and seclusion from hostile Americans. There, at what today is Half Moon Bay, they founded the first town in the County, which was named San Benito. It was later dubbed Spanishtown by the American settlers, a name that stuck for many years. So isolated was the village that even the Gold Rush had no effect on it until 1853. At that time, James Johnston, a member of one of the first American families on the Coastside, undertook to build his home south of the village. His house was the most lavish and luxurious in the area and was the center of social life for the community. The Johnston House still stands today on a commanding position overlooking the ocean.“

Purisima

“Four miles south of Spanishtown, on a narrow strip of disputed land, American squatters formed the village of Purisima. It was intended to rival Spanishtown as a prosperous business center. In time, a thriving village grew up on the site which showed great promise of becoming the economic center of the Mid-Coast. In the 1880's some oil was discovered in the vicinity and the town experienced a small boom. The high hopes of its residents soon faded, however, as Spanishtown's superior location at the cross roads attracted more people. The once thriving town fell into obscurity and all that remains today is the hull of the old schoolhouse and the cemetery.“

Pescadero

“Farther south in the Pescadero Valley, another American pioneer, Alexander Moore, built his home in 1853. The rich, fertile soil of the valley had attracted other settlers and in the 1860's a prosperous farming community developed. Pescadero, which means fishing place in Spanish, is said to have been named by Spanish settlers who noted that it was a favored fishing spot for the local Native Americans [Indians]. From the 1860's until the turn of the century, the area around Pescadero was a favored summer resort for San Franciscans.”

San Gregorio

“The broad San Gregorio Valley, north of Pescadero, was also a rich farming region. Indications are that the name San Gregorio was first applied to the valley when it was used as a sheep ranch by Mission Santa Cruz early in the 19th century. The small village established at the head of the valley in the early 1860's became a major agricultural center. Its hotel, built in 1865, served the new stagecoach trade between the coast and the Bayside.”

Dairies and Lumbering

“In the 1860's dairy ranching became a major enterprise in the San Gregorio-Pescadero region. The biggest dairymen were the Steele Brothers, who came from Marin County in 1862. They set up several dairies along the South Coast and manufactured cheese and butter for export to San Francisco. By 1860 logging also became important, the redwood forests on the east sides of the County had been leveled and lumbermen moved to the Coastside. Here stood great stands of magnificent trees which furnished a resource for lumbermen into the 20th century.”

Need for Transportation

“With the forests producing lumber, the fertile soil growing an incredible variety of produce, and milk and cheese coming from the herds of cattle grazing on the coastal grasslands, the Coastside sought a better way to get their products to market. Hemmed in by the mountains, with poor roads, it was extremely difficult to get wagons over the surrounding ridge to the Bayside and San Francisco. Many looked out over the water and envisioned the ocean as their best chance. With no natural harbors to shelter ships, a few enterprising individuals built long wharfs at which ocean going vessels could dock. The best known of these were Waddell's Wharf at Ano Nuevo and Ames Wharf at Amesport, now Miramar. At Tunitas Creek, Alexander Gordon conceived the Coastside's most daring attempt to create a port. Here, he built a chute from the top of the cliff to the water below on which goods could slide down to the waiting ships. The venture was not successful, and today nothing remains but a few bolts in the rocks that supported Gordon's Chute.”

“Lighthouses were built along the Coast to improve the safety of ocean transport. In 1853, the clipper ship Carrier Pigeon went aground off the point that now bears her name. Boats were sent to salvage the cargo, for there were not yet wagon roads. That same year, the first survey for a lighthouse on the South Coast was undertaken by the U.S. Government. A recommendation was made for a light station at Ano Nuevo but the lighthouse was eventually constructed at Pigeon Point in 1872. A whistle was installed at Ano Nuevo the same year. Ano Nuevo acquired a light in 1890. A steam whistle was also placed at Point Montara in 1887, but was replaced in 1900 when a squat metal tower was constructed to house a light.”

"The need for better links to the outside has been a central theme of Coastside history. In the 1860's and 70's, stage roads were built to connect Redwood City and San Mateo on the Bayside with Half Moon Bay, Purisima, San Gregorio and Pescadero. Completion of the San Francisco-San Jose Railroad in 1863 was also a major event for Coastsiders. San Mateo and Redwood City then became the main connections between the railroad and the stage lines to the Coastside. Besides better communication and freight service, the stage roads brought tourists to the South Coast to fish, camp, and enjoy the beach and forests."

"As transportation improved, people on the South Coast, which was then part of Santa Cruz County, petitioned for annexation to San Mateo County because of the lack of roads to the County seat at Santa Cruz. In 1868, the legislature authorized annexation and San Mateo County's land area increased nearly one fourth. But despite the annexation and new stage lines to San Mateo and Redwood City, development languished. The Coastside remained the center of farming, lumbering, dairy production and recreation for the County. Only Half Moon Bay, Pescadero and San Gregorio survived into the mid-20th century as viable towns."

COASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT SINCE 1900

Ocean Shore Railroad

"The first years of the 20th century held great promise for the Coastside. In 1905, the Ocean Shore Railroad Company began building a line down the coast from San Francisco to Santa Cruz. For years, talk of a railroad along the coast had stirred local hopes for increased development. Speculators lost no time planning townsites with picturesque names like Vallemar, El Granada and Rockaway Beach. The rails had reached Mussel Rock on the north coast when the 1906 earthquake struck. Much of the line was obliterated and construction equipment was carried into the ocean. The quake dealt a staggering financial blow to the fledgling railroad and plans for the railroad were scaled down. At the same time, however, land speculators expected the quake and fire which destroyed San Francisco to produce a boom. They envisioned an exodus from the city to the coast, with thousands of persons building on the newly subdivided lots. To their disappointment, San Francisco quickly rebuilt. Although many of the Coastside lots were sold, few were developed."

"By 1908, the Ocean Shore Railroad had tunneled through San Pedro Point, cut a precarious route along Devil's Slide and extended beyond Half Moon Bay to Tunitas Creek. It then ran out of funds. The 26-mile gap between Tunitas and Davenport in Santa Cruz County was never closed and passengers had to ride in touring cars between the two points. In spite of deep financial troubles, the railroad survived until 1920 by hauling freight between coastal towns and farms and San Francisco. But by 1920, the roads had been improved and cars and trucks cut into business so deeply that the line was forced out of business."

Prohibition and Bootlegging

"The year the Ocean Shore Railroad folded, Prohibition began, bringing new life to the coast. Restaurants, boarding houses, hotels, and inns that had been built to serve rail travelers adapted to the auto traffic along the north part of the new coast road during the Prohibition years of the 20's and 30's. Its isolation and remoteness made the coast an ideal spot for rumrunning, speakeasies, bootleggers, and moonshiners. Under cover of fog and darkness, boats from Canada unloaded cargo at numerous points. Millions of dollars of liquor were smuggled into thirsty San Francisco by cars and vans or consumed in Coastside road houses catering to

customers from San Francisco and the Peninsula. Rum-running and bootlegging became the County's biggest business during the period, a business that was punctuated by a number of shootouts between rumrunner and federal agents."

"Following prohibition's repeal in 1933, the effects of the Depression hit the Coastside hard. The local economy was boosted somewhat with jobs and money when the State undertook completion of the Coast Highway, much of which ran along the old Ocean Shore Railroad route."

World War II

"The attack on Pearl Harbor late in 1941 brought other changes to the Coastside. The Army, Navy and Coast Guard moved in to prepare for a possible Japanese invasion. They constructed gun emplacements, communications posts, barracks, airstrips, and other facilities. Some existing buildings were taken over for military use. Soldiers and Coast Guardsmen kept a 24-hour watch along the beaches. Coastside residents also felt the impact of wartime measures because of the blackouts and housing shortages resulting from the influx of defense workers from Bayside war industries."

Post-War Development

"After the war, the north coast, because of its proximity to San Francisco, exploded with development. New housing tracts spread rapidly over what had been sand dunes, farm fields and grazing land. Artichokes, flowers and dairy cattle disappeared. In their place rose rows of almost identical houses. Ground which the San Andreas Fault had split open in 1906 was graded and covered with homes, as were magnificent but unstable bluffs overlooking the sea. A popular folksong of the period, "Little Boxes" by Malvina Reynolds, described the changing character of the County's north coast. The land hunger of the squatters of the 1850's was matched by that of the home seekers and developers a century later. The population of the area doubled and then doubled again the two decades after 1940. Pacifica, which did not exist before the war, incorporated in 1957 as a collection of north coast subdivisions, and Half Moon Bay, the County's oldest town, incorporated in 1959. Soon after, with the aid of federal funds, the first real harbor on the San Mateo coast was completed at nearby Princeton. The rapid post-war growth of Pacifica ended by the late 1960's when available land disappeared. The absence of a cross-county freeway helped prevent rapid development of the area south of Devil's Slide."

"In the mid-1960's, Henry Doelger, a developer who had built many subdivisions in San Francisco, Daly City and Pacifica, announced plans to build a community for 30,000 people in the area north of Half Moon Bay. Most of Doelger's plans never materialized, but they did draw attention to the vacant town sites platted by the railroad promoters 50 years earlier. As a result, other investors moved in during the 1970's and the pace of home building north of Half Moon Bay accelerated, more than doubling the area's population. However, the limited availability of water, sewers and other facilities eventually slowed construction to a virtual halt."

"During this same period, a strong environmental movement developed to preserve the coast. A new Statewide awareness arose as people realized that the rapid pace of post-war development had destroyed irreplaceable resources. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted in 1970. A State coastal conservation initiative was passed by California voters in 1972 to establish measures to control further development of the coast and retain for future generations much of its remaining beauty. The 1976 Coastal Act and the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program are the result of that 1972 Initiative."

2. Applicable Policies and Regulations

a. Half Moon Bay General Plan

The Half Moon Bay General Plan, Open Space and Conservation Element contains the following policies that are relevant to cultural resources:

Policy 6-1

The City will actively solicit technical and financial assistance from the State and federal governments for purposes of undertaking a survey of potential archaeological resources in Half Moon Bay.

Policy 6-3

In that portion of any development of 1 acre or more, as indicated on the Land Use Plan Map, which is also within an area designated on the Map of Potential Archaeological Resources, an archaeological survey shall be undertaken as a part of the preparation of a specific plan for development. The survey shall include findings on actual and potential resources on the site, impacts of the development proposed, and recommended mitigation measures. All feasible mitigation measures shall be incorporated in the specific plan or development plan prior to the issuance of a permit for development.

Policy 6-4

As a part of any project to construct new roads, trails, sewer, or water lines, or other public projects involving substantial excavation which could destroy archaeological resources within the areas designated on the Map of Potential Archaeological resources, provision shall be made for an archaeological survey and the opportunity to sample and salvage the site by a qualified archaeologist as a part of the construction project.

b. San Mateo County General Plan

The General Plan policies of San Mateo County's General Plan (1986) includes a number of policies that are applicable in the Coastal Annexation Area. These policies define the resources, list standards for proposed development and include standards for proposed open space land uses adjacent to existing agricultural uses. These policies are listed by number here; the full text of the General Plan policies is found in Appendix A.

<u>5.1</u>	<u>Historic Resource Protection</u>
<u>5.2</u>	<u>Rehabilitation of Historic Structures</u>
<u>5.3</u>	<u>Protection of Archaeological/Paleontological Sites</u>
<u>5.6</u>	<u>Increase Public Awareness</u>
<u>5.7</u>	<u>Definition of Historic Resource</u>
<u>5.8</u>	<u>Definition of Historic District</u>
<u>5.9</u>	<u>Definition of Historic Landmark</u>
<u>5.11</u>	<u>Recognition of Historic Resources</u>
<u>5.12</u>	<u>Rehabilitation of Historic Resources</u>
<u>5.15</u>	<u>Protection of Historic Resources</u>
<u>5.20</u>	<u>Protection of Archaeological/Paleontological Resources – Site Survey</u>

5.21 Site Treatment

c. State of California

Public Resources Code 21083.2 (g) defines a unique archaeological resource to be: an archaeological artifact, object, or site, about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria: (1) contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; (2) has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or, (3) is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Section 21084.1 requires treatment of any substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) as a significant effect on the environment. The definition of "historical resource" includes archaeological resources listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the CRHR and by reference, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, and local registers.

Other state level requirements for cultural resources management appear in the California Public Resources Code, Chapter 1.7, Section 5097.5 (Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historical Sites), and Chapter 1.75, beginning at Section 5097.9 (Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites) for lands owned by the state or a state agency.

The disposition of Native American burials is governed by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code, and falls within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). If human remains are discovered, the County Coroner must be notified within 48 hours and there should be no further disturbance to the site where the remains were found. If the remains are determined by the coroner to be Native American, the coroner is responsible for contacting the NAHC within 24 hours. The NAHC, pursuant to Section 5097.98, will immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American so they can inspect the burial site and make recommendations for treatment or disposal.

d. Federal Statutes/Regulations

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) established the federal government's policy on historic preservation and the programs, including the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), through which that policy is implemented. Under the NHPA, historic properties include ". . . any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places" (16 United States Code [USC] 470w (5)). Section 106 (16 USC 470f) of the NHPA requires federal agencies, prior to implementing an "undertaking" (e.g., issuing a federal permit), to consider the effects of the undertaking on historic properties and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) a reasonable opportunity to comment on any undertaking that would adversely affect properties eligible for listing on the NRHP.

If a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit is required for construction (wetland fills or

crossings), the NHPA of 1966 (as amended) and its implementing regulations (16 USC 470 et seq., 36 CFR Part 800, 36 CFR Part 60, and 36 CFR Part 63) also apply. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), as lead federal agency for issuing the CWA Section 404 permit, would be the lead agency for NHPA Section 106 compliance and consultation with the SHPO and ACHP would be required.

3. **Significance Criteria**

CEQA requires a Lead Agency to identify and examine environmental effects that may result in significant adverse effects. Where a project may adversely affect a unique archaeological resource, Section 21083.2 requires the Lead Agency to treat that effect as a significant environmental effect and prepare an EIR. When an archaeological resource is listed in or is eligible to be listed in the CRHR, Section 21084.1 requires that any substantial adverse effect to that resource be considered a significant environmental effect. Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 operate independently to ensure that potential effects on archaeological resources are considered as part of a project's environmental analysis. Either of these benchmarks may indicate that a project may have a potential adverse effect on archaeological resources.

The project would have a significant effect on cultural resources if it would:

- CUL-1 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5;
- CUL-2 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature;
- CUL-3 Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries;
- CUL-4 Not conform to relevant plans, policies and ordinances related to protecting cultural resources.

1. **Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

CUL-1 Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact CUL-1 An historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources. Subdivision (g) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 states that a resource identified as significant in an historical resource survey may be listed in the California Register if the survey meets all of the following criteria:

- (1) The survey has been or will be included in the State Historic Resources Inventory.
- (2) The survey and the survey documentation were prepared in accordance with office procedures and requirements.
- (3) The resource is evaluated and determined by the office [of Historic Preservation] to have a significance rating of Category 1 to 5 on DPR Form 523.

(4) If the survey is five or more years old at the time of its nomination for inclusion in the California Registry, the survey is updated to identify historical resources which have been demolished or altered in a manner that substantially diminishes the significance of the resource.

Specific lands to be acquired by the District have not been identified, but lands acquired may contain historical resources. Due to public safety concerns, historical structures may need to be removed. At a minimum, treatment of a building and/or structure to be affected should provide for mitigation options and procedures for both the building to be affected by the project and any adjacent buildings with the potential to be affected by either direct or indirect impacts. Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and 1b will mitigate all impacts to historic structures to less than significant levels.

As stated in the Project Description, all properties acquired by the District in the Coastal Annexation Area remain subject to existing Federal, State, County and City laws including local land use regulations and zoning designations. Further, the Draft Service Plan states that any properties acquired in the Coastal Annexation Area will have individual site assessments or use and management plans prepared for each acquisition.

Mitigation CUL-1a The protocol for determining if structures are of historic value is as follows:

1. The property and building types will be identified and evaluated by a qualified cultural consultant;
2. The cultural consultant will determine if the structures in question are currently included in a local register of historic resources, on the California Register of Historic Resources or on the National Register of Historic Places;
3. If it is determined that the structures in question are not currently included in a local register of historic resources, on the California Register of Historic Resources or on the National Register of Historic Places, a DPR 523 form issued by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) will be completed by the cultural consultant and the structural and building data sent to a qualified architectural historian;
4. If it is determined that the structures in question are currently on the California Register of Historic Resources or if the building has been determined to be of historic value, there are two options that would mitigate any impact to the historic values:
 - a) Retain and rehabilitate the building, rehabilitate it according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (U.S. Department of Interior 1990). New construction near this building should be consistent with its historic character; or
 - b) Move the building to a different location on its current parcel or to a different parcel appropriate to its historic character.

Mitigation Cul-1b Short-Term/Construction activities may impact nearby historic properties. These impacts may include dust accumulation on building facades, and increased noise and vibration from construction equipment. Construction period impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

1. Project specifications should shall require the contractor(s) and any subcontractors to conform to the County's noise control requirements.
2. Project specifications should shall require the general contractor and any subcontractors to control dust and exhaust emissions of particulates through water sprinkling during demolition and

excavation activities; covering of stockpiles of soil, sand and other such materials; covering trucks hauling debris, soil, sand and other such materials; street sweeping of the streets surrounding excavation and construction sites; equipment maintenance to reduce emissions; and, prohibitions on idling engines when not in use.

3. Cleaning of the adjacent historic buildings may be necessary after construction activities to prevent long-term damage to the building fabric. The need for cleaning shall be determined by a qualified Historic Architect, shall follow the standards set by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be completed in consultation with the Historic Architect.

4. A structural engineer should shall inspect the buildings prior to construction to determine if the noise and vibration anticipated during construction will affect the buildings framework and fabric. The report, with any recommendations and mitigation measures, should be reviewed by a qualified Historic Architect.

CUL-2 Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact CUL-2 Specific lands to be acquired by the District have not been identified, but lands acquired may contain archaeological and paleontological resources. Ground excavation or other ground disturbance during development of improvements could impact these resources. Destruction or other substantial adverse changes to archaeological and paleontological resources would be a significant impact. Mitigation measures can be applied to reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. The Mitigation Measure CUL-2 listed below will mitigate all cultural impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation CUL-2 Application of the Standard Protocol for Unexpected Discovery of Archaeological and Paleontological Cultural Materials will be applied:

Protocol for Unexpected Discovery of Archaeological and Paleontological Cultural Materials In the event that any cultural resources are exposed during construction, work at the location of the find will halt immediately within 10 meters (30 feet) of the find. If an archaeologist is not present at the time of the discovery, the District will contact an archaeologist for identification and evaluation in accordance with CEQA criteria.

A reasonable effort will be made by the District and archaeologist to avoid or minimize harm to the discovery until significance is determined and an appropriate treatment can be identified and implemented. Methods to protect finds include fencing, covering remains with protective material and culturally sterile soil or plywood. If vandalism is a threat, 24-hour security shall be provided. During this evaluation period, construction operations outside of the find location can continue preferably with an archaeologist monitoring any subsurface excavations.

If the resource cannot be avoided, the archaeologist will develop an appropriate *Action Plan* for treatment within 48 hours to minimize or mitigate the adverse effects. The District will not proceed with construction activities that could affect the discovery until the *Action Plan* has been reviewed and approved. The treatment effort required to mitigate the inadvertent exposure of significant cultural resources will be guided by a research design appropriate to the discovery and potential research data inherent in the resource in association with suitable archaeological field

techniques and analytical strategies. The recovery effort will be detailed in a professional report in accordance with current archaeological standards. Any non-grave associated artifacts will be curated with an appropriate repository.

CUL-3 Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact CUL-3 Specific lands to be acquired by the District have not been identified, but lands acquired may contain human remains. Ground excavation or other ground disturbance during development of improvements, such as trails, could disturb these remains, which would be a significant impact. Mitigation Measure CUL-3 can be applied to reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level:

Mitigation CUL-3 Application of the Native American Burial Plan (NABP) will be applied:

Native American Burial Plan (NABP)

- 1) In the event of an inadvertent discovery of human remains and cultural items during project construction, the field crew supervisor shall take immediate steps, if necessary, to secure and protect any remains and cultural materials. This shall include but is not limited to such measures as (a) temporary avoidance by construction until the remains and items can be removed; (b) posting a security person; (c) placement of a security fence around the area of concern; or, (d) some combination of these measures. Any such measures employed will depend upon the nature and particular circumstances of the discovery.
- 2) The County Medical Examiner (Coroner) shall be notified by the field crew supervisor or other designated District manager and informed of the find and of any efforts made to identify the remains as Native American. If the remains are identified as a prehistoric Native American by either a professional archaeologist under contract to the District or the Medical Examiner's forensic archaeologist, the Medical Examiner is responsible for contacting the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours of notification of the find. The Medical Examiner may choose to document and remove the remains at his/her discretion depending on the circumstances of the discovery. The NAHC then designates and notifies a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD has 24 hours to consult and provide recommendations for the treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the human remains and grave goods [Note: Other culturally affiliated Native Americans [Indians] may be consulted by the MLD during the consultation and recommendation process to determine treatment of the skeletal remains].
- 3) Each burial and associated cultural items shall be stored as a unit in a secure facility, which shall be accessible to the MLD and other Native American representative(s) or their designated alternates upon prior arrangement.
- 4) The remains and associated cultural items shall be reburied in a secure location as near as possible to the area of their discovery or at an off-site location acceptable to the MLD that has minimal potential for future disturbance. The reburial shall be done in a manner that shall discourage or deter future disturbance. Reburial shall be conducted by persons designated by the MLD, with the assistance, if requested, of the District's field crew. The location shall be fully documented, filed with the NAHC and the California Historical Resources

- Information System, Northwest Information Center, California State University, Sonoma and treated as confidential information.
- 5) If the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD, or the MLD fails to make a recommendation, or the District or designate rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation (as per Section 5097.94 subdivision (k)) fails, reinterment of the human remains and associated cultural items associated shall take place with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.
 - 6) For security reasons, no news releases, including but not limited to photographs, videotapes, written articles, or other such means that contains information about human remains or burial-related items of Native American origin shall be released by any party during the discovery, recovery and reburial unless approved by the MLD.
 - 7) Any disputes that arise among the MLD and representatives of affected Native American groups and/or between the District or designate and the MLD concerning cultural affiliation or the ultimate disposition of Native American human remains and associated funerary objects and unassociated funerary objects shall be resolved according to the dispute resolution procedures in Section 5097.94 of the State of California Public Resources Code.
 - 8) The Archaeological Data Recovery/Native American Burial Treatment Report(s) shall be prepared by professional archaeologists. The report shall include, but not be limited to, the following: project overview; ethnographic section; previous archaeological research in the region and on-site; circumstances of discovery; recovery procedures and techniques; artifact analysis; faunal analysis; osteological analysis and interpretation; and, conclusions. The MLD and other interested Native American representative(s) shall be provided an opportunity to review the report and submit comments within the same time period as accorded any other reviewers.
 - 9) Objects not associated with the human remains and recovered from private land shall be transferred to the District. If curation of any objects is required, curation will be at repository approved by the District. Repositories can include the History Museums of San Jose collections, the Tiburon Archaeological Research Group, San Francisco State University and the Collections Facility, Department of Anthropology, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.

CUL-4 Would the project not conform to relevant plans, policies and ordinances related to protecting cultural resources?

Impact CUL-4 Adherence to relevant plans and policies as listed in this section will avoid or reduce all substantial adverse effects on cultural resources from future acquisition, operation and management of parcels in the Coastal Annexation Area to less than significant levels. The Draft Service Plan includes the following policies that will avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources, listed below. These policies are part of the proposed project, therefore are not listed as mitigation.

Policy	Guideline
Guideline G.6.3	Inherent in the preservation of open space resources is the protection of: rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species; ecological systems; water quality; visual resources; and the unique cultural resources in the Coastal Annexation Area, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources. Therefore, prior to making any lands available to low-intensity public recreational access, the District shall prepare and adopt a site-specific resource management and public access plan for any lands acquired by the District or managed through contract for other public or private non-profit property owners. The development of plans will include opportunities for public involvement.
Implementation Action G.6.A(i)	Upon completion of the annexation process and with public involvement through local groups, the District shall conduct hearings to develop its Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area. These hearings shall address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agriculture and timber production; inter-agency relationships; and public information. <i>See also Implementation Actions G.5.C(i) and G.5.E(i)</i>
Guideline G.8	The District shall work with other public recreation and open space providers, conservation agencies, non-profit land trusts, and community organizations for the preservation and management of open space resources that are regionally significant. District participation, to the extent allowed by law, could include: partial financing for land acquisition; temporary receivership of property; coordination of technical planning and legal services relating to open space issues; joint grant proposals; co-sponsorship and participation in demonstration projects; and joint open space resource management training.
Guideline G.9	The District will encourage active public participation in: maintaining, restoring, and protecting natural resources; assisting in scientific research programs; and providing science and conservation education opportunities to the public.

K. Geology

The diverse terrain of the San Mateo County Coastside reflects an equally diverse geology. Area geology determines landforms and soil types and certain geological hazards such as earthquake faults and landslides. Mitigation measures contained in this chapter and in Chapter IV-H, Hydrology, will reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

1. Environmental Setting

The Coastal Annexation Area is underlain by some of the most complex and active geology in the world. The earth is made up of everything from iron- and magnesium-rich rocks formed deep in the interior to sand and gravel recently deposited by streams and rivers. Major active faults in the Coastal Annexation Area are the San Andreas and San Gregorio Faults. The main trace of the San Andreas fault is also highly active and has the potential to generate 7.9 magnitude earthquakes (Blake, T.F., 1996, EQSEARCH). Other faults in the area include the Pilarcitos, unnamed faults parallel to the San Andreas Fault, the Seal Cove, and thrust faults south along the Peninsula.

The San Andreas Fault has been a major factor in the development of the topography and soils within the Coastal Annexation Area. Some of the oldest rocks belong to the Franciscan Complex, formed some 150 to 90 million years ago as the Farallon Plate was subducted under the North American Plate. Many of the soils within this area are developed on sedimentary rocks and consist of sandy loam and silt loam surface layers over silty clay and silty clay loam subsoils. Boulders and cobbles derived from a conglomerate in the underlying geologic section are also present. Small coastal valleys occur throughout the length of the project along the major drainages within the watersheds. The soils in these valleys are deep and moderately well drained and have developed on low terraces and alluvial fans along the stream channels.

2. Applicable Policies and Regulations

The following policies are relevant to the Coastal Annexation Program and its potential effects related to geology, soils and seismic issues. Conformance with these policies will avoid or minimize adverse impacts. The Use and Management Plans subsequently prepared by the District will include review for consistency with these policies.

a. Half Moon Bay General Plan

The City's General Plan Chapter 4 addresses hazards from the perspective of siting urban development. The concern is for minimizing risk to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard. These policies address issues related to increasing risk to life and property by developing on unstable areas "arising from seismic events, tsunami run-up, landslides, flooding, or other geologic hazards such as expansive soils and subsidence areas. In areas of known geologic hazards, as indicated on the [City of Half Moon Bay] Geologic Hazards Map, a geologic report shall be required. Mitigation measures shall be required where necessary".

b. San Mateo County General Plan

The policies contained in the County's General Plan also address hazards from development, especially "[1] in an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, or [2] in any other area of

the County where an investigation is deemed necessary by the County Department of Public Works". Relevant policies are listed below; the full text of the General Plan Policies is found in Appendix A:

- 15.20 Review Criteria for Locating Development in Geotechnical Hazard Areas
15.21 Requirement for Detailed Geotechnical Investigations

3. Thresholds of Significance

A project would be normally considered to have significant geological and/or seismic effects if one or more of the following factors were met:

- GEO-1: Expose people or structures to 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;
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking;
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or
 - iv) Landslides
- GEO-2 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?
- GEO-3 Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?
- GEO-4 Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

4. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

- GEO-1 Expose people or structures to 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.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?**
- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**
- iv) Landslides?**

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.

Impact GEO-1 District acquisition or management of land alone would not increase public exposure to geologic hazards. However, future District facilities such as a field office or maintenance building could be constructed in an area subject to geologic hazards such as seismic

shaking or liquefaction. Such structures would be subject to an environmental review and permitting process by the City of Half Moon Bay or the County of San Mateo. This process would ensure that geologic hazards are avoided or mitigated to a less than significant level prior to approval.

Other future scenarios in the Coastal Annexation Area could lead to geologic impacts. These are discussed in detail, below:

When open space areas are opened to the public, users could potentially be exposed to geologic hazards such as unstable slopes in landslide areas. As part of the trail route planning, the District shall assess the potential for geologic hazards to affect the trail and the safety of trail users. With careful site planning, hazard areas can be avoided or the risk to public safety can be mitigated to a level of insignificance.

Mitigation GEO-1a Surveys shall be conducted as part of trail route site planning to identify the occurrence of any potentially hazardous geologic conditions such as unstable slopes in landslide areas. Such areas shall be avoided or necessary construction design measures shall be incorporated into the trail design to assure that:

- Users will not be exposed to the identified hazard
- Trails would not contribute to increasing the degree or extent of instability
- Drainage from the trail would be routed away from the instability

In no event shall a trail be routed across an instability that is actively supplying sediment directly into a channel within a watershed known to support anadromous fish species, unless the instability is stabilized.

Mitigation GEO-1b The District shall routinely monitor trails and provide regular maintenance to avoid public exposure to hazardous conditions.

Mitigation GEO-1c Where structures are proposed, a geotechnical evaluation shall be conducted to identify engineering methods to avoid the potential for structural failure due to geological hazards. All buildings shall be designed in a manner that reflects the geologic hazards on the site, and shall be consistent with local and Uniform Building Codes.

GEO-2 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?

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.

Application of mitigation measures GEO-1a-GEO-1c, above will reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels.

GEO-3 Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.

The program's effects on soil erosion and loss of topsoil are described in Chapter IV-H, Hydrology. Application of mitigation measures HYD-1a, HYD-1b, HYD-1c, HYD-1d and HYD-2 will reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels.

GEO-4 Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact GEO-4 Expansive soils are possible in the project area due to intense precipitation of significant durations typical of the Santa Cruz Mountains. Saturated soil conditions in areas of clay soils can cause these soils to expand. However, most of the impacts to life or property related to expansive soil result from insufficient or poorly executed building foundations; the District is only proposing a small field office and maintenance facilities within the Coastal Annexation Area. Any new parking or staging areas will be paved with gravel, so the risk to users of new open space preserves from clay soils will be negligible.

V. Alternatives

The assessment of alternatives to the proposed project in an EIR is intended to explore whether alternative actions, including no action, may reduce or eliminate significant environmental effects found for the proposed project. Under CEQA, an EIR must “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a). Section 15126.6(a) also states that an EIR “must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation.”

The foregoing environmental analysis finds that the Coastal Annexation project with mitigation will not cause significant environmental impacts. Future activities in the Coastal Annexation area have the potential to cause environmental impacts; these impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels with application of the Draft Service Plan Guidelines, Policies and Implementation Actions and the mitigation measures listed in each section of EIR Chapter IV, Environmental Assessment. Therefore, because there are no significant environmental impacts resulting from the project, it is difficult to select alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts of the project. CEQA Section 15126.6(a) states that “a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives should be discussed to foster informed decision making and public participation.”

In addition to comparing the level of environmental impact between alternatives, a determination must be made whether the particular alternative could obtain most of the basic project objectives. The Draft Service Plan states that the Mission for the Coastal Annexation Area is:

To acquire and preserve in perpetuity open space land and agricultural land of regional significance, protect and restore the natural environment, preserve rural character, encourage viable agricultural use of land resources, and provide opportunities for ecologically sensitive public enjoyment and education.

As stated in Chapter II, Project Description, the basic project objectives are to:

- protect watershed integrity and water quality;
- protect sensitive resources such as habitats for special-status species;
- provide key links to existing District and other public open space lands;
- maintain long-term opportunities for economically viable agriculture;
- provide visitor-serving facilities for low-intensity recreation;
- support development of an integrated regional trail system coordinated with the San Mateo County Trails Plan; and
- provide opportunities for scientific research, resource conservation demonstration projects, outdoor environmental education programs, and interpretive programs.

The alternatives analysis contained in this chapter includes three classes of alternatives:

- 1) No Project, including No Action and action by alternative service providers,
- 2) Alternative geographic annexation areas, and
- 3) Other Alternatives, including parcel-by-parcel annexation, extending the Sphere of

Influence only, purchase of conservation and agricultural easements only, and management only.

A. No Project

This section considers the effects of the District's taking no action on the project as well as the effects of actions that could be taken by alternative service providers in absence of annexation by the District.

1. No Action

If the District does not annex the Coastal Area, it is logical that the District would not purchase or manage lands in that area, or fulfill any of the provisions of the proposed Service Plan. Technically, the District can acquire land outside of its jurisdiction, however District policy is to purchase lands outside of District boundaries only under special circumstances (District Basic Policy, March 1999, Open Space Acquisition Policies as Lands Relate to Sphere of Influence, February 1987).

No District action on the coastside means that the potential impacts associated with visitor facilities and the visitor presence such as, potential hydrological and biological impacts of trail construction and use would be avoided. Impacts associated with acquisition and management such as, potential conflicts with agricultural uses would be avoided. However, because these potential impacts are capable of being reduced to less than significant during implementation through application of existing Draft Service Plan policies, guiding principles and mitigation measures listed in this EIR, the environmental benefit from the No Action alternative is not appreciable.

The environmental impact of No Action is foreclosure of the potential environmental benefits of the proposed annexation. The effect of proposed District actions in the Coastal Annexation Area will be a net benefit to a variety of environmental resources: open space, agriculture, biology, public recreation, aesthetics, and cultural resources. This benefit will accrue due to the District protection of managed land from development and intensive use which tends to degrade those resources. There are environmental impacts associated with additional development and a potential loss of open space and agricultural lands that could occur if the District does not purchase and/or manage lands as open space. This potential benefit would be lost if the District does not annex the Coastal Area.

This alternative does not meet the District's objectives for this project or result in avoiding or substantially lessening the significant effects of the project.

2. Alternative Service Providers

a. Public Agencies

If the District does not pursue open space conservation in the Coastal Annexation Area, other entities may do so. At present, the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation and the County of San Mateo have a significant presence in the Coastal Annexation Area. The State owns roughly 15,600 acres, 11% of the 140,000 acre annexation area. The County owns 8,800 acres (6%) (see Map 10 Land Ownership and its accompanying Tabular Analysis). The U.S. government currently has a minor presence in the annexation area through the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), administered by the National Park

Service. The GGNRA is more active to the north, beginning in the hills above Pacifica and extending into Marin County.

The State and County do not have any major expansion plans within the Coastal Annexation Area, although with the passage of Propositions 12 and 40 (both provide funding for park acquisition), there may be more money available for future acquisitions. One area of expansion for County Parks is the recent acquisition of a 49-acre parcel near El Granada (known as Mirada Surf). The District Superintendent for the State Parks stated that although the State Parks may accept some new properties from other organizations such as POST or the Coastal Conservancy, it does not have major funding for operations and maintenance of new properties (Ron Schafer, State Parks, pers. comm.).

There is currently a proposal to extend the GGNRA boundaries south into the Coastal Annexation Area to include approximately 4800 acres. This proposal includes the approximately 4300 acre Rancho Corral de Tierra which is in the process of being acquired by POST. POST proposes to transfer most of this property to the GGNRA. This proposal is further discussed in Chapter III Section B.4. Land acquired and managed by The National Park Service must meet specific criteria including that it be of national significance. This 4800 acre boundary adjustment meets the criteria for inclusion into the GGNRA. Due to this strict criteria that is used by the National Park Service for land acquisition, it is unlikely that this agency would play a large role in land acquisition and management in the rest of the Coastal Annexation Area.

It is expected that the influence of the State and County would be fairly modest and would accomplish the basic project objectives of the District's Coastal Annexation project with the exception of maintaining long term opportunities for economically viable agriculture. While the County's recreation plans in the bayside areas typically favor more active uses such as ballfields, this is not the case in the Coastal Annexation Area. Also, while the State offers higher-use activities such as provision of campgrounds, parking lots and toilets, because any expansion by the State within the Coastal Annexation Area would be modest, the impacts from provision of park and recreation areas by the State and County would be similar to the proposed project, but on a reduced scale commensurate with the extent of their acquisitions.

The other public agencies operating on the coastside share general open space and visitor serving recreation objectives with the District, but do not include preservation of agricultural land in their mission. In the Coastal Annexation Area, the District mission includes "encourage viable agricultural use of land resources" and "maintain long-term opportunities for economically viable agriculture". The Alternative Service Providers alternative would not accomplish the proposed project's potential environmental benefits of agricultural preservation.

b. Private Non-Profit Land Trust

Private, non-profit land trusts, notably the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST), the Trust for Public Land (TPL), the Sempervirens Fund, and the Sequoia Chapter of the Audubon Society have been active in the Coastal Annexation Area. Current private land trust holdings (May 2002) are in excess of 16,000 acres (11%) (see Table IV-A-3 and Map 10). These groups and other similar entities, such as the American Land Conservancy, have expressed an intent to continue with private land acquisition. The objective of the private land trust is similar to the District's overarching purpose, which is open space land preservation, but the private trusts usually have a reduced capacity to offer land management, and usually do not provide public access and low intensity recreation as does the District. In the past, the District has

cooperatively managed lands owned by private trusts in order to provide for safe, controlled public access. That cooperative relationship is taken into account in the implementation scenarios in the Draft Service Plan and Fiscal Analysis.

Thus, continuing private trust acquisition is possible under the No Project alternative, but without District participation in management. To the degree to which private trust land did not allow public access, then the potential impacts associated with visitor facilities and the visitor presence would be avoided. Impacts associated with trail construction and usage, including potential conflicts with agricultural uses and potential hydrological and biological impacts would be avoided. However, because these potential impacts are capable of being reduced to less than significant during implementation through application of existing Draft Service Plan policies, guiding principles and mitigation measures listed in this EIR, the environmental benefit from this form of the No Project alternative is not appreciable.

The benefit of public recreation from District management, then, would not be achieved under this alternative. The District generally would be unable to provide improved access to public open space lands. In addition, the benefits of public safety and resource management, as are currently provided by the District in existing preserves, would not be provided. These benefits include a regular presence on-site, which provides public safety, including 2-way radio communication to report hazards like fire, flood or medical emergencies. District personnel work closely with California Department of Forestry Fire Protection and local fire and emergency providers to ensure quick response to fires and emergencies. That additional benefit would not be available if District personnel were not present in the area.

B. Alternate Geographic Annexation Areas

The proposed project is the entire 140,000 acre coastal portion of San Mateo County contiguous with the entire existing western boundary of the District and reaching from the Santa Cruz County line to the southern limits of the City of Pacifica and the San Francisco Watershed Lands. An alternative to annexation of the entire area would have the District consider extending its Sphere of Influence to include the entire Coastal Annexation Area, but annexing only a portion of the larger area at this time.

The Coastal Annexation Area could be subdivided in many different ways, but overall consideration of population, land use, and physical geography suggest the three subareas shown on Map 17, Geographic Subareas and described in Section IV.A, Land Use. There are four logical combinations of the three geographic subareas which are explored here as alternative District annexation actions:

- 1) Annex the Northern Watersheds, only.
- 2) Annex the Skyline Upper Subarea, only.
- 3) Annex the Skyline Upper Watersheds and Northern Watersheds together.
- 4) Annex the Skyline Upper and Southern Watersheds together.

The alternative of Annex the Southern Watersheds Only was considered but rejected as infeasible since that subarea is not contiguous to the District's current boundary and would present difficulties in management and patrol.

1. Northern Watersheds Only

The Northern Watersheds only alternate annexation area extends from the southern boundary of the City of Pacifica south to the Pescadero Watershed and from the District's current boundary and LCP boundary west to the Pacific Ocean (see Map 17, Geographic Subareas). This alternative includes the unincorporated midcoast communities, the City of Half Moon Bay and San Gregorio. Including the 4,000 acres of the City of Half Moon Bay, the Northern Watersheds alternative is 57,400 acres in size, 41% of the entire proposed annexation area (see Table IV-A-1, Land Use Summary and Table IV-A-3, Ownership Status).

Geographically, the Northern Watersheds area is the coastal plain and lower drainages. It contains the City of Half Moon Bay and the unincorporated communities of El Granada, Montara, and Moss Beach so that some 2,700 acres (5%) are considered urban land use. Most of the population of the coastal annexation area is in the Northern Watersheds portion. Roughly 6,600 acres (12%) of the area is agriculturally cultivated, some 21,100 acres is used for grazing, and the remainder is predominantly coastal scrub with some woodland. See Map 12, Important Farmlands and Map 15, Vegetation.

Land ownership (see Map 10) in the Northern Watershed shows small coastal State, County, and City parks, with less than 6% of the total area in public ownership. Numerous small parcels reflect the urban presence of Half Moon Bay and the urban mid-coast in the Northern Watersheds. However, roughly 80% of the area is still in large parcels of 40 acres or more.

Some of the planning characteristics for this area are:

- The District already owns headwaters of San Gregorio Creek
- San Gregorio Creek is good anadromous fish habitat (e.g. Steelhead and Coho); protection is a National priority
- At present, there is no coordinated resource management plan in place to protect the watershed as is the case with the Pescadero/Butano watershed to the south.
- There is significant development pressure/potential (i.e. density credits, large parcels that could be subdivided)

Annexation of the Northern Watersheds area would still require the District to develop agricultural related policies as part of the Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area. While there are agricultural related policies in the Draft Service Plan, the District will develop further policies if the annexation is approved that will constitute the Basic Policies for the Coastal Annexation Area (Guideline G.6.1 Draft Service Plan). Coastal zone planning issues and all other environmental areas of concern would persist and would require the same scope of assessment at the time specific acquisitions and facilities were considered.

By eliminating the Southern and Skyline geographic area from the project, the potential impacts from visitor facilities and visitor presence would be avoided there. Impacts from trail construction and use, including potential conflicts with agricultural uses and potential hydrological and biological impacts would be avoided. However, because these potential impacts can be reduced to less than significant through application of existing Draft Service Plan policies, guiding principles and mitigation measures listed in this EIR, it is not necessary to eliminate the Southern and Skyline geographic area from the annexation to substantially reduce or eliminate impacts.

Reducing the annexation area would limit the overall environmental benefit from the project. The Southern and Skyline geographic area are biologically and agriculturally rich, but would not receive the potential benefits of the proposed open space preservation program such as acquisition, management and preservation.

The Northern Watersheds contains roughly half of the agricultural and grazing lands in the Coastal Annexation Area. Limitation of the Coastal Annexation to this alternative would meet some of the basic project objectives, but on a reduced scale due to the smaller amount of agricultural land that could potentially be preserved. It would also significantly reduce the preservation of key scenic and biological resources found elsewhere.

2. Annex Skyline Upper Watersheds Only

The Skyline Upper Watersheds alternate annexation area is roughly equivalent to the Skyline planning area of the County of San Mateo General Plan, with the exclusion of those parts of the Skyline planning area already in the District (see Map 17, Geographic Subareas). The Skyline planning area includes all of the proposed annexation area not in the coastal zone. The Skyline Upper Watersheds alternative annexation area is contiguous with the current MROSD jurisdiction. The Skyline area is 47,500 acres in size, one third of the proposed annexation area.

Geographically, the Skyline Upper Watersheds is the steep western side of the Santa Cruz mountains. The low density population includes commuters to Bayside employment. Due to steep terrain, the Skyline has essentially no cultivated agriculture; roughly 18% of the area is used for grazing, the remainder is wooded, predominantly redwood forest. See Map 12, Important Farmlands and Map 15, Vegetation.

Land ownership (see Map 10) reflects the large County park and portions of the State park systems; one quarter of the Skyline Upper Watersheds is in public ownership. So far, private land trusts have not played a significant role here. About 87% of the Skyline Upper Watersheds is in parcels of 40 acres or greater.

Some of the planning characteristics for this area are:

- This area does not have the land use protections of the Coastal Zone
- Pending POST acquisitions provide opportunities for trail/open space linkages
- There are opportunities for connections between District lands and Pescadero County Park

District annexation of the Skyline Upper Watersheds area would keep annexation contiguous to the existing District and would extend District open space protection to the same kind of terrain and recreation potential that it now manages on the Bayside at its current preserves.

Annexation of the Skyline Upper Watersheds area only would reduce the importance of the District developing policies to deal with agriculture and coastal zone planning issues. All other environmental areas of concern would persist as identified in this EIR, and would require the same scope of assessment at the time specific acquisitions and facilities were considered.

As with the previous geographic alternative, reducing the annexation area removes the potential project impacts and potential project benefits from the area excluded. Because potential impacts can be reduced to less than significant through application of existing Draft

Service Plan policies, guiding principles and mitigation measures listed in this EIR, the environmental benefit from this geographic alternative is not appreciable.

Foregoing annexation of the Northern and Southern watersheds would reduce the overall environmental benefit from annexation. Those areas are biologically and agriculturally rich in other geographical alternatives would not receive the potential benefits of the proposed open space preservation program such as acquisition, management and preservation. The Skyline Upper Watersheds contains only a small amount of agricultural and grazing lands compared to the rest of the Coastal Annexation Area. Limitation of the Coastal Annexation to this alternative would meet some of the basic project objectives, but on a significantly reduced scale because very little agricultural land that could potentially be preserved. It would also significantly reduce the preservation of key scenic and biological resources found in the other geographical alternatives.

3. Skyline Upper and Northern Watersheds

The Skyline Upper and Northern Watersheds alternate annexation area is the combination of both areas described above (see Map 17, Geographic Subareas). The combined annexation area would be contiguous with the existing MROSD boundary.

The impacts of this alternative would be similar to those described above with the added benefit that more geographical area would potentially benefit from the elements of the proposed open space preservation program such as acquisition, management and preservation.

The Skyline Upper and Northern Watersheds together contain roughly 60% of the agricultural and 70% of the grazing lands. Reduction of the Coastal Annexation Area to this alternative would meet some of the basic project objectives, but on a reduced scale due to the smaller amount of agricultural land that could potentially be preserved. It would also reduce the preservation of key scenic and biological resources found in the Southern Watershed.

4. Skyline Upper and Southern Watersheds

The Skyline Upper and Southern Watersheds' alternate annexation area is the combination of the Skyline Upper area described above and the Southern Watersheds area. The combined annexation area would be contiguous with the existing MROSD boundary. The Southern Watersheds area includes coastal portion of the coastside from the Pescadero Watershed on the north and extends south to the San Mateo/Santa Cruz County line and inland to the LCP boundary (see Map 17, Geographic Subareas). The Southern Watershed area is approximately 35,100 acres in size, one quarter of the proposed annexation area. It is entirely within San Mateo County's Local Coastal Program.

Geographically, the Southern Watershed area comprises coastal plain and lower drainages. It contains the small community of Pescadero. Over 40% of the cultivated agriculture of the annexation area is in the coastal plain of the Southern Watersheds; roughly 3,800 acres (11%) of the area is cultivated, 11,400 acres (32%) is used for grazing, the remainder is predominantly coastal prairie, coastal scrub and chaparral, with some 2,000 acres of mixed evergreen forest. See Map 12, Important Farmlands and Map 15, Vegetation.

Land ownership (see Map 10) reflects several State Parks, including Butano and Ano Nuevo. In all, some 9,700 acres (28%) are in public ownership. Private land trusts have been

active on the Southern Watersheds; with holdings of more than 5,000 acres. Almost 85% of the Southern Watersheds is in parcels of 40 acres or greater size.

Some of the planning characteristics for the Southern Watershed are:

- There is development pressure/potential (i.e. density credits, large parcels already subdivided on paper)
- There are opportunities to expand Cloverdale Ranch and Butano State Park and connect with Big Basin Redwoods State Park
- The area has important concentrations of rare species and anadromous fisheries
- The area has important viewsheds and scenic Highway 1.

Because agriculture and forestry are important uses in the areas considered in this alternative, annexation of the Skyline Upper and Southern Watersheds area would still require the District to develop agricultural and forestry related policies and refine those listed in the Draft Service Plan for inclusion into the future Basic Service Plan. Coastal zone planning issues and all other environmental areas of concern would persist as with the proposed annexation project and would require the same scope of assessment at the time specific acquisitions and facilities were considered, as is true of the proposed annexation project.

Excluding the Northern Watersheds geographic area from annexation would reduce the potential impacts associated with visitor facilities and the visitor presence such as trail construction and use, potential conflicts with agricultural uses and potential hydrological and biological impacts. However, because these potential impacts are capable of being reduced to less than significant during implementation through application of existing Draft Service Plan policies, guiding principles and mitigation measures listed in this EIR, the environmental benefit from this geographic alternative is not appreciable.

The overall environmental benefit of the proposed open space preservation program such as acquisition, management and preservation would not be afforded to the Northern Watersheds area. Important areas that are biologically and agriculturally rich in the Northern Watersheds and important open space near the present urban centers would not receive the potential benefits of preservation. Reduction of the Coastal Annexation Area would still meet the basic project objectives, but on reduced scale due to a smaller geographic area.

C. Other Alternatives

1. District annexation on a parcel by parcel basis

An alternative to annexation of the entire Coastal Annexation Area is annexation of individual parcels as they are acquired. The District would purchase a parcel as it became available and may apply to LAFCo to annex the parcel when the District determines that it is appropriate. This practice is what currently happens today. The Coastal Annexation project would not be pursued and the District would proceed with parcel acquisition and management as it currently does. Future acquisitions would occur on a piecemeal basis when the District wishes to acquire or manage a property.

The potential impacts associated with visitor facilities and the visitor presence would be reduced to the extent that land annexed by the District is reduced. Impacts associated with trail construction and usage, including potential conflicts with agricultural uses and potential hydrological and biological impacts would be reduced. However, because these potential

impacts are capable of being reduced to less than significant during implementation through application of existing Draft Service Plan policies, guiding principles and mitigation measures listed in this EIR, the environmental benefit from this alternative is not appreciable.

The effect of District actions resulting from the proposed annexation project will be a net benefit to a variety of environmental resources: open space, agriculture, biology, public recreation, aesthetics, and cultural resources. This benefit will accrue due to the District protection of managed land from development and intensive use which tends to degrade those resources. There are environmental impacts associated with additional development and a potential loss of open space and agricultural lands could occur if the District does not purchase and/or manage lands as open space. This potential benefit would not occur if the District does not annex the Coastal Area.

This alternative would not meet the District's basic project objectives for several reasons: the District would be less able to plan an efficient and manageable system of open space preserves and trails, and less able to coordinate with other open space providers. This would reduce the amount of open space protection because it would make it harder to balance the investment of public funds between outright acquisition and cooperative management for maximum public benefit.

2. Extending District Sphere of Influence Only

Another alternative would be to extend only the District's Sphere of Influence to include the Coastal Annexation Area but not annex the area at this time. Extension of the Sphere of Influence would still require LAFCo approval. The District would need approval from LAFCo for future annexation proposals within their expanded Sphere of Influence. Future annexations could occur on a piecemeal basis when the District determines that it is appropriate or the District could pursue annexation of the entire area as is currently proposed.

The District would still be able to purchase and manage lands within its Sphere of Influence. The District could still include the area in its Master Planning documents and Regional Open Space Study which would allow for comprehensive open space planning for the area. The level of impact and benefits of this alternative would be similar to the proposed project to the degree that the District was able to move forward with implementation. Although this alternative is not technically incompatible with the District's objectives for the Coastal Annexation Area, it is not the preferred alternative for several reasons. Despite the Sphere extension, annexation would still need to occur on a parcel-by-parcel basis. This limitation would limit the District's ability to take advantage of opportunities working collaboratively with other governmental agencies and with non-profit non-governmental organizations as outlined in the Coastal Annexation Service Plan. This would reduce the amount of open space protection because it would make it harder to balance the investment of public funds between outright acquisition and cooperative management for maximum public benefit.

3. Purchasing Conservation and Agricultural Easements Only

An alternative where the District would only purchase conservation and agricultural easements assumes that the District would still expand its Sphere of Influence to include the Coastal Annexation Area, but there would be no land acquisition or management of properties owned by other entities. Acquisition of easements means that the land is still owned by the current landowner and the District would not have use of the property for public access. Therefore, the amount of land purchased and managed and open to public access would be

reduced under this scenario. However, it is possible that more land may be protected under this alternative because of the cost per acre of land is less when acquiring easements versus acquiring fee title.

There would be fewer recreational opportunities because less land would be owned and managed by the District. The potential impacts associated with providing visitor facilities and the resulting increase in visitor presence in the Coastal Annexation Area would be avoided. Because these potential impacts from the provision of visitor-serving low-intensity recreation facilities are capable of being reduced to less than significant levels during implementation through application of Draft Service Plan Policies, Guiding Principles and Implementation Actions and mitigation measures listed in this EIR, the environmental benefit from this alternative is not appreciable.

Purchase of Conservation Easements Only would meet the resource protective project objectives:

- protect watershed integrity and water quality;
- protect sensitive resources such as habitats for special-status species;
- maintain long-term opportunities for economically viable agriculture;

It may allow limited attainment of the objective:

- provide opportunities for scientific research, resource conservation demonstration projects, outdoor environmental education programs, and interpretive programs.

With only easements the District would be unlikely to be able to meet the visitor serving objectives:

- provide key links to existing District and other public open space lands;
- provide visitor-serving facilities for low-intensity recreation;
- support development of an integrated regional trail system coordinated with the San Mateo County Trails Plan; and

Because the majority of the potential impacts identified in the EIR are associated with the visitor serving component of the project, the Purchase of Conservation Easements Only Alternative may be considered the environmentally preferable alternative. As demonstrated in the EIR, those visitor serving impacts can be mitigated to less than significant and it is not necessary for the District to forego attaining those visitor serving objectives in order to reduce or eliminate environmental impact.

4. Management of Open Space Lands Only

An alternative where the District would only manage open space lands assumes that the District would still expand its Sphere of Influence to include the Coastal Annexation Area, but would limit its activities to management of lands owned by other entities. There would be no land acquisition or conservation easements purchased. Therefore, the amount of land purchased and preserved by the District would be eliminated under this scenario.

According to the Draft Service Plan, management of lands through contract with other property owners (i.e., Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST), State of California) could involve stewardship programs and visitor-serving low-intensity recreation access. Contracts for ranger patrol, maintenance, and construction of improvements in managing other property owner's lands would be subject to available District resources such that no significant negative effect to existing District services would result.

The level of environmental impact of this alternative would be similar to the proposed project. This alternative would still meet the basic project objectives, but on a greatly reduced scale because the District would not be purchasing properties or conservation easements and would be limited to the management of existing and future acquisitions by other entities.

VI. CEQA Issues

CEQA asks the lead agency to consider several specific issues. These are discussed in this chapter.

A. Significant Irreversible Environmental Impacts

CEQA guidelines state that any significant irreversible environmental changes which would be caused by the proposed project should it be implemented should be discussed. Section 15126 (c) states that “Uses of nonrenewable resources during the construction and operation phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or non-use thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts, and, particularly, secondary impacts generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.”

Annexation of the Coastal Annexation Area into District jurisdiction would not involve a substantial use of nonrenewable resources, since the main District policies are to retain and steward natural open space preserves. Some nonrenewable resources (sand, gravel, fossil fuel) would be used in the construction, operation, and maintenance of new District preserves in the Coastal Annexation Area, especially at parking lots and trail staging areas; quantities of these resources would be small and are not considered significant.

B. Growth-Inducing Impacts

CEQA guidelines state that growth-inducing impacts are defined as ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. The concept of growth inducement also includes the characteristic that some projects may encourage and facilitate other activities which could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

As expressed in the Draft Service Plan, and modified as mitigation measure LU-1, Permanent Policy 2 states that the District will not initiate any activities in the Coastal Annexation Area that would require a General Plan amendment or zoning change. The proposed project would not remove obstacles to economic and/or population growth, as land would remain in its current land use designation. The project may provide new jobs as open space preserves or easements are acquired; however, the total and cumulative amount of these new jobs are small and are unlikely to induce significant growth in housing, industrial, or commercial land uses.

The proposed project would provide new access to undeveloped or underdeveloped area, in the form of new trails in easements or open space preserves within the Coastal Annexation Area. However, the addition or creation of new trails in the Coastal Annexation Area will by itself not induce significant growth in housing, industrial, or commercial land uses.

The open space preserves or easements acquired as a result of the project will not result in an extension of public services to an area not currently served by these services, nor will it set a precedent for future development. As is stated in the Draft Service Plan, the District is most interested in obtaining and/or managing “open space” properties. These are properties

that typically have few or very limited existing improvements. Municipal sewer or water services are not normally sought by the District unless already available to the property.

The project would not result in indirect growth-inducing effects. Indirect growth inducement occurs when a project attracts people from a large regional area who then buy goods and services in the local area, thus stimulating economic growth and employment in the local area with a corresponding increase in demand for public services and housing. The District's open space preserves will generally serve the regional San Mateo County community and will not attract large numbers of people that would generate significant indirect growth-inducing effects.

C. Effects Not Found to be Significant

As part of the Notice Of Preparation process, the following issues were found not to have environmental impacts and are not considered further in the EIR:

Mineral Resources. Mineral Resource Areas in the Coastal Annexation Area include two significant oil field areas (one east of Seal Rock, below Half Moon Bay and one west of La Honda in the San Gregorio area); one active quarry in Pilarcitos; and small limestone deposits in the San Francisco Water Department lands and California Fish and Game Refuge area. The Coastal Annexation Project would not affect the availability of any of these known mineral resources.

Population/Housing. A small number of District employees could move over to coastal San Mateo County as new preserves are established, and some temporary work crews could be required from time to time for development or maintenance of trails or other facilities. The total effect would be very small and would not induce significant growth in population or housing needs. It is possible that the District could acquire a property that has existing farmworker housing, but the District is a public agency that acquires and manages open space resources in a natural condition. These resources do not have substantial numbers of existing housing on them. The proposed project would not, therefore, displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing.

D. Cumulative Impacts

CEQA Guidelines state that "an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable" (§15130). A cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. The discussion of impacts usually describes probable future projects or growth projections expected to produce related or cumulative impacts, including those projects outside the control of the agency. The discussion of cumulative impacts should focus on the cumulative impact to which the other projects contribute rather than other attributes of those projects that do not contribute to the cumulative impact.

The primary project effect is progressive protection and management of open space lands along the San Mateo coastside. The analysis of cumulative impacts therefore begins by evaluating possible future open space and park projects which may produce related impacts, and then examines how the proposed project and possible future actions may act cumulatively.

1. Future Projects Producing Related or Cumulative Impacts

a. Possible Future Actions by MROSD

The proposed annexation and Service Plan do not depend on funding sources beyond those already available to the MROSD. Additional funding would allow the District to increase activity on the coastside beyond what is described in the Draft Service Plan and Fiscal Analysis. It is reasonably foreseeable that the District may seek additional funding through a voter-approved ballot measure or from other sources.

There are two options for seeking voter-approved funding: voter-approved funding only in the Coastal Annexation Area (Optional Scenario #1) or voter-approved funding District-wide (Optional Scenario #2). District polling suggests that a tax rate of \$1 dollar per month per household may be approved. The additional revenues would allow expanded District Services. For the purpose of the cumulative impact analysis, the funding scenarios could change the Service Plan as shown in Table VI-1. Because additional funding depends on a ballot yet unscheduled ballot measure, both scenarios assume that Years 1-5 under each scenario would be the same as under the Basic Service Plan.

1) Optional Service Plan Scenario #1

Assumptions: A new funding source is approved by Coastal Annexation Area residents only. A tax rate of \$1 per month per parcel (\$12 per year) would generate \$300,000 to \$400,000 per year. The District could expand its program of managing land acquired by other agencies and organizations. In addition to current Skyline area acquisition and management programs, the District could have a modest acquisition program within the Coastal Annexation Area. Optional Service Plan Scenario 1 would result in the management and acquisition of between 9,085 to 13,595 acres after 15 years, an increase of 10% to 15% over the proposed project.

2) Optional Service Plan Scenario #2

Assumptions: A new funding source is approved by all District residents. A tax rate of \$1 per month per parcel (\$12 per year) would generate \$3 million to \$4 million per year. The MROSD Board would consider input from its constituents and decide what portion of the additional funding would be directed to Coastal Annexation Area programs. The District's program to manage lands, whether acquired by the District or by other agencies and organizations within Coastal Annexation Area, could be significantly expanded and the District could undertake a broader acquisition program of its own, in addition to ongoing acquisition activities in the Skyline area. Optional Service Plan Scenario 2 would result in the management and acquisition of between 11,479 to 14,450 acres after 15 years, an increase of 62% to 96% over the proposed project. Both of these scenarios would ensure open space and habitat protection for larger areas within the Coastal Annexation Area, but in Optional Scenario 2, the upper limit of acreage managed could be as much as 17% of the annexation area.

b. Possible Future Actions by Other Open Space and Recreation Agencies

The District would be only one of several agencies acquiring and/or managing open space in the Coastal Annexation area. Public agencies are the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation, County of San Mateo, and Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), administered by the National Park Service. Private, non-profit include POST, TPL,

Audubon, the Nature Conservancy, and others. These are described in Chapter V, Alternatives, Section A.2, No Action, Alternative Service Providers.

1) Public Agencies

While the State and County might be able to purchase more lands as a result of Propositions 12 and/or 40, the total acreage purchased with funds from these propositions would be modest, and there is no plan for major expansion for State Parks within the area. The State does not have the money for operations and maintenance of any new properties (Ron Schaefer, pers. comm.) While the County's recreation plans in the bayside areas typically favor more active uses such as ballfields, this is not the case in the Coastal Annexation Area. The County also has no major expansion plans within the area.

There is currently a proposal to extend the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) boundaries south into the Coastal Annexation Area to include approximately 4,800 acres. This proposal is further discussed in Chapter III Section B.4. GGNRA lands are operated by The National Park Service. Lands included in the GGNRA boundary must meet specific criteria including that it be of national significance. This 4,800 acre boundary adjustment meets the criteria for inclusion into the GGNRA. Due to this strict criteria that is used by the National Park Service for land acquisition, it is unlikely that this agency would play a large role in land acquisition and management in the rest of the Coastal Annexation Area. In addition, the GGNRA manages its lands in a similar fashion to MROSD in that they emphasize low-intensity recreational uses.

These other agency actions will act cumulatively. The District is interested in securing cooperative acquisition opportunities with other public agencies whenever possible. There are a number of examples of land purchased by the District with the cooperation of state, county or local agencies, such as Edgewood County Park in San Mateo County and St. Joseph's Hill Open Space Preserve in Los Gatos.

2) Private Agencies

Private nonprofit organizations are active in this area. The general mission of these groups is to purchase land, and then sell it to a park and open space district, such as District's. That way, the money spent on acquisition by these groups gets freed up for future acquisition. The projected 12,000 acres includes management of lands acquired by these other entities as is reasonably foreseeable and has been analyzed in Chapter IV of this EIR. The most expansive scenario for this analysis would be 23,000 acres, or double the amount of the proposed project, which is analyzed above.

In some instances, a private organization will acquire land and hold it for future transfer to the District. A private, nonprofit land trust, such as Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST), the Trust for Public Land (TPL) or the Nature Conservancy can operate freely in the private market and facilitate acquisition transactions with the District.

Grant projects offer special acquisition opportunities. If there is a piece of property available for sale and the District staff rates the property highly as a potential grant project, the District may apply for a grant that is not approved for six months to a year. In most cases, the District would have to receive the grant before purchasing the property. If there is an immediate opportunity to buy a property, a private organization such as POST could buy it and

hold it until the District could secure a grant. Then the District would acquire the property from the private organization. (Reference District's "Land Acquisition Policies and Procedures")

c. Regional Growth

According to the Coastside Subregional Planning Project, ABAG projects that total population in the City of Half Moon Bay and the unincorporated communities of Montara, Moss Beach, Princeton, El Granada, and Miramar will to increase 50 percent between 2000 and 2020 (Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County 1998). This small subsection of the Coastal Annexation Area is expected to lead all other cities in the County, other than Brisbane, in net population growth during this 20-year period (Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County 1998). There are political and legal means to manage growth, such as the Local Coastal Program and the General Plans described in Section IV.A, Land Use. Already, any LCP amendment in San Mateo County must go to a voter referendum. The rural service centers in the south coastside are not projected for large amounts of new housing. Growth in visitor serving uses and some population growth will continue along the trends identified in the County General Plan. A recent voter initiative seeks to limit growth in Half Moon Bay to 1% per year.

This population growth and the development associated with it has the potential for significant adverse effects on agriculture and coastal resources. The EIR addresses the cumulative impact potential of regional population and land use change in the environmental setting in analyses of Chapter IV.

2. Potential Cumulative Impact

As is noted in Chapter IV of this EIR, none of the proposed actions of this project, as mitigated, would result in significant environmental effects. The fundamentally low intensity use of an open space preservation program minimizes potential for cumulative impact in most environmental areas. The Coastal Annexation Area has extensive agricultural, biological, scenic, and recreational values that depend on and contribute to open space. The proposed project along with either of the Optional Service Plan Scenarios or with action by other open space and recreation agencies would increase the extent of regional open space protection and have an increased beneficial cumulative impact on those resources.

a. Land Use

It is speculative at this stage in the proposed program to identify the location of acquisitions or easements that would be attainable with the increased funding afforded by the Optional Service Plan Scenarios. As shown in Section IV.A, Land Use, the general nature of the land uses within areas acquired or managed under the Base Service Plan will not materially change. Increased preservation or more extensive management made possible by additional funding will be subject to the same policies and mitigation which would be effective even for the larger total amount of land affected.

b. Agriculture

The District is committed to sustaining and encouraging agricultural viability. The Guidelines and Implementation Actions contained in the Draft Service Plan plus the mitigation included in this EIR allow for agricultural use consistent with resource protection. Under the Draft Service Plan, the District would only acquire lands from willing sellers and would consider the potential sale or lease of District-owned lands for agricultural uses after conservation or

public access easements or conditions are applied to the property based on the site-specific resource characteristics of the property.

As stated in Chapter I, Introduction, if the Coastal Annexation Area project is approved, future District actions will be subject to subsequent planning processes. Prior to making lands that it acquires or manages open to public access, the District will prepare a use and management plan for these lands, and will prepare CEQA documentation for each use and management plan. However, because the main goal of the project is to acquire open space for preservation, recreation, and restoration, environmental effects remain less than significant, even with implementation of Optional Scenario 2. This is because all future acquisition of lands and easements will follow both the Draft Service Plan Policies and Guidelines and the relevant policies, ordinances and guidelines of San Mateo County.

There will be no significant cumulative impacts associated with actions by other agencies either from purchasing land for open space and recreation or from managing it.

The project would tend to offset rather than exacerbate the cumulative effects of regional growth. Regional growth may take place at the expense of agricultural land. Unlike residential and economic development projects, the District would only implement minimal improvements (e.g., gravel roads and parking areas, natural surface trails) within its open space and recreational areas. Although any acreage taken out of agricultural production would add to the overall cumulative losses of agricultural production in San Mateo County, the District Service Plan policies promoting preservation of agriculture in the Coastal Annexation Area would ensure that any losses are offset by lands permanently protect by the District and are insignificant. This is one of the key project objectives particular to the Coastal Annexation Area. Additionally, the Guidelines and Implementation Measures proposed in the Draft Service Plan, in conjunction with the mitigation measures included in this EIR, would ensure that District actions do not significantly adversely affect the viability of agriculture would also reduce the potential for cumulative impact.

c. Public Services & Infrastructure

The potential for cumulative traffic and transportation impact is minimal for the Optional Service Plan Scenarios or for land preservation by others. All such low intensity uses have low trip generation. The current maximum trip generation for the District's preserves is 1 trip per hour per 32 acres (Hexagon Transportation Consultants, 2001). If the District acquires or manages a cumulative total of 23,000 acres after 15 years, the total trip generation would be 719 cars per peak hour. It is speculative to assess exactly where these 719 cars would be within the roadways of the 140,000 acre Coastal Annexation Area; however, given the total number of cars on these roadways at any given time, 719 vehicles per hour within this area are not expected to cause a significant impact to existing or projected levels of service for intersections within this area.

The primary concern for public safety is adequate emergency access and response time by public safety agencies. These are facility-specific planning issues and are not expected to have appreciable potential for cumulative impacts under the Optional Service Plan Scenarios or action by other open space and recreation agencies, which mainly affect the extent of regional open space protection.

d. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazardous materials risks are site-specific and are not expected to have appreciable

potential for cumulative impacts under the Optional Service Plan Scenarios or action by other agencies, which mainly affect the extent of regional open space protection.

Open space areas opened to the public potentially increase risk of wildland fire. The greater scope of visitor serving access under the Optional Service Plan Scenarios increases the significance of this risk. The mitigation incorporated in the project will adequately mitigate for potential cumulative impact.

e. Noise

No significant potential for cumulative noise impacts was identified.

f. Air Quality

No significant potential for cumulative air quality impacts was identified. Traffic from recreational access will be a small component of regional vehicular emissions. The cumulative open space preservation from the proposed project may help manage regional transportation and air pollutant emissions impact of growth.

g. Aesthetics

No significant potential for adverse cumulative aesthetic impacts was identified. The scenic preservation benefits of the proposed project would be cumulatively greater with the Optional Service Plan Scenarios or action by other open space and recreation agencies.

h. Hydrology

Impacts on runoff rate, sedimentation and erosion are reduced by watershed management possible with the proposed project. These benefits would be greater with the Optional Service Plan Scenarios or action by other open space and recreation agencies.

i. Biology

Most biological resource impacts are site-specific and are not expected to have appreciable potential for cumulative impacts. The project potential for beneficial management of biological resources on a large parcel or subwatershed scale would be enhanced by the greater preservation of the Optional Service Plan Scenarios or action by other open space and recreation agencies.

j. Cultural Resources

Cultural resources impacts are site-specific and are not expected to have appreciable potential for cumulative impacts.

k. Geology

No significant potential for cumulative geological impacts was identified.

**Table VI-1
Optional Service Plan Funding Scenarios**

Approximate Time Frame	Optional Scenario #1 - Additional funding would be available from a ballot-approved measure in the Coastal Annexation Area; emphasis on managing land acquired by others, plus a modest District acquisition program. (1)	Optional Scenario #2 - Additional funding from a ballot-approved measure District-wide; emphasis of District programs balanced between managing land acquired by other agencies or organizations and on land acquisition by the District. (1)
Years 1-5 Note: same as Basic Service Plan	<u>Planning</u> <i>Focused planning discussions with local interests to include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy Review for the Coastal Annexation Area - Update of the District Master Plan and Open Space Study to include the Coastal Annexation Area 	<u>Planning</u> <i>Focused planning discussions with local interests to include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy Review for the Coastal Annexation Area - Update of the District Master Plan and Open Space Study to include the Coastal Annexation Area
	<u>Funding</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of existing District revenues; apply for public and private grants - Develop and place new District funding measure on ballot 	<u>Funding</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of existing District revenues; apply for public and private grants - Develop and place new District funding measure on ballot
	<u>Land Acquisition</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acquire approximately 1,000 to 1,200 acres / year via existing District funding augmented by grants - Acquire approximately 130 to approximately 240 acres of easements / year via existing District funding augmented by grants 	<u>Land Acquisition</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acquire approximately 1,000 to 1,200 acres / year via existing District funding augmented by grants - Acquire approximately 130 to approximately 240 acres of easements / year via existing District funding augmented by grants
	<u>Land Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Screen partnership opportunities for resource and public access management - Limited program expansion of resource and public access management by approximately 200 to 500 acres / year based on partnership opportunities and existing District funding 	<u>Land Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Screen partnership opportunities for resource and public access management - Limited program expansion of resource and public access management by approximately 200 to 500 acres / year based on partnership opportunities and existing District funding
	<u>Improvements(2)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish District presence through ranger residency program in housing located on properties acquired by the District - Few areas open to public access 	<u>Improvements(2)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish District presence through ranger residency program in housing located on properties acquired by the District - Few areas open to public access
End of Year 5 Note: same as Basic Service Plan	Lands Acquired: (1) appx. 5,000 to 6,000 acres Easements Acquired (or Monitored for Others): appx. 650 to 1,200 acres Lands Managed Under Contract: appx. 500 to 1,000 acres Total Lands in System: appx. 6,150 to 8,200 acres Facilities:(4) trails: existing roads /trails 14.3 to 19.0 miles trails: new 2.8 to 3.2 miles staging areas 1	Lands Acquired: (1) appx. 5,000 to 6,000 acres Easements Acquired (or Monitored for Others): appx. 650 to 1,200 acres Lands Managed Under Contract: appx. 500 to 1,000 acres Total Lands in System: appx. 6,150 to 8,200 acres Facilities:(4) trails: existing roads /trails 14.3 to 19.0 miles trails: new 2.8 to 3.2 miles staging areas 1

Approximate Time Frame	Optional Scenario #1 - Additional funding would be available from a ballot-approved measure in the Coastal Annexation Area; emphasis on managing land acquired by others, plus a modest District acquisition program. (1)	Optional Scenario #2 - Additional funding from a ballot-approved measure District-wide; emphasis of District programs balanced between managing land acquired by other agencies or organizations and on land acquisition by the District. (1)
	<u>Land Management</u> - Moderate expansion of resource and public access management by approximately 50 to 100 acres / year based on partnership opportunities with others and lands acquired by the District	<u>Land Management</u> - Expansion of resource and public access management by approximately 50 to 100 acres / year based on partnership opportunities with others and lands acquired by the District
	<u>Improvements (3)</u> - Similar to Basic Service Plan except with proportionally more staffing and low-intensity recreation facilities provided	<u>Improvements (3)</u> - Similar to Basic Service Plan except with proportionally more staffing and low-intensity recreation facilities provided, and:
Cumulative Total: End of Year 15	Lands Acquired:(1) appx. 6,950 to 7,900 acres Easements Acquired (or Monitored for Others): appx. 1,575 to 1,800 acres Lands Managed Under Contract: appx. 1,950 to 2,500 acres Total Lands in System: appx. 10,475 to 12,200 acres Facilities:(3) - trails: existing roads /trails 24.3 to 28.5 miles - trails: new 9.2 to 9.9 miles - staging areas 2	Lands Acquired:(1) appx. 7,875 to 9,750 acres Easements Acquired (or Monitored for Others): appx. 1,850 to 2,200 acres Lands Managed Under Contract: appx. 1,750 to 2,500 acres Total Lands in System: appx. 11,475 to 14,450 acres Facilities:(3) - trails: existing roads /trails 26.9 to 33 miles - trails: new 9.9 to 11.5 miles - staging areas 2

(1) Funding opportunities from grant programs for land acquisition vary significantly over time. Grant programs also vary in purpose, geographic area, and requirements for matching funds.

(2) Assumes that preliminary use and management plans focus on site safety and resource protection, therefore no areas would be opened for public use and no access facilities developed.

(3) Assumes the following:

- Approximately 7 miles of trail opened to public use per 1,720 acres of land owned or managed by the District; of these approximately 2/3 will be trails that either exist or are unpaved ranch/fire roads converted to trail use. Trails available for public use will not occur immediately upon the inclusion of lands into the District. Therefore trail mileages indicated are lower than the maximum that could be calculated based on the above formula; and
- Staging areas are provided at a rate of one area per 18 miles of trails and will be evenly distributed between major and minor staging area.

VII. References

A. Personal Communication

Herzberg, Sam, Park Planner, County of San Mateo Parks and Recreation Division, personal communication, April 2001

Keel, Paul, Supervising Ranger, Bay Area District, California Department of Parks and Recreation, personal communication, March 2001.

Martin, Mike, Planner, City of Half Moon Bay, personal communication, April 2002.

Newell, Frank, Principal Appraiser, San Mateo County Assessor's Office. April 2001.

Poyatos, Martha, Management Analyst, San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission, personal communication, various dates, 1999-2001.

Schafer, Ron, District Superintendent, Bay District, California Department of Parks and Recreation, personal communication, March 2001 and May 2002.

Schectman, Sue, General Counsel, Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, personal communication, April 2001.

Weeks, Nicholas, Senior Landscape Architect, Planning and Technical Services, National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, personal communication, April 2001.

B. Bibliography

California, State of, The Resources Agency, Department of Parks and Recreation, July 1999, The Seventh Generation, The Strategic Vision of California State Parks.

----- 1979. San Mateo Coast Area General Plan

----- California Department of Fish and Game. 1995. Gap Analysis of Mainland California: An Interactive Atlas of Terrestrial Biodiversity and Land Management. Natural Heritage Division.

----- California Department of Fish and Game. 1990a. California's Wildlife, Vol. II, Birds.

----- California Department of Fish and Game. 1990b. California's Wildlife, Vol. III, Mammals.

----- California Department of Fish and Game. 1988. California's Wildlife, Vol. I, Amphibians and Reptiles.

----- 2001. California Coastal Act.

----- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. 2001. Important Farmland (agricultural land use). Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.

- Year 2000 survey data. LOCATION: ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/fmmp/.
- California Department of Conservation 2000a. California Farmland Conversion Report 1996-1998. June 2000.
- California Department of Conservation. 2000b. San Mateo County 1998-2000 Land Use Conversion.
- California Department of Conservation. 1994. San Mateo County 1992-1994 Land Use Conversion.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2002. Surface Fuels Maps and Data. Available through the web at http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/fire_data/fuels/fuelsfr.html
- City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, July 1991. 1991 San Mateo County Congestion Management Program.
- Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000.
- Crawford Multari & Starr Sage Associates, June 1994. South County Agricultural Preservation Study. Agricultural Suitability, Development Suitability, and Areas of Potential Conflicts.
- Golden Gate National Parks Association. Gateways newsletter. Fall 2001.
- Half Moon Bay, City of. 1993. Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan.
- 1995. Park and Recreation Element.
- Holland, R.F. 1986. Preliminary Description of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California.
- Koenig, Paul, Dec. 8, 1998. Executive Officer, San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission, memo "Midpeninsula Open Space District Application to Annex the San Mateo County Coastside."
- Koenig, Paul, Jan. 12, 1999. Executive Officer, San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission, memo "Request for Transfer of Jurisdiction relating to Proposed Midpeninsula Open Space District Application to Annex the San Mateo County Coastside."
- Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District. 1999. Basic Policy of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District. Adopted by the Board of Directors on March 10, 1999.
- 1999. Comment Letter on Trails Plan Draft Program EIR.
- 1994. Resource Management Policies. October 1994.
- 1991. Open Space Use and Management Planning Process. Amended March 13, 1991.
- 1988. Land Acquisition Policies and Procedures.

- 1986. Policies Regarding Use of Eminent Domain.
- 1984. Policies Regarding Improvements on District Lands. Amended October 10, 1984.
- 1978. Agricultural Use Policy Statements. Adopted by Board of Directors February 8, 1978.
- Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and San Mateo County. 1998. Coastside Subregional Planning Project. Sponsored by The Association of Bay Area Governments. Sept. 1998.
- Peninsula Open Space Trust. San Mateo County Boundary Study Golden Gate National Recreation Area. May 2001.
- San Mateo, County of. (no date). Planning and Building Division, Various pamphlets.
- 1999a. Guide to Creek & Wetland Project Permitting. San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP).
- 1999b. 1999 Agricultural Crop Report. Department of Agriculture/Weights and Measures.
- 1999c. Zoning Regulations. Environmental Services Agency, Planning and Building Division. July 1999.
- 1999d. San Mateo County Trails Plan. Draft Program Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse No. 95053071. Parks and Recreation Division, Environmental Services Agency.
- 1998. Local Coastal Program Policies 1998 Update. June 1998.
- 1997. (and 94-96) Agricultural Crop Report. Dept. of Agriculture/Weights & Measures.
- 1986. Skyline Area General Plan Amendment. Policies and Ordinances. Amended May 6, 1986.
- 1986. General Plan Policies. Nov. 1986.
1. Vegetable, Water, Fish and Wildlife Resources
 4. Visual Quality
 6. Park and Recreation Resources
 9. Rural land Use
 10. Water Supply
 11. Wastewater
 15. Natural Hazards
- 1979. Local Coastal Plan Hearing Draft. Vol. II. Maps. Nov. 1979.
- 1979. Local Coastal Program, Suitable Recreation Areas, Background Report. January 1979.

- 1979. Land Use Plan, Local Coastal Plan Hearing Draft. Nov. 1979.
- 2001. San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division website. www.eparks.net
- San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission. 2001. Standards for Evaluation of Proposals.
- 2001. Procedures for the Evaluation of Proposals.
- 2001. General Policies and Criteria for the Evaluation of Spheres of Influence.
- University of California Cooperative Extension, January 1989. The San Mateo County Agricultural Economic Viability Project.
- U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, 1993, Golden Gate National Recreation Area pamphlet.
- 2001. 2001 Management Policies.
- U.S. House of Representatives. H.R. 3632 - Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act of 2000.

C. Document Preparers

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
330 Distel Circle
Los Altos, CA 94022-1404
(650) 691-1200, fax (650) 691-0485
www.openspace.org

L. Craig Britton, General Manager
Susan Schectman, General Counsel
John Escobar, Assistant General Manager
Cathy Woodbury, Planning Manager
Mathew Freeman, Open Space Planner

Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger
396 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 552-7272, fax (415) 552-5816

Richard Taylor, Esq.

Thomas Reid Associates

560 Waverley Street, Suite 201
Palo Alto, CA 93401
(650) 327-0429, fax (650) 327-0429
www.traenviro.com

Thomas Reid, Principal in Charge
Janet Cochrane, Senior Associate
Paula Hartman, Senior Associate
Sandy Ho, Administrative Assistant
Virginia Justus, Graphics Coordinator
Wendy Knight, Associate
Eben Polk, Associate
Christine Schneider, Senior Associate

Tom Haney
Terrabytes Digital Mapping
(650) 969-0730
www.mapdata.com

Hexagon Transportation Consultants
40 S. Market St., Ste. 600
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 971-6100, fax (408) 971-6102
www.hextrans.com

Gary Black