



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
Inter-Departmental Correspondence
Planning and Building



Date: May 17, 2013
Board Meeting Date: June 4, 2013
Special Notice / Hearing: 10 Days;
Newspaper Notice
Vote Required: Majority

To: Honorable Board of Supervisors

From: Jim Eggemeyer, Community Development Director

Subject: Public hearing to consider amending the San Mateo County General Plan by adding Chapter 17, Energy and Climate Change Element, and associated amendments to other chapters of the San Mateo County General Plan, adoption of the San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP), and certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

County File Number: PLN 2011-00310

RECOMMENDATION:

Resolutions:

- 1) Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations related to environmental impacts identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan, adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the mitigation measures described in the Final Environmental Impact Report, and certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the General Plan amendments and the Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan as complete and adequate.
- 2) Amending the San Mateo County General Plan, adding Chapter 17, Energy and Climate Change Element, and associated amendments to other chapters of the San Mateo County General Plan.
- 3) Adopting the San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan

BACKGROUND:

Report Prepared By: Matt Seubert, Senior Planner, Telephone 650/363-1829

Location: Unincorporated San Mateo County

Applicant: San Mateo County Planning and Building Department

Environmental Review: Please see the Environmental Review Section of this report for discussion.

History: In August of 2009, the County was awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) program. Although the bulk of this grant was allocated to the County Public Works Department and other programs, a \$350,000 portion of this grant was allocated to the Planning and Building Department for the development of an update to the General Plan and a Climate Action Plan (CAP). In late 2009, the details of the grant were negotiated between the County and the Department of Energy. In 2010, the County issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a consultant to complete much of the work for this project, including technical research, a baseline Greenhouse Gas (GHG) inventory, assisting with public engagement, writing the draft CAP and General Plan amendment, and writing the EIR. The County received seven proposals and ultimately selected PMC (formerly Pacific Municipal Consultants) as its project consultant. On February 8, 2011, the Board of Supervisors approved a contract with PMC in the amount of \$300,000 for work on the project. The term of the initial contract ran through December 31, 2012. The project was delayed in late 2012 due to federal funding requirements and it became necessary to extend the contract in order to complete the project. Consistent with the authorizations in the contract, the Community Development Director has extended the term of the contract with PMC until June 30, 2013.

With the assistance of PMC and guidance from the Steering and Technical Advisory Committees, County staff has prepared an Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP or CAP), General Plan amendments, and an EIR for the entire project.

DISCUSSION:

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The specific project documents for consideration at today's hearing are available on the Documents page of the project webpage:

<http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/planning/rechargesmc/index.html>.

- General Plan Amendment, Chapter 17
- Associated amendments to other chapters of the General Plan
- EECAP
- EIR

In general, this staff report provides brief summaries of the documents above, as well as information regarding project background, context, and how the projects are integrated and comply with each other and with other County regulations and efforts. The

executive summaries of these documents provide excellent overviews of the components of the project.

1. The General Plan Amendment

Context: The Existing County General Plan

The County General Plan dates from 1986, when there was little consideration given to energy conservation, and none to climate change. The General Plan Amendment will add a new Chapter (Chapter 17) to the General Plan that includes policies regarding energy efficiency and climate change. The amendment also includes changes to other chapters of the General Plan so that the entire Plan will now address energy efficiency and climate change, and so that it will be internally consistent with regard to these issues.

This amendment to the General Plan is part of the County's ongoing effort to update the General Plan. Other recent amendments include the Housing Element (2011), the North Fair Oaks Plan (2011), and several recent amendments to the Local Coastal Program (LCP), including the Midcoast Update (2012). County staff intends to continue to prepare updates to portions of the General Plan as need dictates and resources allow.

Chapter 17: Energy and Climate Change Element

Chapter 17 begins with a summary of this new General Plan element and its relationship to implementing the EECAP. The chapter demonstrates the County's commitment to implement state and regional guidance for greenhouse gas emissions. It provides a brief overview of the State of California regulatory context, potential impacts of climate change on San Mateo County and particular vulnerabilities within the unincorporated County. It also contains a summary of the GHG inventory, and provides definitions for terms used in the element. The format for this chapter is somewhat different than many of the existing chapters in the Plan, and is organized using the format of Goal, Policy, and Implementing Strategy. The eight Goals for reducing GHG emissions are listed below:

1. Promote and implement policies and programs to reduce community-wide greenhouse gas emissions.
2. Maximize energy efficiency in new and existing development.
3. Promote the expansion of the use of renewable energy supplies.
4. Promote and implement policies and programs to reduce vehicle miles traveled by all vehicles traveling in the unincorporated County.
5. Encourage the use of clean, low-emissions vehicles and equipment.

6. Promote and implement policies and programs with the goal of achieving zero waste.
7. Support sustainable agricultural practices, and
8. Promote and implement policies and programs to reduce water use.

The amendment also includes two Goals specific to adaptation to climate change impacts:

9. Identify and prepare for climate change impacts, and
10. Enhance the adaptive capacity of natural and man-made systems.

For all of these Goals, each has at least one Policy, and each Policy has at least one Implementing Strategy. For example, Goal 4: “Promote and implement policies and programs to reduce vehicle miles traveled by all vehicles traveling in the unincorporated County,” is to be achieved partly through Policy 4.1: “Expand transit-oriented and mixed-use development that reduces reliance on vehicular travel.” This Policy is in turn implemented in part through Implementing Strategy 4.1.C: “Evaluate options to reduce minimum parking requirements and promote a variety of transportation choices in new development.”

The Implementing Strategies in the General Plan roughly correspond with the Implementation Matrix in the EECAP. However, the EECAP has measurable and quantifiable targets, while the General Plan policies are less specific and are not intended to be quantified. Part of the reason for this is that the General Plan policies are not intended to be frequently updated, whereas the EECAP, which is the implementation document, may be updated more frequently.

Amendments to Other Chapters of the General Plan

In addition to the new Chapter 17 amendment to the General Plan, the amendment also includes changes or additions to other parts of the existing General Plan. It is necessary to update the other related chapters of the General Plan with regard to issues related to energy efficiency and climate change, and to make the Plan internally consistent with the new Chapter 17. These amendments include changes to Chapter 1 on Vegetative, Water, Fish and Wildlife Resources, Chapter 4 on Visual Quality, Chapter 6 regarding Parks and Recreation Resources, Chapter 8 regarding Urban Land Use, Chapter 10 regarding Water Supply, Chapter 12 regarding Transportation, and Chapter 15 on Natural Hazards.

These changes include adding definitions not included in the existing Plan, referencing climate change in appropriate parts of the General Plan, and adding reference to climate change vulnerability as a natural hazard. The amendment

adds new language encouraging transit-oriented development and mixed-land use in appropriate locations. The amendment also includes several changes and additions to the Circulation Chapter including new policy language regarding complete streets. Policies related to complete streets will encourage the use of transportation choices and alternatives to driving, which will help reduce GHG emissions. These policies will also make the County's General Plan compliant with MTC requirements that Complete Streets policies must be included in General Plans in order to remain eligible for grant funding for upcoming One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) grant program funding cycles. Other amendments include policies related to the impact of climate change on wildlife corridors and sea level rise, including coordinating sea level rise adaptation planning on the bayside shoreline.

2. The EECAP

Context and Overview

The Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP or CAP) begins by providing an introduction to the project, and putting the project in context with current scientific knowledge. The EECAP also puts the project in context with Federal, State, and regional government regulations, including SB 375 and AB 32. One of the purposes of adopting the EECAP is to adopt a plan consistent with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) standards for a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Based on BAAQMD guidance, a lead agency may use a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy to streamline project review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The County may review projects under CEQA using the EECAP, and if the County deems projects consistent with the EECAP, projects would thus also be considered consistent with BAAQMD standards for GHG emissions as relates to CEQA. Such projects would be eligible to tier from the EIR that the County prepared for the EECAP, for purposes of greenhouse gas emissions. This is more fully explained in Appendix D of the EECAP.

The EECAP also includes a GHG inventory as well as a number of strategies for reducing GHG emissions. In addition, the EECAP includes chapters on vulnerability and adaptation, implementation, as well as a glossary, and other supplemental materials. The EECAP implements the General Plan Amendment with regard to energy efficiency and climate change. The EECAP may be updated periodically, whereas the General Plan is not intended to be amended frequently.

The EECAP includes the following: GHG Inventory (Chapter 3 and Appendices B and C), GHG reduction strategies (Chapter 4 and Implementation in Chapter 6), and Adaptation to Climate Change (Chapter 5 and Appendix E). In addition, the EECAP includes related appendices and supporting materials.

GHG Emissions Inventory, Reduction Target, and Reduction Strategies

As an important early step in the development of the EECAP, County staff and consultants conducted a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory. This inventory is used to establish a baseline figure for GHG emissions in the County, against which future targeted reduction levels can be measured. The GHG baseline used is the year **2005**. Although this is obviously not the same as today's actual 2013 GHG level, 2005 is used as the baseline for several reasons. First, as explained more fully in the EECAP Executive Summary, the State's goal under AB 32 is to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and the State translates this goal as a 15% reduction target for 2020 compared to the "current year" or baseline, at the time of AB 32's adoption. AB 32 was enacted in 2006, and the "current year" or baseline is thus considered to be 2005 for purposes of measuring progress toward this 2020 target. Second, because of AB 32, 2005 is used as a standard baseline year in many jurisdictions, and thus provides a good benchmark for the County to compare itself to targets used by the State and other jurisdictions. Finally, because of the adoption of AB 32, a significant amount of GHG data for 2005 has been collected by the State and by local jurisdictions, providing more robust and extensive comparative data for that year than for any subsequent year.

As explained in the EECAP Executive Summary, the largest GHG contributor by far in the unincorporated County is the transportation sector, and this is mostly due to emissions produced by single-occupant vehicles. Other significant contributors are commercial, industrial, and residential energy usage. Off-road vehicles, solid waste, agriculture, water and wastewater contribute much smaller percentages of GHGs. GHGs are measured in terms of metric tons of carbon dioxide emitted per year or its equivalent (MTCO_{2e}). For the baseline year, the total calculated GHG emissions from these sectors in the unincorporated County were over 780,000 MTCO_{2e}.

The GHG Inventory is used to calculate emissions in the unincorporated County for the baseline year (2005). Based on this inventory, the EECAP then establishes measurable targets and timelines for reducing greenhouse gas emissions within the lands of the unincorporated County, to achieve the desired GHG reduction by the target year (2020). As the EECAP was developed, the Steering Committee and project staff felt it important that the targets and goals be significant, but also realistically achievable within the time frames established. The GHG reduction measures proposed would achieve a 17% GHG reduction, which is the proposed GHG reduction target.

Based on the inventory and reduction target, the EECAP describes (1) a set of implementation measures intended to achieve the reduction target, with a quantifiable reduction in GHG attached to each measure; (2) a set of "co-benefits," beneficial outcomes that would be generated by these measures, in addition to GHG reduction; and (3) a set of "supportive measures" that would reduce GHG, but for which the amount of GHG reduction cannot be quantified, either because

there is no existing baseline data for these measures, or simply because the amount of reduction for the individual measure cannot be calculated. These supportive measures are described in the EECAP, but are not included in the calculation of GHG reduction to achieve the target.

It is important to note that if some GHG reduction measures currently included in the EECAP are deemed infeasible or inadvisable and are proposed for deletion, the ability to achieve the targeted reduction might be compromised. Achieving the target would thus require some combination of new measures and/or strengthening of other proposed measures, or, alternatively, the target would have to be lowered.

Much of the reduction in GHGs will be due to State programs or requirements, particularly in the transportation sector. However, the EECAP contains local implementation measures and an implementation matrix detailing measures that can be taken to reach the GHG reduction target. These are grouped into the following topic areas:

1. Residential Energy Efficiency
2. Commercial Energy Efficiency
3. Green Building Regulations
4. Renewable Energy
5. Transportation
6. Alternative Fuels
7. Waste Diversion
8. Water Efficiency
9. Sustainable Agriculture Practices
10. Off-Road Technologies
11. Sequestration

Similar to the format of the Chapter 17 amendment to the General Plan, each of these Goals contains at least one Implementation Measure, and each Measure contains at least one specific Action Item. Each Implementation Measure details the amount of projected GHG reduction attributed to it, identifies the responsible implementing County department or agency, and categorizes co-benefits. Co-benefits include:

1. energy conservation;
2. improved air quality;
3. improved public health;
4. supporting the local economy;
5. reducing water usage;
6. providing educational opportunities;
7. saving money;
8. improving mobility;
9. promoting equity; and

10. protecting natural resources.

As an example, as part of topic area #5 above (Transportation), Goal #7 is to “Develop Efficient Parking Practices.” To achieve this Goal, one Implementation Measure is to amend the outdated County Parking Ordinance. This Implementation Measure is projected to reduce GHG by 1,170 metric tons, and would be implemented by the Planning Department via several Action Items including reducing minimum parking requirements in appropriate circumstances. However, although the EECAP is a declaration of County policy, the EECAP by itself does not allocate funding or staffing resources to any particular Implementation Measure.

Although most GHG emissions in the County are transportation-related, State programs and mandates will provide much of the projected GHG reduction in this topic area. In terms of local efforts, the most significant emission reductions by goal topic are projected to occur in the goal topic areas of commercial energy efficiency, green building ordinance, renewable energy, waste diversion, and off-road technologies, although this varies somewhat depending on the time frame chosen. In terms of specific implementation measures, the most significant emission reductions are projected in the following:

- Measure 2.3: Institutional Energy Efficiency
- Measure 3.2: Green Building Incentives
- Measure 13.2: Zero Waste
- Measure 15.1: Construction Idling

Again, this depends in part on the time frame used. For example, some measures, such as Measure 4.9, Emissions Offset Programs, have a much more significant impact when looking at the 2035 time frame as compared to the 2020 time frame.

A number of Implementation Measures have been already or are being undertaken. For example, the Green Building Ordinance has been in place since 2008 and has been recently strengthened. Other measures have been implemented in County government operations, but these measures are not necessarily included in the EECAP’s calculated GHG reduction target for unincorporated County lands. This is because some County-owned facilities, including the County Government Center, are located within incorporated cities, and reduction measures in these locations do not count toward the unincorporated County’s GHG targets. Nonetheless, these supportive projects demonstrate the County’s continued commitment toward improving energy efficiency and reducing GHG emissions. For example, the County parking structure was recently retrofitted with solar panels on the top level. These provide much of the energy needed to run 555 County Center.

Achieving the GHG reduction goal for the unincorporated County is complicated somewhat because of the dispersed, lower density land use pattern compared to more urban, compact, and incorporated cities that affect opportunities for energy efficiency and waste reductions. Suburban and rural land use can be more energy intensive than more compact settlement patterns, due to such energy consuming activities as more heating, air conditioning, and landscaping watering and maintenance of individual homes with large yards as compared to multi-family residential uses more prevalent in denser cities. For example, some rural areas in the unincorporated County use propane power to supplement energy provided by the local utility, PG&E. Propane generally produces more GHGs than energy provided by public utilities. While most cities have regular trash pickup, some rural areas of the unincorporated County do not have municipal trash pickup (see Figure 14 of the EECAP), which makes the goals of achieving zero waste and recycling more difficult.

Communities in the unincorporated County have higher vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and fewer alternative transportation options compared to compact urban areas. In addition, many of these roads and streets may not have sidewalks, which enhance pedestrian safety and travel. Further, the roadway network in rural and many suburban areas is more difficult to navigate as a pedestrian, because it often features lengthy blocks and discontinuous segments, compared to the grid-like pattern of generally shorter block lengths in many incorporated cities. Additionally, transit service is generally less complete in rural and suburban areas as compared to cities, mostly because of the lower population density. Subsequently, there is less opportunity for multi-modal transportation options (e.g., transit and walking), compared to denser and more compact, walkable cities with more public transportation service. Reducing VMT is challenging in rural and suburban areas because lower density areas are more reliant on automobile transportation, which is more GHG intensive than public transit or walking. That said, there are proposed policies in the General Plan Amendment and the EECAP to promote greater transportation choice, such as the Complete Streets policy.

Vulnerability and Adaptation: The Impact of Climate Change

The Pacific Institute has calculated (2009) that the largest economic impacts of climate change in California will be felt by Orange and San Mateo Counties. It estimates that over 100,000 people are at risk in each county due to projected sea level rise combined with a 100-year flood event. The institute estimates that the economic impact in terms of property damage would be in the neighborhood of \$67 billion dollars for the entire San Francisco Bay Area (not just San Mateo County) from such a combination of events.

In the case of San Mateo County, much of the potential economic impact would be due to rising sea levels along the relatively flat San Francisco Bay shoreline areas. These areas are almost entirely within the incorporated cities of the

County, and within the unincorporated San Francisco Airport area. The County does not have land use authority over the incorporated cities, and the SFO airport is under the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco. Nevertheless, there are areas of the unincorporated County that are indeed vulnerable to sea level rise, particularly on the Pacific Ocean coast, for example the Princeton harbor area, as well as County facilities and relatively small unincorporated pockets on the bayside. However, there could be impacts on other more inland portions of unincorporated County lands due to impacts on utilities and infrastructure, such as storm sewer systems. In addition, rising sea level may contribute to other economic and environmental impacts, such as coastal bluff erosion and retreat, salt-water intrusion, negative impacts on roads, utilities and other infrastructure, and impacts on wildlife and ecosystems.

Climate change will have other impacts on the County, which were explored in the Vulnerability Assessment part of this project. In addition to sea level rise and its indirect impacts, climate change is expected to result in increased temperatures and more variable precipitation patterns and possibly more extreme storm events. Adaptation is addressed in Chapter 5 of the EECAP. This chapter focused on the following topic areas that will likely be impacted by the aforementioned changes in climate:

1. agriculture and forestry;
2. wildland fire, including along the urban-rural interface;
3. the built environment, including infrastructure and roads;
4. natural resources;
5. water; and
6. public health.

The specific climate change impacts on each of these topic areas are more fully explained in this chapter. Chapter 5 also presents Policy recommendations in three categories: (1) ongoing supportive actions, (2) priority operational actions, and (3) priority adaptive capacity actions.

Implementation

Chapter 6 of the EECAP focuses on implementation and aims to make this a useful and updatable document for the project time frame and beyond. It is recommended that staff provide a progress report on the EECAP to the Board of Supervisors every two years, and that the EECAP be updated and major revisions approved by the Board every five years. This chapter also includes action items related to monitoring and reporting, updating the GHG Inventory and the CAP, developing collaborative partnerships for implementation, and securing funding for project implementation. The Implementation Matrix summarizes all GHG reduction measures, projected GHG reduction amounts, performance targets for each measure, community cost and savings, responsible implementing agency, and applicability to type of development. In addition, Appendix E contains the

Adaptation Matrix, a working document with a framework of strategies for responding to vulnerability and adaptation issues identified in Chapter 5. It includes identification of asset categories and vulnerabilities from Chapter 5, lead agencies, a range of tools, and possible implementation actions.

RELATED CLIMATE ACTION PLANNING EFFORTS IN SAN MATEO COUNTY

In a separate but related effort, the County has produced a CAP for government (municipal) operations. This CAP was produced by the County Manager's Office and adopted by the Board of Supervisors in late 2012. It focuses on County operations – facilities, fleet, operations and maintenance, etc. in whatever location those operations are located, both in the unincorporated County and within incorporated cities. This CAP has a 15% below baseline GHG reduction target.

The project presented today relates specifically to the unincorporated portions of the County, because that is the geographic area over which the General Plan and its implementing regulations have jurisdiction. Greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in general do not, however, respect jurisdictional boundaries.

County Planning and Department of Public Works staff has also worked to coordinate this project with the Regionally Integrated Climate Action Planning Suite (RICAPS). This is a separate but related Countywide effort coordinated by C/CAG to provide technical support, tools, coordination, and a CAP template to the various jurisdictions within the County as they develop their individual CAPs. The County's EECAP included some of the same members of the consultant team that worked on RICAPS. The efforts use similar, though not always identical, methodologies and reduction measures, as the County's efforts somewhat preceded those in RICAPS. In some cases, the County has developed reduction measures that go beyond the template used in RICAPS. In addition, the County's project also includes an adaptation component as well as General Plan amendments, which are not specifically a part of the RICAPS template. Some of the jurisdictions within San Mateo County have not begun preparing a CAP, some are currently drafting a CAP with the assistance of the RICAPS process, several are in or nearing the public hearing and adoption stage, and a few have adopted a Climate Action Plan. As other jurisdictions' CAPs move into the adoption and implementation phase, County staff will continue to coordinate its efforts with the other member jurisdictions within RICAPS. More information about RICAPS can be found at the following internet link:

http://www.smcenergywatch.com/countywide_climate_action.shtml.

RELATION TO THE LCP

This project is not a proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) amendment and is independent of the LCP. The General Plan Amendment provides General Plan policies that apply throughout the entire unincorporated County. Likewise, the EECAP also includes implementation measures that apply throughout the County. The County has certain obligations under the State Coastal Act, but also has other obligations under

other State laws, such as SB 375 and AB 32. The County also has jurisdiction within all areas of the unincorporated County under its general police powers.

This approach is consistent with past County practice regarding the General Plan. For instance, the 2011 Housing Element was also a General Plan amendment that applied Countywide, and was not an LCP amendment, nor was it certified by the Coastal Commission. Neither was the 1986 General Plan certified by the Coastal Commission.

That said, the Planning Department recognizes that there are issues related to climate change and energy efficiency that have a particular impact in the Coastal Zone, particularly in the areas of vulnerability and adaptation. For this reason, Coastal Commission staff was asked to and did participate in the Vulnerability Assessment, and has been notified of the progress of the project. The County recognizes that in instances that would apply specifically and exclusively to implementation including development permitting within the Coastal Zone, an LCP amendment and/or CZ/CD zone amendment would need to be certified by the Coastal Commission at a future date. However, the current project does not propose any such specific regulatory changes exclusive to the Coastal Zone nor zoning changes to the CZ/CD zone.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The project has been guided by a lengthy and extensive public outreach and engagement process, which has included the following components:

Steering Committee. The project Steering Committee convened regularly to discuss local priorities, to provide direction to the project team for the development of the GHG inventory and the EECAP policies, and to review work products. It includes stakeholders from environmental, building, real estate, agriculture, labor, energy, transportation and other interest groups, including representatives from the Committee for Green Foothills, Sierra Club, Building Trades Council, San Mateo County Association of Realtors (SamCAR), Farm Bureau, PG&E, SamTrans, and Planning Commission. It met nine times between 2011 and 2013.

Technical Advisory Committee. Development of the project has also been assisted by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), consisting of County staff from various departments, including Planning and Building, Public Works and Parks, Health, and Fire. It met several times during the process to discuss and review preparation of the work product, sometimes at joint meetings with the Steering Committee.

Vulnerability Assessment Working Group. The project also included a Vulnerability Assessment and an adaptation component, for which the project team convened a Vulnerability Assessment Working Group. This group included County staff, as well as stakeholders from public agencies and non-governmental public interest organizations. This group overlapped somewhat with the Steering Committee and the TAC, but included staff from other agencies such as the Coastal Commission, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) and others. This group participated in

development of the Vulnerability Assessment, convening to identify vulnerability topics and adaptation priorities. This working group convened five times using a webcast or webinar presentation and comment approach. In addition, the second public workshop (see below) also focused on vulnerability issues.

Public Workshops. In addition to the groups mentioned above, public outreach also included three public workshops to solicit input during the earlier stages of the project. Planning staff publicized the first and second workshops with postcard mailings to all homeowners associations in the unincorporated County as well as all stakeholders identified in the Planning Department's list of agencies and organizations that follow planning issues. Notice of workshops was also publicized in the San Mateo Times and Half Moon Bay Review newspapers.

1. The first workshop was held in North Fair Oaks in August 2011, and gave the public an opportunity to provide input on priorities for energy efficiency and sustainability. It was well attended and included presentations, discussions, and small group activity.
2. The second workshop was held on the Midcoast in November 2011, and provided an opportunity for the public to provide input on vulnerability and adaptation to climate change. It was attended mostly by Coastsides residents and included presentations, discussions, and comment boards.
3. The third workshop was held in Redwood City in April 2012 and featured the presentation of the draft CAP implementation strategies. This workshop was attended by many residents who had attended one of the first two workshops and included a presentation, open house, and live polling.

Survey. During the initial stages of developing the project, the project webpage featured a survey on energy efficiency and climate change issues. About 20 people responded to the survey. Their responses were used to help identify energy reduction strategies and to prioritize implementation measures.

Communication and Webpage. The project webpage was used as a means of disseminating project information to interested parties, collecting information from the public via surveys, and developing a notification list for project updates. The project webpage can be accessed at:

<http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/planning/rechargesmc/index.html>.

Although the project team strove to incorporate all comments and viewpoints from the committees and at the workshops, and although the committees were broadly supportive of the overall project goals and policies, there was not unanimous agreement on every detail of every aspect of the project. The composition and roles of these committees, as well as further explanation of the public engagement workshops and process, are discussed in more detail in Chapter 1 of the EECAP.

PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW

On March 27, 2013, during the 45-day public review period for the DEIR, the Planning Commission considered this project as an information item and an opportunity for the Commission and the public to comment on the draft documents. Comments at this hearing were generally focused on the EECAP itself, rather than on the accompanying General Plan Amendment or the DEIR.

After the Planning Commission hearing, staff received additional comments from several parties, including BCDC, BAAQMD, Save the Bay, the Committee for Green Foothills, and the Office of Supervisor David Pine. For example, BCDC, Save the Bay, and the Office of Supervisor David Pine emphasized highlighting the issue of sea level rise and coordinating with other participants at all levels of government and in the private and non-governmental sector regarding sea level rise, particularly on the bayside. The EECAP and the General Plan Amendment were updated to highlight the importance of this issue and the coordinating role that the County can play to help address it. The Committee for Green Foothills asked that additional language in the General Plan related to the importance of wildlife corridors be included. Staff subsequently prepared revised documents which incorporated comments made by the public at the Planning Commission hearing, direction from the Commission itself, as well as additional comments received after the hearing.

The project was presented to the Planning Commission again on May 8, 2013, following the conclusion of the public comment period on the DEIR. The Commissioners made a number of changes to the EECAP at the hearing, for example changing the wording of the GHG reduction target to 17%, instead of 15% with a 2% buffer. Commissioner Slocum also provided written comments reiterating her statements at the Planning Commission hearing, and comments have been incorporated into the revised documents presented to the Board of Supervisors. Several people spoke in favor of the project, including representatives from Save the Bay, the Committee for Green Foothills, and SamCAR. SamCAR staff asked that additional language be added regarding outreach to stakeholders during project implementation, which staff said could be incorporated into the final document. The Planning Commission recommended that the Board approve the project with the changes made at the hearing, by a vote of 4-0, with one absence. Changes made by the Planning Commission and at the Planning Commission hearing of May 8 have been incorporated into the documents presented to the Board of Supervisors for consideration today.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

A Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was prepared for this project and circulated for public comment from February 21 to April 8, 2013. The DEIR was distributed through the State Clearinghouse to all responsible agencies and other parties as required by CEQA, and was also made available for public review at the Planning and Building Department. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this project during the 45-day DEIR review period on March 27, 2013. At this hearing,

the Commission and the public were given an opportunity to review and comment on the project and the DEIR. Comments made by the Commission and the public at that hearing focused on the EECAP itself, rather than on the DEIR. These comments were relatively minor in nature and have been incorporated into the revised EECAP. They do not change the conclusions of the DEIR, and no changes to the EIR were necessary.

Staff received two written comments during the 45-day review period, one from CalTrain, and another from SamTrans. Both letters expressed support for the project and are included in the FEIR. Staff received no other written comments during the review period. These written comments have been reviewed, and as they are supportive comments, no changes to the EIR were necessary as result of these comments.

Following conclusion of the 45-day public comment period, staff prepared the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). The FEIR must address all written comments received on the DEIR. In this case, there were only two written comments on the DEIR, and both expressed support for the project. The FEIR must also address any substantive changes made to the project being reviewed for environmental impact, for example, any significant changes to the proposed GHG reduction measures. The modifications made to the EECAP do not propose any significant changes to the proposed GHG reduction measures. Instead, for the most part, they provide additional background or explanation. For this reason, it is not necessary for the FEIR to reconsider the environmental impacts of the project initially addressed in the DEIR, because the changes proposed to the project are relatively minor in nature. As the comments on and changes to the project were relatively minor in nature, and the conclusions of the DEIR are not changed, no changes to the EIR are necessary. The FEIR is available on the project webpage at:
<http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/planning/rechargesmc/docs.html>.

For the most part, the EIR concludes that potential impacts of project adoption are less than significant, either with or without mitigation. However, the FEIR found that implementation of the proposed EECAP could have significant impacts on some sensitive and special-status species and their associated habitat and migratory corridors. These impacts would be reduced by incorporating design measures into all energy facilities constructed as part of EECAP implementation. These measures would include design of the installation of transmission lines, wind energy facilities, and wind turbines to reduce the likelihood of bird electrocutions and collisions, discourage the use of such sites by birds, and design features to minimize impacts to birds and bats. However, potential impacts cannot be fully eliminated, so this impact was considered significant and unavoidable.

The EIR, consistent with the requirements of CEQA, assesses potential environmental impacts that could result from adoption of the EECAP and amendment, and recommends mitigation measures, as needed, to reduce impacts to less than significant. The FEIR also compares the potential impacts of adopting the project to various alternatives, including a No Project Alternative (Alternative 1), or adopting a Wind Energy Generating

Facility Restriction Alternative (Alternative 2). The FEIR concludes that while a No Project Alternative would avoid potential environmental impacts of project adoption, it would not achieve any of the goals of the project. Alternative 2 would result in a more severe impact to climate change and GHG reduction as compared to the proposed project and may not be able to attain the requirements of AB 32. The proposed project is the environmentally superior alternative due to its ability to reduce overall GHG emissions in the County and curbing air pollutants.

County Counsel has reviewed and approved the Resolutions as to form.

Adoption of the EECAP and General Plan amendments contributes to the Shared Vision 2025 of an Environmentally Conscious Community, where the County is committed to reducing its carbon emissions, and using energy, water and land more efficiently. The project also aligns with the vision of a livable community by improving connections and access in communities.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Adoption of the EECAP and the amendments to the General Plan do not have any specific, direct, or immediate fiscal impact to the County. Adoption of these documents does not allocate funding nor commit the County to any specific capital or other improvements. Implementation of the EECAP will necessitate the expenditure of staff time. This impact has not been quantified, and would depend in part on which implementation measures the County decides to pursue over a given period of time.