
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

K. POPULATION & HOUSING

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) addresses the subject of population and housing with respect to the proposed Big Wave Wellness Center and Office Park Project (“proposed project”), including: (1) the potential of the proposed project to induce population and/or housing growth; (2) the degree to which the proposed project would cause growth in comparison to adopted population and housing growth forecasts; (3) the consistency of the proposed project with adopted regional and local policies; and (4) the potential of the proposed project to affect the balance between jobs and housing. In addition, the potential cumulative population and housing impacts of the proposed project in combination with all known related projects are evaluated in this section.

METHODOLOGY

The analysis in this section is based primarily on data provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census Bureau), the California Department of Finance (DOF), and the County of San Mateo (County). This section uses data collected and provided at the county level wherever available and feasible in an effort to provide comprehensive analysis.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Onsite Conditions

The two parcels which comprise the project site where development is proposed are currently undeveloped and have recently been in agricultural use. As such, these portions of the proposed project site do not contain any existing residents or housing units. The person who is farming the site currently also farms other sites, including the nearby airport property. A maximum of 10 day laborers assist with the farming operations for approximately 40 days out of the year, which equates to approximately 0.64 full-time employees per year.¹

Population

Table IV.K-1 shows the historical and projected population data for the County as well as unincorporated Half Moon Bay where the proposed project site would be located, including the projected population for year 2013 when the project buildout is expected to be complete. Unincorporated Half Moon Bay includes the coastal communities of Moss Beach, El Granada, Montara, Miramar and Princeton by the Sea, which are all located within a 5-to-6 mile long area along the San Mateo County Coastline. The population in

¹ E-mail correspondence from Scott Holmes, Member of Board of Directors, Big Wave Project, on May 16, 2009.

2013 is projected to increase to 758,910 in San Mateo County and increase to 11,750 in unincorporated Half Moon Bay.

**Table IV.K-1
County of San Mateo
Historical and Projections Population Data
2000 – 2020**

Year	Entire County	Unincorporated Half Moon Bay
2000	707,163	10,627
2009	745,858 ¹	11,503 ²
2010	741,000	11,600
2013 ³	758,910	11,750
2020	800,700	12,100

¹ State of California, Department of Finance, Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and State, 2001-2009, website: http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-4/2001-09/documents/E-4_2009%20Internet%20Version.xls, accessed on August 11, 2009.

² Calculated by adding 90 percent of the difference between 2000 and 2010 population to the 2000 population.

³ Calculated by adding 30 percent of the difference between 2010 and 2020 population to the 2010 population.

Source: ABAG, Projections 2007, and Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, August 2009.

Employment

Local employment data is relevant to population impact analysis due to the relationship between employment and population growth. In June 2009, San Mateo County had an unemployment rate of 8.9 percent.² This is an increase from a 4.7 percent average unemployment rate in 2008.³ However, most counties in California are experiencing similar increases in unemployment. Statewide unemployment has risen to 8.9 percent as of June 2009 compared to 4.7 percent in June 2008.⁴

Table IV.K-2 shows current employment data for unincorporated Half Moon Bay where the project site is located, surrounding communities, and San Mateo County as a whole. Included in the table are the cities of Pacifica, 10 miles north of the proposed project, and Half Moon Bay, 4 miles south of the site. Access between Pacifica and unincorporated Half Moon Bay is expected to improve with the construction of Devil's Slide tunnel on Highway 1 scheduled to open summer 2011, thereby improving access to

² State of California, Employment Development Department, Monthly Labor Force Data for Cities and Census Designated Places, June 2009 -- Preliminary, March 2008 Benchmark, website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/?pageid=133>, accessed on August 11, 2009. Data is not seasonally adjusted.

³ State of California, Employment Development Department, Monthly Labor Force Data for Cities and Census Designated Places (CDP), Annual Average 2008 - Revised, March 2008 Benchmark, website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/?pageid=133>, accessed on August 11, 2009. Data is not seasonally adjusted.

⁴ State of California, Employment Development Department, California Labor Market Review, June 2009, website: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/lfmonth/Calmr.pdf>, page 12-13, accessed on August 11, 2009.

employment opportunities in unincorporated Half Moon Bay for residents of Pacifica.⁵ Average unemployment for year 2008 was 3.5 percent for unincorporated Half Moon Bay, 5.8 percent for City of Half Moon Bay, and 5.5 percent for City of Pacifica. Current unemployment in the area shows an increase from 2008, ranging from 6.7 percent in unincorporated Half Moon Bay, 10.8 percent in the City of Half Moon Bay, and 10.2 percent for the City of Pacifica.

Table IV.K-2
Current Employment Data

Area	Average 2008 Unemployment Rate ¹ (%)	June 2009 Unemployment Rate ² (%)
Unincorporated Half Moon Bay ³	3.5	6.7
City of Half Moon Bay	5.8	10.8
City of Pacifica	5.5	10.2
San Mateo County	4.7	8.9

Source:
¹ State of California, Employment Development Department, Monthly Labor Force Data for Cities and Census Designated Places (CDP), Annual Average 2008 - Revised, March 2008 Benchmark, website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/?pageid=133>, accessed on August 11, 2009. Data is not seasonally adjusted.
² State of California, Employment Development Department, Monthly Labor Force Data for Cities and Census Designated Places, June 2009 -- Preliminary, March 2008 Benchmark, website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/?pageid=133>, accessed on August 11, 2009. Data is not seasonally adjusted.
³ As represented by El Granada Census Designated Place.

Data from ABAG indicates that for the year 2005, many employed residents were traveling outside of their communities for employment. For example, unincorporated Half Moon Bay had a total number of 1,960 jobs but the employed residents in the community consisted of 5,530 persons.⁶ This represents a ratio of one job per 2.8 employed residents.

As shown in Table IV.K-3, projection data for years 2010 and 2015 similarly indicate that there will be almost three times the number of employed residents to the number of jobs in unincorporated Half Moon Bay as well as the nearby City of Pacifica. This suggests that residents of these communities will continue to travel to other communities for employment. The ratio of jobs to employed residents is almost 1 to 1 for the City of Half Moon Bay suggesting that these residents will be able to find work within their community.

⁵ See, *Highway 1 Tunnel Bores Ahead*, Mike Aldax, *San Francisco Examiner*, March 11, 2009.

⁶ ABAG, *Projections 2007*.

**Table IV.K-3
Projected Employment Data**

Area	Ratio of Jobs to Employed Residents		
	2010	2015	2030
Unincorporated Half Moon Bay	1:2.7	1:2.8	1:2.9
City of Half Moon Bay	1:1.1	1:1.2	1:1.4
City of Pacifica	1:2.9	1:3.0	1:3.1
San Mateo County	1:0.9	1:1.0	1:0.9

Source: ABAG, Projections 2007, and Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, May 2009.

Table IV.K-4 shows employment by major sector for the County in 2007.⁷ As shown, employment in the County is diversified across a variety of sectors, with ‘professional and business services’ and ‘trade, transportation, and utilities’ jobs comprising approximately 40 percent of the County’s employment. In addition, ‘manufacturing’, ‘government’, ‘educational and health services’, and ‘leisure and hospitality’, each comprise approximately 10 percent of the County’s employment.

**Table IV.K-4
County of San Mateo
Employment by Industry
2007 Annual Average**

Industry	Jobs	Percent of Total
Trade, Transportation, & Utilities	75,100	21.9
Professional & Business Services	63,400	18.5
Leisure & Hospitality	35,000	10.2
Government	32,600	9.5
Educational & Health Services	32,100	9.4
Manufacturing	30,800	9.0
Financial Activities	21,600	6.3
Natural Resources, Mining, & Construction	20,800	6.1
Information	17,400	5.1
Other Services	11,800	3.4
Agriculture	2,000	0.6
Total	342,600	100

Source: California Employment Development Department, Industry Employment & Labor Force - by Annual Average, March 2008 Benchmark, website: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/sanmahaw.xls>, accessed on May 14, 2009; California Employment Development Department, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages, San Mateo County Third Quarter 2008, website: http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/qcew/CEW-Major_NAICS.asp, accessed on May 14, 2009; phone interview with Ruth Kavanagh, Labor Market Consultant, California Employment Development Department, on May 6, 2009; and Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, May 2009.

⁷ 2008 annual industry employment data not available, as confirmed by Ruth Kavanagh, Labor Market Consultant, California Employment Development Department, on May 12, 2009.

Housing

As defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, household is another term for an occupied dwelling unit.⁸ A housing unit is a group of rooms or a single room occupied as separate living quarters where occupants live separately from other persons in the building and have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall. The population of an area includes household population as well as “group quarters population”. Group quarters population refers to persons in nursing homes, hospitals, jails, educational institutions, etc.⁹

Information on current vacancy rates in the project area is limited. According to the San Mateo County Housing Element, which addresses the housing needs of the unincorporated portions of the County, rental vacancy rates in the area surrounding the proposed project site in the year 2000 ranged from 0.8 percent to 3.7 percent and homeowner vacancy rates ranged from 0.4 percent to 0.8 percent.¹⁰ The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development considers that a rental vacancy rate of 5 percent allows ordinary mobility and choice within the rental market but a vacancy rate below 5 percent indicates a housing shortage.¹¹ A vacancy rate of 2 percent is generally considered normal for ownership housing.¹² This suggests that at least in the year 2000, the area surrounding the project site was facing a housing shortage. Department of Finance data, which does not specify whether vacancy rates are due to rental or ownership property, indicates that the total vacancy rate as of January 2009 for the entire County was 1.9 percent (5,060 vacant units available out of a total of 268,908 housing units) and for unincorporated portions of the County was 2.8 percent (627 vacant units available out of a total of 22,703 housing units).¹³ These vacancy rates indicate that there is a housing shortage both in the unincorporated portions and the County as a whole. According to the Housing Element, the midcoast urban area, the region in which the proposed project site is located, contains a significant amount of vacant undeveloped land, and therefore opportunities for new development to accommodate population growth.¹⁴ However, major

⁸ U.S. Census Bureau, *State & County QuickFacts*, website:
http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/meta/long_HSD310200.htm, accessed February 17, 2009.

⁹ U.S. Census Bureau, *Terms & Definitions, Housing Unit Estimates*, website:
http://www.census.gov/popest/topics/terms/housing_unit.html, accessed February 17, 2009.

¹⁰ County of San Mateo, *General Plan Housing Element adopted December 2003, amended July 2004, Exhibit 14.16, page 14.30*, website:
http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/vgn/images/portal/cit_609/26/7/1367882591SMCo%20Housing%20Element%201-%20Intro_Background.pdf, accessed on August 11, 2009.

¹¹ County of San Mateo, *General Plan Housing Element adopted December 2003, amended July 2004, page 14.11*, website:
http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/vgn/images/portal/cit_609/26/7/1367882591SMCo%20Housing%20Element%201-%20Intro_Background.pdf, accessed on May 15, 2009.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ State of California, Department of Finance, *Demographic Research Unit*, website:
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/ReportsPapers/ReportsPapers.php>, accessed on May 15, 2009.

¹⁴ See County of San Mateo, *General Plan Housing Element adopted December 2003, amended July 2004, page 14.170*, website:
http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/vgn/images/portal/cit_609/26/8/1367882587SMCo%20Housing%204-%20Element%20Resources.pdf, accessed on August 11, 2009.

development in the Montara and Moss Beach area, at least in the short term, will continue to be constrained by limited infrastructure.¹⁵

In 2007, only 15 percent of Bay Area households could afford a median-priced home; in San Mateo County, only 12 percent of households could afford a median-priced home.¹⁶ Affordability is also an issue for low and moderate-income households renting in San Mateo County.

REGULATORY SETTING

Federal

No federal plans, policies, regulations or laws related to population and housing are applicable to the proposed project.

State

Government Code Section 65580-65590 (Housing Element Law)

All California localities are required by Article 10.6 of the Government Code (Sections 65580-65590) to adopt housing elements as part of their general plans and to submit draft and adopted elements to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review and compliance with state law.

Government Code Section 65588(c) (Coastal Zone)

State Government Code Section 65588(c) requires the Housing Element review to take into account low or moderate-income housing converted or demolished in or near the Coastal Zone, pursuant to State Government Code Section 65590. Generally, replacement units are required if a residential structure containing three or more dwelling units is demolished or converted. Additionally, low and moderate-income housing must be provided either on the site of new housing developments or on other sites in or near the Coastal Zone. In addition, all large developments permitted in the Coastal Zone since the adoption of the County's LCP in 1980 have been required to provide affordable housing.

Regional and Local

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

The HCD works with regional Councils of Governments (COGs) to determine the amount of housing needed within a region. ABAG is this region's COG. The County of San Mateo, in partnership with all twenty cities in the County, formed a subregion. The formation of a subregion, for the purposes of

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ ABAG, *San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan 2007-2014*, page 9 at website: <http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/pdfs/SFHousingNeedsPlan.pdf>.

conducting the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), is allowed by state law. The San Mateo subregion designated the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) as the entity responsible for coordinating and implementing the subregional RHNA process. ABAG publishes an annual report that discusses housing issues of importance to the San Francisco Bay Area. The 2008 report, San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan, 2007-2014, explains the RHNA process and outcomes.

The determination of housing need is based on existing need and estimated population growth. Need is determined for households in all income categories: very-low, low, moderate and above-moderate incomes. Once the total regional need is determined, ABAG works with local governments to allocate the total need to individual cities and counties. Local governments are then required to plan where and how the allocated housing units will be developed within their communities. This is done through the Housing Element of each local government's General Plan.

Based on a methodology that weighs a number of factors (e.g., projected population growth, employment, commute patterns, available sites), quantifiable needs for housing units in the region are determined according to various income categories. The San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan, 2007-2014, allocates 15,738 housing units to the County of San Mateo. Of that, C/CAG allocated 1,506 housing units to unincorporated San Mateo County.

San Mateo County General Plan Housing Element

San Mateo County is updating the Housing Element of its General Plan. The County's last Housing Element was adopted in 2003 and amended in 2004. State law mandates that the next update be submitted to the HCD by June 30, 2009. The planning area for the Housing Element consists of unincorporated lands under County jurisdiction. As of 2003, half of the County's land area, but only 8.7 percent of its population, is in unincorporated areas.¹⁷

Relevant goals and objectives for the unincorporated areas of the County as specified in the Housing Element include:

- HE 14.1 To maintain and improve the quality and affordability of the existing housing stock in order to minimize the displacement of existing residents;
- HE 14.2 To promote sufficient production of new housing of affordable cost and diverse size to accommodate the housing needs of all persons who reside, work, or who can be expected to work or reside in the County;
- HE 14.3 To strive to provide housing in balanced residential environments that combine access to employment opportunities, transportation, childcare and other community services;

¹⁷ County of San Mateo, *General Plan Housing Element adopted December 2003, amended July 2004, page 14.6, website:*
http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/vgn/images/portal/cit_609/26/7/1367882591SMCo%20Housing%20Element%201-%20Intro_Background.pdf, accessed on May 12, 2009.

- HE 14.4 To ensure that housing is equally available to all persons regardless of age, race, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, ethnic background, income, disability or other arbitrary factors;
- HE 14.19 To encourage the provision of housing near employment centers and/or where adequate infrastructure and services exist or can be provided;
- HE 14.48 To expand the housing choices for special needs groups by using techniques to help increase the variety, location, size and price of housing available;
- HE 14.49 To provide affordable housing opportunities and supportive services for the elderly and disabled through programs including the construction of new housing units; and
- HE 14.50 To promote the development of housing for the elderly or disabled in all appropriate locations, considering locations within urban areas that are located close to public transportation and other essential services and lands that do not have major topographical constraints.

San Mateo County Local Coastal Program

The San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP), an area plan adopted June 1998 was prepared in response to the 1976 Coastal Act and guides existing and future development in the 88,000-acre San Mateo Coastal Zone. This region stretches along 55 miles of shoreline from the San Francisco County border to the Santa Cruz County border. Most of the land within the planning area is rural, although several small communities exist including Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Miramar, and Princeton by the Sea.

Relevant goals and objectives for the coastal area of the County as specified in the LCP are similar to the goals of the Housing Element and include:

- LCP 3.1 To protect, encourage and, where feasible, provide housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income who reside, work or can be expected to work in the Coastal Zone;
- LCP 3.2 To strive to ensure that decent housing is available for low and moderate income persons regardless of age, race, sex, marital status or other arbitrary factor;
- LCP 3.3 To strive to provide such housing in balanced residential environments that combine access to employment, community facilities and adequate services;
- LCP 3.4 To strive to improve the range of housing choices, by location, type, price and tenure, available to persons of low and moderate income; and
- LCP 3.6 To allocate affordable housing in part in order to reduce home-to-work travel distance within the Coastal Zone.

Montara - Moss Beach - El Granada Community Plan

The Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan covers the portions of the County that extend along the Pacific Coast from Martini Creek, at the base of Montara Mountain, to the northerly city limits of the City of Half Moon Bay. The plan indicates that preservation of the community's existing character is important to residents because it gives a sense of identity that is unique to the area.

Relevant goals and objectives related to housing for the Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan include:

- CP 1.8 To accommodate a variety of dwelling styles within an economic range that serves the housing needs of the community;
- CP 4.1 To build housing that relates to its physical setting, does not destroy the natural features of the land, and is compatible with the neighborhood scale and coastal character of the community;
- CP 4.2 To provide incentives that will encourage the development of an adequate housing base designed to meet the needs of all residents in the community, especially those with low and moderate incomes;
- CP 4.4 To prioritize the provision of housing affordable to low and moderate income families in new residential construction, particularly if government subsidies are available;
- CP 4.5 To incentivize development of lower income housing, such as through density bonuses and reduced parking requirements; and
- CP 4.6 To consider innovative housing programs that require a proportion of all new units be provided for low and moderate income families.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**Thresholds of Significance**

As stated in §15126.2(d) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, "It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment." Based on Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*, a project could have a significant impact on population and housing resources if the proposed project would:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

As discussed in Section V.C (Impacts Found To Be Less Than Significant) of this DEIR, the potential impacts associated with Thresholds (b) and (c) listed above were determined to result in a less-than-significant (or no) impact. Therefore, only Threshold (a) listed above is addressed in the following discussion.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact POP-1 Induce Substantial Population Growth in the Area

Population Growth Due to Project Construction

Construction of the proposed project would take place over approximately 30 to 36 months. Construction-related employment opportunities would not likely result in household relocation by construction workers to the vicinity of the proposed project site for various reasons, including the following:

- Construction employment has no regular place of business; rather, construction workers commute to job sites that may change several times a year.
- Many construction workers are highly specialized (e.g., crane operators, steelworkers, masons, etc.) and move from job site to job site as dictated by the demand for their skills.
- The work requirements of most construction projects are also highly specialized, and workers are employed on a job site only as long as their skills are needed to complete a particular phase of the construction process.
- Some construction workers would likely be drawn from the construction employment labor force (6.1 percent of the total labor force in the County when combined with natural resources and mining industries) already present in the County.

Consequently, the project-related construction workforce would not likely relocate as a consequence of working on the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to population growth associated with temporary jobs would be ***less than significant*** and no mitigation measures are required.

Population Growth Due to Project Operation

New Jobs Associated with the Proposed Project

The project consists of two components, an Office Park and a Wellness Center. The Office Park would consist of a total of 225,000 square feet of mixed use comprised of 40 percent general office, 25 percent research and development, 15 percent storage, and 20 percent light manufacturing. It is not expected that employees would be generated from the 15 percent of the Office Park that would be used for storage. Based on an analysis of the types of uses proposed at the project site, it is expected that an average of 650

workers would be employed at the Office Park portion of the project site, with a peak of 780 workers in very robust economic times.¹⁸ The Wellness Center would include several programs that are designed to provide employment opportunities for up to 37 low-income developmentally disabled (DD) adults living onsite, as well as an additional four full-time and four part-time jobs for staff to manage the various operations. Therefore, as shown in Table IV.K-5 below, the proposed project, including both components, has the potential to employ approximately 825 persons per year, at full operation. Population impacts related to project-related jobs growth is discussed further below in conjunction with impacts related to project-related housing growth.

New Housing Associated with the Proposed Project

The proposed project would result in construction of a maximum of 70 apartment and single-story units for use by up to 50 DD residents and 20 staff members. These units would be available to own, rent, or for staff housing. The majority of the units (50) are intended for DD residents and would be available as separate living quarters in the form of single units (one-bedroom/bathroom module) or multiple units containing separate living room and dining room/kitchen area. Additionally, the units would have direct access from the outside. Because these units are in keeping with the definition of a housing unit occupied as a separate living quarter as opposed to group quarters housing, comparison of these types of units is more consistent with household population as opposed to group quarters population for purposes of analyzing population growth associated with new housing.

Total Population Growth Associated with the Proposed Project

Taking into account new housing and new jobs associated with the proposed project, it is assumed that a total of 858 people could potentially contribute to the population growth of the area, as shown in Table IV.K-5. This is derived from the 825 jobs created plus 70 housing units minus the 37 housing units for DD residents that would also be employed by 37 of the 45 jobs on the Wellness Center portion of the project site. This number represents the most conservative analysis in which it is assumed that all persons to fill the new housing and jobs created from the project site would be relocating from outside of San Mateo County and that 780 workers would be employed at the Office Center portion of the project site rather than the more likely scenario in which 650 workers would be employed.

**Table IV.K-5
Population Growth Associated with the Proposed Project**

Source	Jobs
Office Park Employment	780 (Peak)
Wellness Center Employment	
Developmentally Disabled	37
Full-Time Staff	4
Part-Time Staff	4
Employment Subtotal	825
Wellness Center Housing	

¹⁸ E-mail correspondence from Scott Holmes, Member of Board of Directors, Big Wave Project, on May 16, 2009.

**Table IV.K-5
Population Growth Associated with the Proposed Project**

Source	Jobs
Developmentally Disabled	50
Staff	20
Housing Subtotal	70
Overlap Due to Portion of Housing Provided for a Developmentally Disabled Employees	(37)
Total Minus Overlap	858
<i>Source: Project Applicant; and Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, August 2009.</i>	

Project buildout is expected to be complete in year 2013. The projected population in 2013 is 758,910 persons for the entire San Mateo County and 11,754 persons in the unincorporated Half Moon Bay area where the project site would be located, as shown in Table IV.K-1. Extrapolating from ABAG projections data, population between 2009 and 2013 is projected to increase in San Mateo County by 19,441 persons and increase in the unincorporated Half Moon Bay area by 247 persons. Representing 4.2 percent of the County population growth between 2009 and 2013, the proposed project's contribution to the increase in population in the County would be within ABAG's population projections. However, under this conservative analysis where it is assumed that all persons filling the jobs and housing units at the project site would be coming from outside of the unincorporated Half Moon Bay area, the population growth associated with the proposed project is more than three times greater than the projected population growth in the unincorporated Half Moon Bay area between 2009 and 2013.

Assuming that some or all of the jobs created at the project site would be filled by persons relocating to the area, it appears that the local housing market does not contain sufficient vacancy to accommodate large amounts of population influx. As noted, vacancy rates indicate that there is a housing shortage both in the unincorporated portions and the County as a whole.

However, based on current market analysis, it is reasonable to assume that many of the jobs at the project site would be filled by persons living in the area as opposed to people relocating to the area. Unemployment data indicates a need for local employment opportunities. Current unemployment in the area ranges from 6.7 percent in unincorporated Half Moon Bay to 10.8 percent in nearby City of Half Moon Bay. Average unemployment for year 2008 was 3.5 percent for unincorporated Half Moon Bay, 5.8 percent for City of Half Moon Bay, and 5.5 percent for City of Pacifica.

In addition, projections data indicates that many employed residents of these communities are traveling outside of their communities for work. In 2005, unincorporated Half Moon Bay had a total number of 1,960 jobs but 5,530 employed residents, which equates to one job per 2.8 employed residents. Projections data for years 2010 and 2015 similarly indicate that for the communities of unincorporated Half Moon Bay and City of Pacifica there will be almost three times the number of employed residents to the number of jobs. This suggests that there exists a local market for jobs that can be held by residents who are currently traveling outside of the area for employment. Also, according to the Year 2000 U.S. Census, 53 percent of employees in the project vicinity travel from outside the area to work in the Half

Moon Bay Area and 47 percent of the employees in the project vicinity live within the Half Moon Bay area.

Therefore, when assuming a conservative scenario that all persons filling the jobs and housing units at the project site would be coming from outside of the unincorporated Half Moon Bay area, population growth associated with the proposed project is more than three times greater than the projected population growth in the unincorporated Half Moon Bay area between 2009 and 2013. However, based on current unemployment and vacancy rates, it is anticipated that the majority of jobs and housing created by the project would be filled by the existing population.

Additionally, housing to be provided at the project site is in conformity with area plans and policies because of its emphasis on providing affordable housing for developmentally disabled persons. The Housing Element, Local Coastal Program, and Montara - Moss Beach - El Granada Community Plan include variously as part of their goals to provide affordable housing options for special needs groups including the disabled. A related goal is to provide affordable housing in areas that reduce travel time between work and home. Since the housing at the project site is fulfilling a specific need identified in the local plans, this suggests that the housing at the project site is not contributing to substantial population growth in the area. Moreover, 37 of the jobs at the Wellness Center would be specifically provided for DD residents living at the project site. These jobs would not affect the balance between jobs and housing in the local community. The proposed project would assist the area in achieving a jobs/housing balance by providing approximately 825 net new jobs and 70 new housing units, or approximately 12 jobs per dwelling unit. By providing a substantial number of new job opportunities along with a moderate supply of new housing, the proposed project would not only provide adequate jobs to employ future project residents, but provide a surplus of jobs to employ existing and future residents in the surrounding community.

Therefore, as discussed above, impacts related to population growth associated with project operations would therefore be *less than significant* and no mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The housing-induced population growth of nearby projects is not relevant since the project proposes housing for up to 70 DD residents and related staff, which has been identified as a need in local community plans and policies. There are no related residential projects in the unincorporated Half Moon Bay area. Residential development projects that are located in the cities of Pacifica and Half Moon Bay do not appear to be designed for DD residents.

Regarding cumulative impacts contributing to substantial population growth, the employment potential of related projects needs to be considered. While on an individual basis, the impacts of the proposed project are not significant, cumulatively with other projects, the potential jobs created could induce substantial population growth in the area. The projects in the City of Half Moon Bay are not relevant to the cumulative impact discussion as they concern residential and park uses. Within the midcoast area and the City of Pacifica, both of which contain insufficient local jobs for employed residents and those seeking

work, as indicated by the jobs/housing imbalance in those areas and by unemployment rates, approximately 33,155 square feet and 94,743 square feet of commercial, industrial and mixed-use projects have been proposed, respectively.¹⁹ Application of employee generation rates to these numbers indicates that the related projects would generate up to 448 employees.²⁰ Along with the 825 employees expected to be generated at the proposed project, a total of 1,250 employees could be generated by projects in the area. In the year 2030, the population in unincorporated Half Moon Bay is projected to be 12,300 and projected to be 42,100 in City of Pacifica.²¹ The ratio of jobs to employed residents is projected to be one job per 2.9 residents in unincorporated Half Moon Bay and one job per 3.1 residents in the City of Pacifica. Therefore, given the imbalance in the number of jobs compared to the number of residents, impacts associated with the potential growth in jobs stemming from the related projects would be less than significant and would create local employment opportunities for residents currently working outside of the area and for unemployed residents seeking employment. Cumulative impacts related to population growth would be *less than significant* and no mitigation measures are required.

LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts to population and housing would be *less than significant*.

¹⁹ Within the midcoast area, projects 1 through 7, as described in Table III-1 in Section III, Project Description, consist of commercial, industrial, and mixed uses. Within the City of Pacifica, projects 8 through 13 consist of mixed and commercial uses.

²⁰ Los Angeles Unified School District, Commercial/Industrial Development School Fee Justification Study, September 2002. Generation Rate = 0.0034965 employee/square foot of office use. (It is assumed that the related projects designated as mixed-use will contain office uses. Office uses generally yield a higher number of employees than other types of commercial uses including industrial uses.)

²¹ ABAG, Projections 2007.