



**Port of Redwood City
NOTICE OF PREPARATION and
NOTICE OF SCOPING MEETING**

**POSTING ONLY
04/29/2024**

Date: May 1, 2024

To: Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, and Other Interested Parties

Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report, Notice of Public Review Period and Circulation of the Initial Study, and Notice of Scoping Meeting for the Port of Redwood City Ferry Terminal Project

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Port of Redwood City (Port), as the Lead Agency, will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Port of Redwood City Ferry Terminal Project (the proposed project).

The Port is interested in the views of your agency as to the appropriate scope and content of the EIR, as well as any recommended mitigation measures related to responsible and trustee agencies' statutory responsibilities. Your agency may need to use the EIR prepared by the Port when considering permits or other approvals associated with the proposed project. If you are not a public agency with any statutory or regulatory responsibility concerning this project, your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested so that the EIR may be prepared in consideration of the input from the community and surrounding areas.

Project Description

The proposed project would provide Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA)-operated passenger ferry service at Redwood City with origin and destination points of San Francisco and Oakland. Initial service would be during weekday morning and afternoon commute periods between the hours of approximately 6 am to 9 pm using diesel powered ferry vessels capable of carrying up to 300 passengers. As the ferry service matures, midday, evening, weekend, and special event service may be added. The ferry terminal would include waterside and landside components, including a ferry dock, gangway, fixed access pier and security gate, kiosks, portable restroom, bicycle storage, surface parking lot, and new utilities required to establish the proposed ferry service. The proposed project also includes widening the Seaport Boulevard loop road from the Pacific Shores Center entrance to the ferry terminal site to accommodate a bicycle trail and sidewalk and extending the Bay Trail along the north edge of the project site to the ferry terminal. The relocation of existing infrastructure (e.g., railroad spur, terminus of Frontage Road, lighting and utilities, and a maintenance building) and modifications to an existing public parking lot would be required to accommodate the access improvements. The proposed project also includes a zone change to allow future visitor-serving uses consisting of a three-story hotel with an associated restaurant, retail and meeting/event facilities, a standalone restaurant, up to 10,000 square feet of standalone office space, and a permanent restroom facility at the ferry terminal.

Project Location

The ferry terminal site is a 9.2 acre Port property near the confluence of Redwood Creek and Westpoint Slough. Other project improvements would occur along a portion of Seaport Boulevard west of the Pacific Shores Center, the railroad tracks and Frontage Road east of the Port, and a portion of the existing public parking lot and waterfront park northwest of Pacific Shores Center. The ferries would operate within existing navigation routes in San Francisco Bay to and from Redwood City and San Francisco and Oakland.

Potential Significant Impacts

Based on the findings of the Initial Study prepared in conjunction with the NOP, the Port has identified potential significant impacts for the following topics: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities/Service Systems.

Document Availability and Review Period

A copy of the Initial Study and NOP is attached to the notice that has been distributed by email and it can be reviewed in hard copy at the Port office located at 675 Seaport Boulevard, Redwood City, CA 94063; the Downtown Library at 1044 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, CA 94063; Redwood Shores Branch Library at 399 Marine Parkway, Redwood City, CA 94065; and online at <https://www.redwoodcityport.com/ferry>.

The Port will consider all comments received in response to the NOP during the drafting of the EIR. The NOP public review period is scheduled from May 1, 2024 to May 31, 2024 (5 pm). However, Responsible Agencies and Trustee Agencies may submit their responses no later than **30 days** after receipt of the NOP. Please send your response to **Don Snaman, Project Manager** at 675 Seaport Boulevard, Redwood City, CA 94063 or c-dsnaman@redwoodcityport.com. Please provide your name or the name of a contact person in your agency.

Scoping Meeting

A public scoping meeting/open house will be held on May 15, 2024 from 11 am to 12 pm at the Board of Commissioners meeting room at the Port office located at 675 Seaport Boulevard. The meeting may also be accessed and observed by joining by video teleconference via Zoom at:

<https://zoom.us/join> Meeting ID: 985 1201 8699 Password: 85917060

Or use this link:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/98512018699?pwd=dTc3a09SMWN5bDFQMfZMSDM4WVNSZz09>

To join by audio teleconference:


Phone: (669) 900-6833 or (346) 248-7799 Meeting ID: 985 1201 8699


The Port of Redwood City is not responsible for a member of the public's technical ability to participate in the meeting.

Information presented at the scoping meeting will also be available on the Port's website:

<https://www.redwoodcityport.com/ferry>

Once the Draft EIR is prepared there will be further opportunity to comment on the proposed project.





MAY 2024

Ferry Terminal Initial Study Port of Redwood City

Prepared for:

Port of Redwood City

**CDM
Smith**

Table of Contents

Section 1 Introduction	1-1
1.1 CEQA Process	1-1
1.2 Document Format	1-1
Section 2 Project Description	2-1
2.1 Project Background	2-1
2.2 Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses	2-1
2.3 Project Overview	2-8
2.3.1 Ferry Terminal Components	2-8
2.3.2 Project Construction	2-15
2.3.3 Project Operations	2-16
2.4 Anticipated Project Approvals and Permits	2-17
2.5 Responsible Agencies	2-18
Section 3 Environmental Evaluation.....	3-1
3.1 Project Summary	3-2
3.2 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	3-3
3.3 Determination	3-4
3.4 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	3-4
Section 4 Environmental Impact Analysis	4-1
Section 5 List of Preparers and Contributors	5-1
Section 6 Acronyms	6-1
Section 7 References	7-1

List of Figures

Figure 1 Regional Map..... 2-3

Figure 2 Vicinity Map..... 2-4

Figure 3 Project Area 2-5

Figure 4 Project Site Plan..... 2-9

Figure 5 Ferry Terminal..... 2-10

List of Tables

Table 1 Agencies, Permits, and Approvals..... 2-18

Section 1

Introduction

The Port of Redwood City (Lead Agency) has prepared this Initial Study (IS) to evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed Port of Redwood City Ferry Terminal Project (proposed project) in the San Francisco Bay. The Port of Redwood City (Port) is the lead agency for this project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA), the City of Redwood City (City), and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) are responsible agencies for the proposed project. The new ferry terminal would create a mid-peninsula transit hub that provides an alternative transportation option connecting to San Francisco and the East Bay. The proposed project also includes site access improvements and proposes plans for future visitor-serving amenities.

1.1 CEQA Process

This document was prepared in accordance with CEQA, the California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21000 et seq., and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 15000 et seq.). One of the main objectives of CEQA is to disclose the significant environmental effects of proposed activities to the public and decision-makers. The Port will consider the information in this IS to determine the scope of the environmental impact report (EIR).

1.2 Document Format

This IS contains the following sections:

Section 1. Introduction. This section provides an overview of the proposed project and the CEQA environmental documentation process.

Section 2. Project Description. This section provides a detailed description of the proposed project's components.

Section 3. Environmental Evaluation. This section includes a summary of the proposed project, identifies environmental resource areas that may be affected by the project, presents the CEQA determination based on the results of the IS, and describes the evaluation of environmental impacts.

Section 4. Environmental Impact Analysis. This section presents the CEQA checklist questions for each impact area along with the environmental analysis for each issue area identified on the environmental checklist. If the proposed project does not have the potential to significantly impact a given issue area, the relevant section provides a brief discussion of the reasons why no impacts or less than significant impacts are expected. If the proposed project could have a significant impact on a resource, a summary of the potential impact(s) is provided, and a determination is made that the issue identified in the checklist question(s) will be further evaluated in the EIR. This section also addresses mandatory findings of significance.

Section 5. Preparers and Contributors. This section provides a list of key personnel involved in the preparation of the IS.

Section 6. Acronyms. This section provides a list of acronyms used throughout the IS.

Section 7. References. This section provides a list of reference materials used during the preparation of the IS.

The environmental analysis included in Section 4, Environmental Impact Analysis, is consistent with the CEQA Initial Study format identified in the CEQA Guidelines. In accordance with the Guidelines, impacts are separated into the following categories:

Potentially Significant Impact. This category is applicable if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. Environmental issues with this finding will be further evaluated in the EIR to be prepared for the proposed project.

Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation Incorporated. All impacts that may potentially be significant will be evaluated in the EIR, along with feasible mitigation measures to reduce such impacts.

Less than Significant Impact. This category is identified when the proposed project would result in impacts below the threshold of significance, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact. This category applies when the proposed project would not create an impact in the specific environmental issue area. “No Impact” answers do not require a detailed explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency that show that the impact does not apply to the specific project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors and general standards.

Section 2

Project Description

2.1 Project Background

Public agencies throughout the Bay Area are planning for and investing in multimodal solutions to ease congestion and reduce greenhouse gases (GHG), including expansion of the regional ferry system. Ferry services have played an important role in the development of the San Francisco Bay Area transportation network and they offer a convenient and practical mobility alternative to congested land-based transportation and public transit services. In its 2016 Strategic Plan, WETA, the region's primary ferry operator, envisioned eleven new ferry terminals and eight routes by the year 2035, including a potential terminal in Redwood City. The Port of Redwood City has long been considered a potential ferry terminal site, with the first terminal planning study completed in 2007 and the first Redwood City and WETA study of ferry service at a Port site conducted in 2012.¹

2.2 Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The project area is comprised of:

- **Project site/Ferry Terminal site:** A 9.2 acre site located at the northern end of Seaport Boulevard where Westpoint Slough and Redwood Creek meet that would be the site of the ferry terminal, Bay Trail extension, and future visitor-serving uses;
- **Seaport Boulevard corridor:** An approximately 60-foot wide corridor that is part of the Pacific Shores Center and encompasses Seaport Boulevard and approximately 10 to 13 feet of land on either side of the roadway from the entrance of the Pacific Shores Center to just north of the entrance of the project site that would be used for vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle access to the project site;
- **Waterfront Park:** A portion of the public waterfront park directly east of the project site and north of the Pacific Shores Center that would include an extension of the existing paved segment of the Bay Trail into the project site;
- **Public parking lot and maintenance building site:** The southern portion of the public parking area and existing maintenance building directly east of the project site and northwest of the Pacific Shores Center that would be used for access to the project site;
- **New maintenance building site:** An approximately 0.1 acre site in the Pacific Shores Center property that would be the site of the relocated maintenance building;
- **Relocated Railroad Tracks:** Approximately 300 feet of existing Union Pacific railway tracks located between the 9.2 acre project site and the waterfront park and public parking; the railway tracks

¹ Port of Redwood City. June 2, 2022. Redwood City Ferry Business Plan. Prepared by CDM Smith. Available at: https://www.redwoodcityport.com/_files/ugd/521530_787a23efc80a4b11956b3e18e66c9160.pdf.

would be removed and relocated approximately 1,000 feet to the south within an abandoned portion of Frontage Road; and

- **San Francisco Bay (including Redwood Creek and Westpoint Slough):** Existing shipping lanes in San Francisco Bay from the project site to the ferry terminals in the Port of San Francisco and adjacent to the Port of Oakland.

The San Francisco Bay, including the ferry routes, and the regional location are shown on **Figure 1**. **Figure 2** shows the project area in context of the surrounding development, islands, and waterways. **Figure 3** shows the project area in greater detail.

Project Site

The project site is in Redwood City on land owned by the Port, bordered by Redwood Creek to the west, Westpoint Slough to the north, Frontage Road and Union Pacific Railroad tracks to the east, and an aggregate and cement marine terminal operated by Cemex Construction Materials (CEMEX) to the south. Bair Island is across Redwood Creek to the west and northwest of the project site and Greco Island is across Westpoint Slough to the northeast. Opposite the railroad tracks is Seaport Boulevard and the Pacific Shores Center office complex and parking lots. Immediately east of the project site is a public parking lot and small maintenance building, a publicly accessible waterfront park, and a portion of the Bay Trail.

The project site is owned by the Port and is under a month to month lease to CEMEX, who used it for the stockpiling of materials for recycling and sale of concrete base rock. CEMEX is currently in the process of vacating the site and, pursuant to lease terms, is removing landside improvements located on-site, including a storage building, equipment and machinery, and stockpiles.

The project site contains some vegetated areas, primarily along the edges. Patches of tidal wetland vegetation are located along the edges of the site and currently a vegetated stormwater ditch extends along the eastern edge of the property. The stormwater ditch begins approximately 400 feet to the south along the CEMEX marine terminal and extends north to a tide gate with a one-way flap that is approximately 100 feet from the entrance to Westpoint Slough. Per the lease agreement with CEMEX and addressed under a previous CEQA evaluation,² CEMEX is in the process of filling the ditch and installing a drainage pipe to convey stormwater to the outlet in Westpoint Slough. The stormwater ditch is approximately 25 feet in width.

The shoreline is largely armored with broken concrete, riprap, and other debris that may have been used to stabilize the fill slope. An abandoned dock that extends parallel from the shore into Westpoint Slough is at the northern edge of the site.

The project site is currently accessed from the CEMEX marine terminal to the south. Frontage Road terminates at an entrance at the project site; however, this entrance is not currently used. The entrance to the project site where Frontage Road terminates crosses the railroad tracks and is gated with a chain link fence. Further, there is a controlled access gate on Frontage Road approximately 1,300 feet south of

² Port of Redwood City. November 2001. Mitigated Negative Declaration for the RMC Pacific Materials Construction Materials Park. Prepared by Science Applications International Corporation.




Figure 1 Regional Map



Figure 2 Vicinity Map



Figure 3 Project Area

the project site. The gated section of Frontage Road, from the controlled access to the terminus at the project site entrance, is not currently used. There is a paved connection from the public parking to Frontage Road where it enters the project site, however, access is currently prevented by bollards. The bollards and gates preclude direct access to the project site from Seaport Boulevard.

The Redwood City General Plan land use map designates the project site as M (Marina) and the corresponding zoning classification is GI (General Industrial).

Seaport Boulevard Corridor

Seaport Boulevard is a four-lane roadway that extends in a generally north/south direction from U.S. Route 101 to the entrance of the Pacific Shores Center, where it becomes a two-lane loop road that provides access to the Pacific Shores Center and parking lots. The western side of the loop road would be used to access the project site. There are two driveways on the northwestern side of the Seaport Boulevard loop road into the public parking lot east of the project site. The Seaport Boulevard Corridor extends from the entrance to the Pacific Shores Center to the project site entrance and includes the existing roadway and approximately 10 to 13 feet of land on both sides of the roadway that consists primarily of a landscaped buffer and driveways into the Pacific Shores Center parking lots.

To the west of Seaport Boulevard, the landscaped buffer varies from approximately 30 feet to 180 feet in width, and includes a berm that separates Seaport Boulevard from Frontage Road, the railroad tracks, and Port properties. The distance between Seaport Boulevard and Frontage Road varies from over 200 feet at the Pacific Shores Center entrance to approximately 35 feet at the closest point. The landscape buffer east of Seaport Boulevard is approximately 20 feet in width and it separates Seaport Boulevard from the Pacific Shores Center parking lots and turf field that is part of the Pacific Shores Club fitness center. There are underground utilities, aboveground utility boxes, and streetlights located within the corridor.

As a transportation corridor, Seaport Boulevard does not have a land use designation or zoning classification. The land use designations of the land east of Seaport Boulevard within the Seaport Boulevard Corridor is O (Commercial - Office Professional/Technology) and the corresponding zoning classification is CP (Commercial Park).

Waterfront Park

The public waterfront park is directly north of the Pacific Shores Center and extends along the length of Westpoint Slough from the project site on the west to Northpoint Court and the Westpoint Marina on the east. The waterfront park includes paved and unpaved segments of the Bay Trail and three circular concrete plazas with seating areas near the water's edge. There are public parking lots on the western and eastern ends of the park and crosswalks on Seaport Boulevard that provide access from Seaport Boulevard and the Pacific Shores Center. The park is primarily landscaped vegetation, trees, and turf grass. To the north is Westpoint Slough and Greco Island, to the south is the Pacific Shores Center parking lots and office buildings, to the west is the project site, and to the east Westpoint Marina.

The Redwood City General Plan land use map designates the waterfront park in the project area as O (Commercial – Office Professional/Technology) and OS-SF (Open Space – San Francisco Bay) and the corresponding zoning classification is CP (Commercial Park) and IP (Industrial Park).

Public Parking Lot and Maintenance Building Site

The public parking lot for the waterfront park within the project area is located directly east of the project site and north of the Pacific Shores Center. The parking lot has approximately 70 stalls and two driveways on either end of the lot that connect to Seaport Boulevard. There is a cinderblock maintenance building, approximately 1,000 square feet in size (approximately 40 feet by 25 feet), located off of the southern parking lot driveway. It has five additional parking stalls and a roll up door and driveway ramp. There is a paved connection from the parking lot to Frontage Road and the project site, however, access between the two properties is prevented by bollards and a gated chain-link fence.

The parking lot is part of the Pacific Shores Center which has a land use designation of O (Commercial – Office Professional/Technology) and a corresponding zoning classification of CP (Commercial Park).

New Maintenance Building Site

The existing maintenance building located adjacent to the public parking lot for the waterfront park would be relocated to a site on the Pacific Shores Center. The Pacific Shores Center has a land use designation of O (Commercial – Office Professional/Technology) and a corresponding zoning classification of CP (Commercial Park).

Relocated Railroad Tracks

The portion of railroad track located between the project site and the waterfront park would be removed and an equivalent length of tracks would be established south of the project site within Frontage Road's existing footprint. Frontage Road would be abandoned from the beginning of the relocated railroad tracks to the terminus at the project site entrance.

As a transportation corridor, the railroad tracks do not have a land use designation or zoning classification. The land use designations of the land adjacent to the existing railroad tracks within the project area is M (Marina) and IP (Industrial – Port Related) to the west and LI (Industrial Light) and O (Commercial – Office Professional/Technology) to the east. The corresponding zoning classifications of land adjacent to the railroad tracks is GI (General Industrial) to the east and Commercial Park (CP) to the west. The CEMEX marine terminal site land use designation is IP (Industrial – Port Related) and the zoning classification is GI (General Industrial).

San Francisco Bay (including Redwood Creek and Westpoint Slough)

The project site is located at the confluence of Redwood Creek and Westpoint Slough. Redwood Creek is to the west of the project area and Westpoint Slough is to the north. These water channels flow into the San Francisco Bay, which is a large bay that parallels the coastline and flows into the Pacific Ocean through the Golden Gate strait. San Francisco Bay is adjacent to many communities in the Bay Area, such as San Francisco, Redwood City, Mountain View, Fremont, and Oakland. The project area and Redwood City are located on the southwestern side of the San Francisco Bay.

WETA operates San Francisco Bay Ferry, which currently operates a fleet of 15 high speed passenger-only ferry vessels in the Bay, serving the cities of Alameda, Oakland, Richmond, San Francisco, South San

Francisco, and Vallejo. San Francisco Bay Ferry currently carries over three million passengers annually.³ The ferries operate in established navigational channels within the Bay and the ports.

The water areas within Redwood City, including Redwood Creek and Westpoint Slough, have a land use designation of OS – SF (Open Space – San Francisco Bay) and a zoning classification of TP (Tidal Plain).

San Francisco Bay is considered part of the project area in that the ferries of the proposed new ferry service would transit the Bay while enroute to their destinations. The analysis of the proposed project focuses on the portion of the Bay where impacts would most likely occur, which are Redwood Creek and Westpoint Slough. However, any impacts that could affect other areas in the Bay are identified and will be evaluated in the EIR as applicable.

2.3 Project Overview

The proposed project would provide WETA-operated passenger ferry service at Redwood City with origin and destination points of San Francisco and Oakland. Ferry service would be provided by WETA with initial service during weekday morning and afternoon commute periods between the hours of approximately 6 am to 9 pm. Diesel powered ferry vessels capable of carrying up to 300 passengers would be utilized. As the ferry service matures, midday, evening, weekend, and special event service may be added. The service would be passenger only and would not transport vehicles. Transport of bicycles and small non-gas powered mobility devices, such as skateboards and scooters, would be allowed pursuant to WETA operating rules and Coast Guard regulations. The ferry terminal would consist of waterside and landside components required to establish the proposed ferry service. The proposed project also includes access improvements and visitor-serving amenities consistent with the Port's 2020 Vision Plan.⁴ These project components are described below.

2.3.1 Ferry Terminal Components

The ferry terminal would include waterside components consisting of berths for two ferry vessels at a pile-supported floating dock with ramps and a gangway to a pile-supported shelter platform, a fixed access pier connecting to the gangway with a landside security gate, electric utilities for boarding ramps, shore power, and lighting. The landside components would consist of a parking lot with transit stops, roadway improvements, bicycle/pedestrian network connections, secure bicycle parking, and utilities serving the ferry terminal site. A portable restroom facility would be provided by the Port. These components are described in greater detail below. **Figure 4** provides a site plan and **Figure 5** shows the ferry terminal.

2.3.1.1 Waterside Facilities

The waterside components would include a floating platform (float) with berths for two ferry vessels from which passengers can board or disembark from the ferry. As shown on **Figure 4** and **Figure 5**, the float would be located on the western shore of the project site, extending into Redwood Creek. The float would act as the landing for vessels servicing the terminal and would provide access for passengers. The float would provide for dual side boarding, which would allow two vessels to operate at the terminal at the

³ Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA). 2024. Water Emergency Transportation Authority San Francisco Bay Ferry Service. Available: <https://weta.sanfranciscobayferry.com/>.

⁴ Port of Redwood City. January 8, 2020. Port of Redwood City 2020 Vision Plan. Prepared by Vickerman & Associates, LLC. Available: [2020 Vision | Port of Redwood \(redwoodcityport.com\)](https://www.portofredwoodcity.com/2020-Vision-Plan).




Figure 4 Project Site Plan




Figure 5 Ferry Terminal

same time, and would also allow for either side of the float to be used for boarding depending on the currents at the time of landing. The float would be constructed with steel to be compatible with spare floats used by WETA when the terminal float is taken out of service for maintenance.

The float would be moored in place by steel guide piles that would support the float and provide navigation aid for landing vessels. The top elevation of the guide piles would account for sea level rise. The guide piles would be approximately 36 inches in diameter and 120 feet long. Two steel piles with floating donut fenders would be located at the offshore end of the float. The donut fenders would protect the corners of the float and provide a pivot point for vessels entering and leaving the berth.

The dimensions of the float would be consistent with recommended WETA specifications, which are currently 42 feet by 135 feet (5,670 square feet). WETA's standard specification recommendations are in the process of being updated to accommodate the possible future installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and batteries should the technology evolve and become available. While electric ferries are not currently feasible to operate on the proposed Redwood City routes due to the route length, the float dimensions would conform with the updated recommendations. This could result in a slight increase in the dimensions of the float. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, the float is assumed to be 6,000 square feet.

The length of the float would accommodate the gangway landing support frame, a boarding ramp system with two high ramps and one low ramp, and deck space for workers. The gangway would provide the walkway connecting the float to the landside ferry terminal facilities. The boarding ramp configuration would allow for the full range of WETA vessels to land at the float and would comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The adjustable high boarding ramps would be located fore and aft (front and rear) for high freeboard vessels. The ramps would be spaced 50 feet apart and line up with the spacing of the fore and aft doors on WETA boats. The low ramp would allow non-WETA vessels that may have low freeboards to use the float.

Walking platforms on the float and an ADA-compliant gangway would provide passenger access to a pile-supported shelter platform. The gangway would be semi-transparent aluminum⁵ that has a light transmitting surface. It would be approximately 90 feet in length and 8.25 feet in width between handrails to accommodate two rows of passengers. The final width would be based on expected passenger loading operations and would account for additional room needed for passengers boarding with bicycles. The pile supported shelter platform would be approximately 40 feet in length and 12 feet in width and would provide access to the gangway. The pile supported shelter platform would be a fixed access pier with a deck elevation that is equal to or above the landside elevation and that takes sea level rise into account. The access pier would have a security gate that is landside of the gangway connection and a canopy to provide protection from the elements (rain, wind-driven rain, and sun) for queuing passengers.

2.3.1.2 Landside Facilities

The landside components would include a parking lot with 250 spaces for ferry users, transit stops for bus and shuttle services to the project site that are expected to be established, and ride share and general public passenger drop-offs and pick-ups. As shown on **Figure 4**, a one-way loop access road for vehicles would extend around the perimeter of the parking lot. A Class I bicycle trail would be located on the

⁵ Transparent aluminum refers to aluminum oxynitride (ALON), a transparent ceramic composed of aluminum, oxygen, and nitrogen.

southern side that connects from Seaport Boulevard to the ferry terminal. The parking lot would meet state and local electric vehicle (EV) requirements and ADA requirements. An ADA-compliant sidewalk would extend along both sides of the loop access road. Entrances to the visitor-serving uses would be on the northern side of the road. The transit stops and drop-off area would be on the western edge of the site, closest to the terminal. Additionally, there would be secure parking for bicycle/micromobility devices (such as scooters) and ferry information displays near the drop-off area and terminal boarding area. A portable restroom facility would be provided for ferry passengers near the terminal boarding area. Additional discussion of site access and the extension of the Bay Trail is provided in Sections 2.3.1.4 and 2.3.1.5 below, respectively. An approximately 20-foot landscaped buffer with a security fence would be established at the southern site boundary to provide a visual and physical buffer that prevents the public from entering the Port's restricted industrial areas.

2.3.1.3 Utilities

There are currently no utilities on-site, so new connections to the existing utility network would be required to serve landside and waterside elements, including electrical, communication, and water utilities. Electric utilities would be needed to operate the adjustable boarding ramp lift system, lighting, and vessel lay berth shore power. Lighting would be provided on the access pier, gangway and float, including rail lighting along the gangway and float walkway system. Lighting would also be provided for the passenger waiting area and the parking lot. Potable water is needed for hose bibs on the float and a fire water system would be established, consistent with Redwood City Fire Department requirements. Communication utilities would be provided to operate the security system, public address system, and Clipper card readers. The portable restroom facility would collect wastewater in an aboveground holding tank and would not connect to the sewer system. Freshwater and electricity for the restroom would be provided either by connections to the new site utilities or via an aboveground holding tank and generator. The portable restroom facility would be replaced by a permanent facility when a sewer line is established at the project site for future visitor-serving uses.

2.3.1.4 Access/Connectivity

The project site would be accessed from the Seaport Boulevard loop road. While access would be available from either direction from the loop road, the western leg provides the most direct access and would be most heavily used. Therefore, the improvements would be on the western portion of the loop road from the entrance to the Pacific Shores Center to the public parking lot east of the project site. There are two existing driveways into the public parking lot; the southwesterly driveway would be closed and replaced with an access road to the project site. **Figure 4** shows a conceptual site plan of the project site and project site access.

The new project site access road would be off of Seaport Boulevard, south of the public parking lot. The access road would have one lane in either direction for vehicles entering and exiting the site. A left turn pocket would be provided for vehicles entering the site northbound on Seaport Boulevard. Vehicles exiting the site stop at a stop sign and could use the lane to turn left or right, but most vehicles would turn right to exit the Pacific Shores Center. A marked bicycle crossing would be provided at the southern side of the intersection at Seaport Boulevard and the site access road and marked crosswalks would be located on either side of the entrance. Egress and ingress to the existing public parking lot would be limited to the northern driveway which would not be modified.

Five parking stalls at the southern portion of the public parking lot would be removed to accommodate the project site access road and sidewalk that would be provided on both sides of the access road. New parking on the project site would replace the five parking spaces removed from the existing parking lot. There is an approximately 1,000 square foot cinderblock maintenance storage building with five parking stalls used by the Pacific Shores Center that is located at the junction of the public parking driveway and Frontage Road. This building and the associated parking spaces would be removed to accommodate the site access road. A new similarly sized and constructed maintenance building would be relocated to a site internal to the Pacific Shores Center.

Frontage Road currently terminates at the entrance to the project site. There is a controlled access gate approximately 1,300 feet south of the project site, and this gated section of road that extends to the terminus at the project site entrance is not currently used. This section of Frontage Road would be abandoned.

Approximately 300 feet of the existing railroad on the eastern edge of the project site would also be abandoned. The track to be removed would be replaced by an equivalent length of track constructed south of the project site within the abandoned Frontage Road. The relocated tracks would connect to the existing tracks via a new switch approximately 1,300 feet south of the project site.

Additional roadway modifications include the widening of the Seaport Boulevard loop road by approximately 10 to 13 feet on either side from the entrance to the Pacific Shores Center to just north of the entrance to the project site to accommodate a Class I bicycle trail and an ADA compliant sidewalk. The Class I bicycle trail would be a two-way bikeway/multiuse path east of Seaport Boulevard that is approximately 13 feet in width and separated from the roadway by a raised curb, bollards, or other buffer. The sidewalk would be on the eastern edge of the bicycle trail and approximately 10-feet in width. The Class I bicycle trail would extend to the entrance to the project site where, as discussed above, a marked crossing would be located at the southern side of the access roadway. The sidewalk improvements would extend past the project site access road to the public parking lot entrance to the north. A sidewalk would also be provided on the western side of Seaport Boulevard from the project site access road to the public parking lot driveway. A crosswalk would be provided at the parking lot driveway entrance from Seaport Boulevard.

2.3.1.5 Bay Trail

The proposed project would extend the Bay Trail along the water's edge at the northern edge of the project site. The trail would connect to the ferry terminal, the other pedestrian and bicycle access improvements, and the existing roadway and trail network. There is currently a segment of the Bay Trail and waterfront park east of the project site adjacent to Westpoint Slough. The paved trail begins approximately 300 feet east of the project site at the public parking lot where it then extends east along Westpoint Slough to a public parking lot in the northeast corner of the Pacific Shores Center, west of Northpoint Court and Westpoint Marina. Near the Project site, the paved trail connects to an unpaved segment that extends approximately 350 feet along the water to a security fence that separates the Pacific Shores Center from the Port's restricted industrial areas approximately 100 feet east of the project site. Under the proposed project, this 350-foot unpaved portion of the trail would be paved and extended approximately 70 feet to the project site boundary near the location of the existing tide gate. Within the project site, the paved trail would continue along the water's edge of the project site to the ferry terminal.

See **Figure 4**. The existing security fence would be reconfigured to allow trail users to access the project site and prevent users from entering the Port's restricted industrial areas south of the project site.

Once completed, the Bay Trail would terminate at the ferry terminal with a connection to the Class I bicycle trail and sidewalk at the southern end of the project site.

2.3.1.6 Future Visitor-Serving Uses

Consistent with the Port's 2020 Vision Plan, the Port is proposing future uses at the project site to expand waterfront access to the community and increase visitor-serving amenities. This includes a zone change at the 9.2 acre project site that would allow the establishment of a hotel and associated restaurant and retail and meeting/event facilities, and a standalone restaurant and small office that are independent of the hotel use. The proposed zone change would change the project site zoning from the existing GI classification to CG (General Commercial). The CG classification would permit a hotel, an administrative or professional office of less than 10,000 square feet, sales of merchandise, and commercial passenger terminal facilities. Restaurants and bars would be permitted as a conditional use. The GI designation would limit lot coverage to 60 percent and while it would allow a building height of up to 75 feet (e.g., five to seven stories), the building height at the project site would be limited to three stories (e.g., approximately 45 feet) in compliance with the project site's General Plan designation of M (Marina) which is not proposed to be amended.

The future visitor-serving uses would be located in the northern side of the project site, along Westpoint Slough, as shown in **Figure 4**. The uses would include hotel, restaurant, and limited office; however, the precise mix of uses and square footage has not yet been identified. The analysis of potential physical environmental impacts is based on reasonable assumptions about future development that could occur based on site constraints and consistency with the Port's 2020 Vision Plan,⁶ existing General Plan land use designation, and the proposed zoning classification. These assumptions are identified below.

The primary visitor-serving use would be a full-service hotel that includes a footprint of approximately 60,000 square feet and that would have up to three stories and approximately 180,000 square feet of building area. The 180,000 square feet is assumed to include integrated ground-floor parking, approximately 100 to 200 rooms, and related services that may include a bar/restaurant, conference/meeting rooms, a fitness center and pool, and retail uses. The project site would also accommodate a 20,000 square foot restaurant and up to 10,000 square feet of office space that would operate independently from the hotel. The independent restaurant and office are assumed to be single-story buildings on individual building pads separate from the hotel. New utilities and utility connections would be required for all new development on-site. As identified in Section 2.3.1.3, the portable restroom facility at the ferry terminal would be replaced by a permanent facility when a sewer line is established at the project site for future visitor-serving uses. The buildings would be located a minimum of one-hundred feet from the water's edge.

Additional parking on-site would be provided to accommodate the visitor-serving uses. The precise number of spaces and location required would be determined at the time specific development is proposed. It is assumed that the parking for the visitor uses would be provided on the ground floor of the

⁶ Port of Redwood City. January 8, 2020. Port of Redwood City 2020 Vision Plan. Prepared by Vickerman & Associates, LLC. Available: [2020 Vision | Port of Redwood \(redwoodcityport.com\)](https://www.redwoodcityport.com/2020-Vision).

hotel, but it may also include some surface parking. The number of stalls provided would be consistent with City parking requirements. It is assumed that a portion of the parking would be shared parking between the ferry terminal and other uses.

2.3.2 Project Construction

Construction of the ferry terminal and parking lot, Bay Trail, and access improvements, including relocation of the railway track, abandonment of approximately 1,100 feet of Frontage Road, and Seaport Boulevard corridor widening are expected to commence at the end of 2025 and last for approximately 14 months.

Construction of the visitor-serving uses would occur after completion of the ferry terminal. The timing and duration for this construction would be determined when the specific development is proposed. This analysis assumes that the construction of the visitor-serving improvements would begin immediately following construction of the ferry terminal and last for a period of approximately 24 months.

The ferry terminal would include waterside construction for in-water installation of the pilings and float and overwater work to install ramping and utilities. The total estimated number of piles is 10, and the amount of new water surface coverage is approximately 7,000 square feet. Waterside construction work would follow industry standard practices and federal and state agency permitting requirements. It would take place from both land and barges. Construction of the float and gangway would occur offsite and would be brought into the site by barge for installation.

Dredging would also be required. The amount of dredging is estimated at approximately 8,000 cubic yards. Dredge material would be removed by barges and taken to an offsite disposal facility for beneficial reuse.

Construction activities associated with the ferry terminal landside improvements would include site preparation, removal and relocation of the railroad tracks and Pacific Shores Center maintenance building, demolition of the public parking lot within the project footprint, excavation and grading, installation of utilities, site paving, painting/stripping, installation of passenger access pier with cover, and installation of other support features and infrastructure including a security gate, EV charging facilities, bicycle storage, parking lot lighting, and signage. The existing unpaved portion of the Bay Trail would be extended, graded, and paved to connect to the Bay Trail within the project site.

Construction of the visitor-serving amenities would include the aforementioned activities and removal of the existing dock parallel to the shore along Westpoint Slough, building construction, and drought-tolerant landscaping. The ferry terminal landside construction and visitor-serving amenities construction would require import of fill material as well as the excavation and removal of soils from the project site. Existing improvements on the project site, including stockpiles, storage building, and equipment, are in the process of being removed by the current leaseholder and the site would be vacated prior to the start of construction. The installation of a conveyance pipe and filling of the stormwater ditch on the eastern edge of the site by the current leaseholder would also be completed prior to construction occurring on the project site.

Connectivity improvements would include site preparation, relocation of utilities and street lighting, grading, roadway widening, paving, and striping. Temporary lane closures on Seaport Boulevard would be required during the construction period. This would require the use of flaggers to control traffic

movement during periods when only one lane is in operation or would require diverting traffic to the eastern leg of the loop road to avoid areas with lane closures.

2.3.3 Project Operations

2.3.3.1 Ferry Operations

WETA's ferry fleet is composed of diesel-powered catamaran-style ships that accommodate between 225 and 445 Passengers. The vessel type proposed for the Redwood City service connecting to San Francisco and/or connecting to Oakland is a 300-passenger capacity vessel. The commute time (excluding passenger loading/unloading time) would be 65 minutes for the Oakland to Redwood City route and 55 minutes for the San Francisco and Redwood City route. The initial service is proposed as a commute-period service, providing three to four trips during both am and pm peak periods on weekdays. This service would operate approximately 6 am to 10:30 am in the mornings and approximately 4 pm to 9:30 pm in the evenings. Depending on demand, midday service to either San Francisco or Oakland, and weekend service to San Francisco may be added. Future plans might also involve extending the service to include special event services to San Francisco, similar to what WETA offers on existing services.

The proposed project evaluated in this IS assumes that full buildout service would be implemented and include all day service to San Francisco and to Oakland that has a higher frequency of service during morning and evening peak periods on weekdays, and weekend day and special event service for the San Francisco route. Actual service would depend on demand and would be subject to WETA's standard operating practices. The full buildout service would be phased-in over time to match demand and available operating resources. For example, midday and weekend service may be introduced after commute-period service is established. In addition, either the San Francisco or Oakland component of the service could be deferred, again depending on demand and available operating dollars.

WETA would require eight crews with a minimum of four people per crew per weekday to operate each route. These crews would work eight-hour shifts. The weekend San Francisco route would require four crews, working ten-hour shifts. The ferry terminal would not be staffed. Passengers would pay fares with Clipper cards or on board the vessel. Ferries would idle at that berth during 10-minute embarking/disembarking. Vessels would dock overnight and on weekends at the WETA Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility (CBOMF) in Alameda and would not be berthed overnight or on weekends at the Redwood City terminal except in the event of an emergency.

Ferry speeds would comply with wake restrictions that are in place to protect both non-motorized water users as well as sea and land species and their habitat. On Redwood Creek, wake enforcement would be the responsibility of the Coast Guard in conjunction with the Redwood City Police Department.

Local bus service and/or shuttle service would be established to provide transit to and from the ferry terminal.

2.3.3.1.1 Oakland Service

The Oakland route would be a round trip service between the East Bay and Redwood City, with an approximate one-way running time of 65 minutes. The service would depart Oakland and travel westbound out of the estuary before heading south to Redwood City. The route would travel through established navigational channels in the inner San Francisco Bay and would turn southwest to enter Redwood Creek. The route would be reversed in the opposite direction with slight modifications for

currents and other navigation constraints. Two ferry boats would be deployed for this service. **Figure 1** illustrates this service.

2.3.3.1.2 San Francisco Service

The San Francisco route would be a round trip service between the San Francisco Ferry Terminal and Redwood City. The one-way running time from the San Francisco Ferry Terminal to the Redwood City Ferry Terminal would be approximately 55 minutes. After departing San Francisco, the route would travel through established navigational channels in the inner San Francisco Bay and would turn southwest to enter Redwood Creek. The route would be reversed in the opposite direction with slight modifications for currents and other navigation constraints. Two ferry boats would be deployed for this service. **Figure 1** illustrates this route.

2.3.3.1.3 Zero Emission Operations

WETA is currently planning for a phased transition of its ferry fleet from diesel operated ferries to zero-emission vessels (ZEV).⁷ The transition will begin with converting to electric vessels on the shorter and medium routes. For longer routes, such as the proposed Redwood City service, electric vessels are currently infeasible and the possible use of alternative fuels is being explored. For purposes of this analysis, because there is no feasible ZEV technology currently planned or available, the use of diesel ferries is assumed for ferry operations. However, the ferry terminal design would comply with WETA standard design recommendations for accommodating electric vessels in the future to assist in the transition should the technology become available.

2.3.3.1.4 Maintenance

Ferry terminal maintenance activities would include security, landscaping, general maintenance, portable toilet cleaning and maintenance, and electricity, water, telecommunications, and trash service. Maintenance dredging, if required, would occur every 2-10 years depending on the specific needs. WETA is responsible for waterside facilities at terminals, such as the maintenance and rehabilitation of floats. The Port is responsible for landside maintenance.

2.3.3.2 Visitor-Serving Uses

The operation of recreation and visitor-serving uses would result in up to approximately 400 new employment opportunities associated with the hotel and related facilities, restaurant, and the limited office uses. The hotel facility would be open 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. The restaurant, retail, and the limited office space uses would have more limited hours than the hotel services.

2.4 Anticipated Project Approvals and Permits

The proposed project requires the following potential permits and approvals. Anticipated potential permits, approvals, and consultation requirements are shown in **Table 1**.

⁷ WETA. January, 2023. Blueprint for Zero Emission Vessel Transition.

Table 1 Agencies, Permits, and Approvals

Agency	Permit/Authority
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Clean Water Act Section 404 Rivers and Harbor Act Section 10
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Federal Endangered Species Act Section 7
National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Federal Endangered Species Act Section 7 Marine Mammal Protection Act Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Management Act
Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA)	Ferry service provider
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	Section 401 Clean Water Act Section 404 Clean Water Act Section 202 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)	Administrative or Major Permit
State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)	NPDES Dewatering Permit, San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) NPDES Package, Construction General Permit and SWPPP
San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Modified bus service to project site
City of Redwood City	Zone Change Stormwater Discharge Storm Drain Permit Sewer Connection Permit Building and Safety Permits Public Works Permits Temporary Traffic Control Plans Demolition Permit Tree Removal Permit
Various Agencies/Utilities	Utility Connection Permits
Union Pacific Railroad	Railroad modifications
California Public Utilities Commission	Railroad Safety Oversight

2.5 Responsible Agencies

WETA, the City, and the SMCTA are responsible agencies for this project.

Section 3

Environmental Evaluation

This section presents the Environmental Checklist, evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed project relative to 20 environmental issue areas, and presents mandatory findings of significance required under CEQA. The analysis begins with a summary delineation of the environmental factors (issue areas) addressed in the checklist and whether any potentially significant impacts have been identified in the analysis, followed by an explanation of the environmental factors potentially affected and significance findings for construction and operation of the proposed project.

The proposed project is evaluated in the context of the existing regulatory and environmental setting. Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant effect on the environment as “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.”

Impacts are separated into the following categories:

- No Impact. This category applies when a project would not create an impact in the specific environmental issue area. A “No Impact” finding does not require an explanation when the finding is adequately supported by the cited information sources (e.g., the project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use if the project area and vicinity does not contain farmland). A finding of “No Impact” is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- Less Than Significant Impact. This category applies when the project would result in impacts below the threshold of significance and would therefore be less than significant.
- Less Than Significant After Mitigation. This category applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures would reduce a “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The mitigation measures are described along with a brief explanation of how they would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.
- Potentially Significant Impact. This category applies if there is substantial evidence that a significant adverse effect might occur, and no feasible mitigation measures were identified at the Initial Study stage to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

3.1 Project Summary

Project Title

Redwood City Ferry Terminal

Lead Agency Name and Address

Port of Redwood City
675 Seaport Boulevard
Redwood City, CA 94063

Contact Person and Phone Number

Don Snaman
Port of Redwood City
(650) 306-4150

dsnaman@redwoodcityport.com

Project Location

The northern portion of the Port of Redwood City and several surrounding features near the confluence of Redwood Creek and Westpoint Slough, including a 9 acre Port property, a portion of Seaport Boulevard and adjacent property west of the Pacific Shores Center and adjacent railroad tracks, a portion of an existing public parking lot and waterfront park northwest of the Pacific Shores Center. San Francisco Bay is also included as part of the project area.

General Plan Designation

M (Marina), IP (Industrial – Port Related), GI (General Industrial), O (Commercial – Office Professional/Technology), LI (Industrial – Light), OS – SF (Open Space – San Francisco Bay)

Zoning

GI (General Industrial), CP (Commercial Park), IP (Industrial Park), TP (Tidal Plain).

Brief Description of Project

Establishment of a ferry terminal with passenger ferry service at Redwood City with origin and destination points of San Francisco and Oakland. The ferry terminal would consist of waterside and landside components required to establish the proposed ferry service, roadway improvements to provide multimodal site access, relocation of existing infrastructure to accommodate the new uses, and an extension of the Bay Trail. The proposed project also includes a zone change to permit future hotel and associated restaurant, retail and meeting/event facilities, a standalone restaurant, and limited office space.

Surrounding Land Use and Setting

The ferry terminal site (project site) is located at the northern end of Seaport Boulevard where Westpoint Slough and Redwood Creek meet. The project site is bordered by Redwood Creek and Bair Island to the west, Westpoint Slough and Greco Island to the north, Frontage Road and Union Pacific Railroad tracks to the east, and the CEMEX marine terminal facility to the south. Opposite the railroad tracks is Seaport

Boulevard and the Pacific Shores Center office complex and parking lots. Immediately east of the project site is a public parking lot, a publicly accessible waterfront park, and a portion of the Bay Trail. Portions of the public parking lot, Frontage Road, railway tracks, waterfront park, Bay Trail, Seaport Boulevard and adjacent land, and the Pacific Shores Center parking lot are also part of the project area.

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required

As listed in **Table 1** in Section 2.4, potential permits and approvals are anticipated from agencies that include the responsible agencies (WETA, the City, and SMCTA), and federal agencies (USACE, USFWS, NMFS), state and regional agencies (SWRCB, RWQCB, BCDC), and local utility providers.

California Native American Tribal Consultation

In accordance with Public Resources Code §21080.3.1, the Port notified the California Native American tribes that requested notification from Redwood City pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.1(b)(1). The tribal consultation process (should it be requested by any tribe/s) as well as the conclusions of any such consultation, will be addressed in the EIR for the proposed project.

3.2 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected





The environmental factors checked below will be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. These issues will be further analyzed in the EIR to determine if, in fact, the impact is significant. If the impact is determined to be significant in the EIR, the EIR will further determine if feasible mitigation is available that can reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

3.3 Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

 <hr/> Signature	 <hr/> Title
 <hr/> Typed/Printed Name	 <hr/> Date

3.4 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines require that an Initial Study contain an identification of environmental impacts using a checklist, matrix, or another method. The discussion of environmental impacts must include a brief explanation indicating evidence to support entries. CEQA Guidelines Appendix G provides specific guidelines related to the evaluation of environmental impacts; these guidelines are provided below:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Section 4

Environmental Impact Analysis

I. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Potentially Significant Impact. A scenic vista is generally defined as a vantage point with a broad and expansive view of a significant landscape feature (e.g., a mountain range, lake, or coastline) or of a significant historical or architectural feature (e.g., view of a historic tower). Significant landscape features within the Redwood City region include the San Francisco Bay and its associated baylands, sloughs, and marshes, and the urbanized San Francisco Bay Peninsula. Within Redwood City, these landscape features are primarily visible from four vantage points within the elevated western hillsides: Easter Cross, Easter Bowl, Canada College, and the Edgewood County Park. These scenic vantage points are approximately five miles or greater from the project site and only offer distant views in the direction of the project site. While the project site may be in the viewshed from certain locations of these vantage points, it is a minor element of the greater scenic vista and is not individually discernable. Similarly, there is a public trail along the southern border of Bair Island⁸ that is approximately 1.6 miles south of the project area. The project site forms part of the distant view to northeast available from an observation platform at the trail's eastern terminus. The project area blends into the background and viewers would not be able to distinguish project construction or operations clearly from the observation point or elsewhere along the

⁸ USFWS. 2023. Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge – Trails website. Available: <https://www.fws.gov/refuge/don-edwards-san-francisco-bay/visit-us/trails>. Accessed December 1, 2023.

trail. Therefore, new visual elements from the proposed project construction or operation would not affect views from these scenic vistas.

However, the project area has a bayfront setting with views of Redwood Creek, Westpoint Slough, Bair and Greco Islands, and the San Francisco Bay. Thus, the proposed project could affect views of these landscape features from surrounding sites, including the existing Bay Trail and public waterfront park to the east and the waterways to the west and north. The impact of proposed project construction and operation on scenic vistas is considered potentially significant and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. According to the interactive California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) state scenic highway mapping tool, the closest officially designated State Scenic Highways are Highway 280, Highway 35, and Highway 1, which are approximately 6 miles west, 8.5 miles southwest, and 13 miles southwest of the project site, respectively.⁹ Additionally, Highway 92, approximately 5.5 miles west of the project area, is eligible for a state scenic highway designation. The project site is not within the viewsheds of these designated or eligible state scenic highways. Therefore, the proposed project would not damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. As a result, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic highways and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project area is located within Redwood City, which is an urbanized area as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15387; therefore, in accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicts with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Because the project area is located along the San Francisco Bay, the potential to affect visual character and quality is also considered.

The project site is zoned General Industrial and there are no applicable zoning regulations governing scenic quality that are applicable to the site. The General Plan designates the project site as Marina, which does not identify any policies or requirements related to scenic quality. However, the proposed site plan will be assessed in the EIR in terms of visual quality and character. The EIR will also further evaluate if there are other plans applicable to the project site that have policies governing scenic quality and whether any conflict could occur. These plans include, but are not limited to, the Port's 2020 Vision Plan,¹⁰ the

⁹ Caltrans. 2023. California State Scenic Highway System Map mapping tool. Available: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>. Accessed November 29, 2023.

¹⁰ Port of Redwood City. January 8, 2020. Port of Redwood City 2020 Vision Plan. Prepared by Vickerman & Associates, LLC. Available: [2020 Vision | Port of Redwood \(redwoodcityport.com\)](https://www.portofredwoodcity.com/2020-Vision-Plan).

Draft Seaport Plan¹¹ prepared the by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and the Association of Bay Area Governments Plan Bay Area 2050.¹²

The project site was used by the current leaseholder for stockpiling of materials for recycling and sale of concrete base rock. The stockpiles, equipment and a storage building are in the process of being removed and the site would be vacated prior to project construction. The site has a low quality visual character; however, it allows for unobstructed views across the site from surrounding public vantage points.

Surrounding land uses consist of a mix of development, open space, and water channels, including the adjacent CEMEX marine terminal, the Pacific Shores Center office campus, Bay Trail and waterfront park, and Bair and Greco Islands. Implementation of the proposed project would introduce new visual elements, including a ferry terminal, ferry vessels, hotel and limited office, parking, and an extension of the existing Bay Trail. The new visual elements would be consistent with other development located along the Redwood City bayfront, and features such as landscaping, extension of the Bay Trail, and well-designed structures that would also be a visual buffer of the CEMEX marine terminal to the south may improve the project site's visual quality. However, because the project site affords views of the Bay and Bair and Greco Islands, the proposed project has the potential to degrade the visual quality and character of the surroundings. The other improvements that will occur in other project areas would primarily be at-grade (i.e., site access improvements, the Bay Trail extension, relocation of railway tracks) or minor (relocation of the existing maintenance building); however, their potential to conflict with applicable regulations governing scenic quality and the potential to degrade the visual quality and character of the surroundings will be evaluated in the EIR.

Therefore, the potential for the proposed project to conflict with applicable regulations governing scenic quality and the potential to degrade the visual quality and character of the surroundings is considered potentially significant and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would occur mostly during daylight hours, although some nighttime construction may occur. Thus, construction may require additional lighting. The proposed project would also install new lighting sources. Lighting would be provided on the access pier, gangway and float (including rail lighting along the gangway and float walkway system), the passenger waiting area, the parking lot, and the hotel and limited office. These new lighting sources would be for safety and security and visual and aesthetic enhancement. The new lighting would make use of modern fixtures and light shields that would direct lighting on-site and prevent spillover and would comply with Title 24 Lighting Zone (LZ-3) requirements. Additionally, the ferry vessels that travel across San Francisco Bay would produce new lighting on San Francisco Bay. The lighting would be similar to the light emanating from other vessels on San Francisco Bay. Due to the transitory nature of ferry operation, the incremental and temporary effect of light emanating from the ferries would not be a substantial source of light and glare to the existing receptors.

¹¹ San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. September 2023. Draft San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan. Prepared by the Seaport Planning Advisory Committee. Available: <https://bcdca.gov/BPA/BPASEaportPlan.html>.

¹² Association of Bay Area Governments. October 1, 2021. Plan Bay Area 2050. Available: [Plan Bay Area 2050 October 2021.pdf \(planbayarea.org\)](https://planbayarea.org/plan-bay-area-2050-october-2021.pdf).

Because there is existing nighttime lighting around the perimeter of the project site and in the project area, including at the Pacific Shores Center to the east and the CEMEX marine terminal to the south, project site lighting would not substantially increase nighttime lighting levels in the area. However, there would be new light sources established at the project site for roadway lighting, ferry terminal lighting, and building lighting for the future visitor-serving uses. There would also be new security lighting along the new southern security fencing. Additionally, existing lighting along the Seaport Boulevard Corridor would be relocated as part of the roadway widening and new lighting along the sidewalk may be installed. Therefore, the potential for nighttime views to be adversely affected will be further evaluated in the EIR. The exterior surfaces associated with the new buildings could also cause glare depending on the types of materials used in building construction. In addition, glare can be caused from unshielded or misdirected lighting sources. Light and glare impacts are considered potentially significant and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department Of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Protection (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

- a. **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**
- b. **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**
- c. **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?**
- d. **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**
- e. **Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

No Impact (Items a-e). The project area and surrounding vicinity do not contain prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as identified on the California Important Farmland Finder. The project area is in a developed urban area classified as “urban built-up land” by the California Important Farmland Finder.¹³ The project site has a zoning classification of General Industrial and was being used by the current leaseholder for stockpiling of materials for recycling and sale of concrete base rock. There are no trees on-site and the site is not suitable for agricultural uses. The project area and surroundings include industrial and office uses, water channels, and open space. None of the land in the project area is farmland and subject to a Williamson Act contract.

The project area is not located on or in the vicinity of agricultural land or forest land, nor any land zoned for agricultural or forestry use. The proposed project would not convert agricultural lands to non-agricultural use; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland; result in the loss of forest land or convert forest land to non-forest use; or involve other changes in the existing environment that would result in conversion of farmland or forest land to other uses. Therefore, no impacts to agricultural land, forest land, or timberland resources would occur with the implementation of the proposed project and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

¹³ California Department of Conservation. 2023. California Important Farmland Finder. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed October 26, 2023.

III. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970 (42 U.S. Code 7401–7661 [2009]) is a comprehensive federal law that regulates air emissions from area, stationary, and mobile sources. The CAA authorized the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) to protect public health and the environment. The NAAQS include standards for six criteria air pollutants: lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and particulate matter (PM). Areas where the monitored concentration of a criteria pollutant exceeds the applicable NAAQS are designated as being in nonattainment of the standards, while areas where the monitored concentration of a criteria pollutant is below the standards are classified as being in attainment. The California Clean Air Act (CCAA), signed into law in 1988, requires all areas of the state to achieve and maintain the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) by the earliest practicable date. CAAQS are at least as stringent as, and often more stringent than, NAAQS.

The project area is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (Bay Area), which includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and southern Sonoma Counties. The Bay Area is in nonattainment status for the following NAAQS: O₃ (8-hour) and PM less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM-2.5). Additionally, the Bay Area is in nonattainment status for the following CAAQS: O₃ (8-hour and 1-hour), PM-2.5, and PM less than 10 microns in diameter (PM-10).¹⁴

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), in cooperation with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and USEPA, have developed air quality plans that are designed to bring the Bay Area into

¹⁴ Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). 2023. Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status. Available: <https://www.baaqmd.gov/about-air-quality/research-and-data/air-quality-standards-and-attainment-status>. Accessed November 30, 2023.

attainment of the national and state ambient air quality standards. The BAAQMD prepares an overall air quality management plan (AQMP) update to meet the federal requirements and/or to incorporate the latest technical planning information. Once the AQMP is approved by CARB and USEPA, it becomes part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for attaining and maintaining the ambient air quality standards. Through this attainment planning process, the BAAQMD develops the BAAQMD Rules and Regulations to regulate stationary sources of air pollution in the Bay Area. The latest AQMP for the Bay Area, *Spare the Air, Cool the Climate*, was adopted on April 19, 2017.¹⁵ The 2017 AQMP discusses a regional strategy to protect public health and the climate and proposes emission reduction measures that are designed to bring the Basin into attainment of the national and state ambient air quality standards.

The proposed project is not expected to result in increased population, but it would result in construction and operational emissions, as discussed further below; therefore, air quality impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction and/or operation of the proposed project may generate emissions that could result in either a violation of an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation. Construction of the proposed project would require activities such as site clearing, grading, excavating, constructing new structures, and commuting to and from the site that could result in fugitive dust and equipment emissions. Pollutant emissions generated by the proposed project would vary depending on the type of construction activity, the specific construction phasing and subphasing, and the anticipated vehicle and equipment use. Air pollutant emissions associated with construction activities could adversely affect the regional ambient air quality in the Bay Area or locally within Redwood City. Similarly, operation of the proposed project may result in increased emissions of air pollutants from new area sources, such as landscaping equipment use; new stationary sources, such as back-up generators or fire pumps; vehicles traveling to and from the project site; and from ferry trips, as ferries would be diesel-powered.

Because the Bay Area is in nonattainment for PM and O₃, as discussed above, the proposed project, when combined with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the area, could result in a net increase of “criteria pollutants” and ambient air quality standard violations. The generation of these pollutants from the proposed project and other cumulative projects could exceed the NAAQS and CAAQS. Thus, this impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Potentially Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors include uses such as residences, schools, medical and care facilities, and parks and recreational areas. A publicly accessible waterfront park and a portion of the Bay Trail located immediately east of the project site are part of the project area. These sensitive receptors may be affected by air pollution generated during construction of the proposed project from fugitive dust and vehicle and equipment exhaust emissions, as well as operation of the proposed project from diesel-

¹⁵ BAAQMD. 2017. *Spare the Air, Cool the Climate*. Final 2017 Clean Air Plan. Available: <https://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a-proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?rev=8c588738a4fb455b9cabb27360409529>.

powered ferries, vehicle trips, and stationary sources. Therefore, the potential exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Short-term odors could be produced during the construction of the proposed project from paving (e.g., laying of asphalt for the parking lot). Odors from these sources would be temporary, localized, and generally confined to the immediate area of construction activities. Although the potential for the proposed project to create objectionable odors during construction is expected to be less than significant, the impacts of dredging, pile driving and other waterside construction activities will be evaluated in the EIR once additional details are known.

Operation of the proposed project includes the use of diesel-powered ferries and maintenance dredging, which may generate odors. Users of the Ferry system, waterfront park, and Bay Trail, as well as employees of commercial and industrial uses near the project area, could be affected by such odors. Although the potential for the proposed project to create objectionable odors during operation is expected to be less than significant, the impacts from maintenance dredging and ferry operation will be evaluated in the EIR once additional details are known.

Operation of the proposed project also includes landside facilities, such as the access pier and parking lot, and visitor-serving uses, such as the hotel and restaurant uses, and limited office. These types of uses are not associated with the creation of odors. The ferry terminal would include a portable restroom and trash service at the project site that has the potential to generate odors. The City would continue to require compliance with regulations related to maintenance of trash and refuse areas (including Redwood City Code Section 14), to ensure that the operation of the proposed project does not create any objectionable odors associated with waste. Additionally, the restroom would be regularly maintained and would be replaced with a permanent facility when a sewer line is established at the project site for future visitor-serving uses. Therefore, odor impacts associated with the restroom and trash service components of the proposed project are considered less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIR.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

- a. **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Potentially Significant Impact. In 2007, WRA Environmental Consultants prepared an assessment of biological resources for the proposed Redwood City ferry terminal.¹⁶ The assessment determined through a site visit and literature review that the project area contains suitable habitat for four special status plant species and 21 special status wildlife species. An additional seven special status wildlife species may occur

¹⁶ WRA Environmental Consultants. June 6, 2007. Biological Resources Assessment Redwood City Ferry Terminal, Port of Redwood City, San Mateo County California. Prepared for Michael Fajans, CHS Consulting Group, 130 Sutter Street, Suite 468, San Francisco CA 94104.

in areas adjacent to the project area, and two special status wildlife species were observed adjacent to the project area during the site visit.

A preliminary search of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) was conducted in November 2023. Based on this search, the project area, which is within the Redwood Point Quadrangle, contains eight federally and state listed species. These species include the salt-marsh harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*), a state and federally listed endangered species, the California least tern (*Sternula antillarum browni*), a state and federally listed endangered species, the western snowy plover (*Charadrius nivosus nivosus*), a federally threatened species, and the California black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*), a state threatened species.¹⁷

Therefore, special status species may be present at or near the project area. A biological resources evaluation will be conducted to determine what protected species may be present based on existing conditions in or near the project area. The EIR will evaluate whether the proposed project would have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Because the project would include in-water work and ferry operations through Redwood Creek and the inner San Francisco Bay, the EIR will also assess the potential to affect marine mammals and aquatic species protected by CDFW and/or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Potentially Significant Impact. The 2007 biological resources assessment determined that there are two sensitive communities – tidal wetlands and tidal waters – present in the project area. Additionally, the area has the potential to support Essential Fish Habitat, another sensitive biological community. A biological resources evaluation will be conducted to determine what sensitive communities may currently be present in or near the project area. The EIR will evaluate if the proposed project would have a significant impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. The impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Potentially Significant Impact. According to the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Mapper, there are no federally designated wetlands on the project site. However, Bair and Greco Islands located to the northwest and northeast of the project site, respectively, are dominated by federally-designated estuarine and marine wetlands.¹⁸ These wetlands are on either side of Redwood Creek, where project ferry service would be operating. Additionally, patches of tidal wetland vegetation are located along the edges of the project site. A biological resources survey will be conducted to determine if sensitive habitat

¹⁷ CDFW. 2023. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) Rarefind. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Maps-and-Data>. Accessed November 29, 2023.

¹⁸ USFWS. 2023. National Wetlands Inventory Wetlands Mapper. Available: <https://www.fws.gov/program/national-wetlands-inventory/wetlands-mapper>. Accessed November 30, 2023.

(including wetlands) is present within or near the project area. Thus, construction and operation of the proposed project could have a potentially significant impact on protected wetlands and this impact will be evaluated in the EIR.

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project site is in an urban area and according to the CDFW Biographic Information and Observation System (BIOS) Viewer, there are no essential connectivity areas (i.e., wildlife corridors) within or adjacent to the project site.¹⁹ Thus, the proposed project would not interfere substantially with movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. However, given the potential for species to occur in and around the site and because project construction would include in-water work and operations would include ferry service through Redwood Creek and the inner San Francisco Bay, ferry operations could interfere with the movement of aquatic species. Thus, the impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less than Significant Impact. Redwood City has a street tree ordinance and street tree preservation ordinance. No trees are within the project site and therefore, no trees would be impacted by construction and operation activities of the ferry terminal and visitor-serving uses. However, trees may be removed in the project area to accommodate the access improvements, primarily within the Seaport Boulevard Corridor. The Redwood City Street Tree Ordinance (Ordinance No. 1010, Section 1) requires the issuance of a permit for the planting, pruning, or removal of trees in the public right-of-way. The Redwood City Tree Preservation Ordinance (Ordinance No. 1536, Section 1, 6-26-72) requires the issuance of a permit from the City Parks and Recreation Director to allow the removal of trees with a circumference of 38-inches or more on private property. Issuance of a tree removal permit is based on factors including the condition of the trees, necessity to remove the trees, topography of the land and impacts of tree removal on erosion, number of trees in the neighborhood, and good forestry practices. All tree disturbance and removal would conform with the Redwood City tree preservation ordinances. While the impact is expected to be less than significant, it will be evaluated further in the EIR. There are no other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources applicable to the proposed project.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. The National Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) program, which began in 1991 under California's Natural Community Conservation Planning Act, is administered by CDFW and is a cooperative effort between resource agencies and developers that takes a broad-based ecosystem approach to planning for the protection and perpetuation of biological diversity. Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP) are administered by the USFWS and are designed to identify how impacts would be mitigated

¹⁹ CDFW. 2023. Biographic Information and Observation System (BIOS) Viewer. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/BIOS>. Accessed November 29, 2023.

when a project would impact endangered species or designated critical habitat. The project area is not located within an adopted NCCP or HCP.²⁰

The Bay Area Conservation Lands Network is a regional conservation strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area. The Network focuses on acquiring and managing land that is important for conservation and represents the region's biodiversity and supports ecological function. The Network designates areas within the region that are essential and important to conservation goals, areas that ensure a connected network, and areas that contribute to conservation goals. The project site and surrounding area, including Bair and Greco Islands, are not within any designated conservation areas.²¹

Bair and Greco Islands are to the northwest and northeast of the project site, respectively. Bair Island comprises three islands, including the Inner, Middle, and Outer Islands, which total approximately 3,000 acres. Approximately 2,000 acres of Bair Island, including the Middle and Outer Islands, are part of the CDFW Bair Island Ecological Reserve, which is adjacent to or shares marine habitat with a Marine Protected Area.²² The remainder of Bair Island is part of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, which contains approximately 10,580 acres of tidal areas and salt ponds.^{23,24} Greco Island is also part of the Don Edwards Wildlife Refuge. USFWS owns and manages the National Wildlife Refuge System and has developed a conservation plan to guide priorities and management of the refuge – *The Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan for Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge* (2012).²⁵ This plan provides a description of the desired future conditions and long-range guidance to accomplish the purposes for which the Refuge was established.

Furthermore, Bair Island is designated as a “State Marine Park”, which is a marine protected area. Marine protected areas are designated by CDFW and are discrete geographic areas designed to protect or conserve marine life and habitat. State marine parks allow for certain uses, such as public use and education, as long as the use does not compromise protection of species of interest or habitat, cultural, or recreational features.^{26,27}

There is potential for construction and operation of the proposed project to conflict with the provisions of the *Comprehensive Conservation Plan for Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge* or the state marine park designation. The impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

²⁰ CDFW. 2023. NCCP Plan Summaries webpage. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning/NCCP/Plans>. Accessed November 29, 2023.

²¹ Bay Area Conservation Lands Network. 2023. Conservation Lands Network Explorer. Available: <https://www.bayarealands.org/explorer-tool/>. Accessed December 8, 2023.

²² CDFW. Bair Island Ecological Reserve webpage. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Lands/Places-to-Visit/Bair-Island-ER#1049290-recreation>. Accessed December 6, 2023.

²³ USFWS. N.d. Overview Map of Hunt Program - Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Available: https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/hunt_map1_overview_layout-508.pdf.

²⁴ USFWS. 2023. Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge – Waterfowl Hunting Program webpage. Available: <https://www.fws.gov/refuge/don-edwards-san-francisco-bay/visit-us/activities/hunting>.

²⁵ USFWS. 2012. The Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan for Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Available: <https://ecos.fws.gov/ServCat/DownloadFile/205121>.

²⁶ CDFW. 2016. San Francisco Bay Marine Protected Areas website. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/San-Francisco-Bay#29097813-marine-protected-areas>. Accessed December 8, 2023.

²⁷ CDFW. 2023. Marine Protected Areas Frequently Asked Questions webpage. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/FAQs#27530610-what-are-marine-protected-areas-mpas->. Accessed December 8, 2023.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Potentially Significant Impact. The current leaseholder is vacating the project site and removing all improvements currently located on-site and the only structure that would be removed under the proposed project is the existing dock along Westpoint Slough. A survey will be conducted for the EIR to determine if the dock or any other features at or near the project area are potentially historical resources and would be affected by the proposed project. If historical resources are affected by the proposed project, significant impacts could result; therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project area is located in an area that has been previously disturbed by construction and industrial activities (i.e., marine terminal operations and stockpiling of materials), placement of artificial fill, office and roadway development, and shoreline processes (i.e., wave action and winter storms). Given that the project area has been substantially disturbed, any archaeological resources that may have existed at one time have likely been previously unearthed, collected, and/or destroyed or lost their stratigraphic and geologic context and would no longer be considered an archaeological resource. Uncovering significant archaeological resources is expected to be unlikely. However, the potential for construction of the proposed project to result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource will be further evaluated in the EIR.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project area is not within any known historical or modern cemeteries. However, in the unlikely event project construction disturbs any unanticipated human remains, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that in the event of the discovery of human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery, all ground disturbance must cease and the County Coroner must be notified. Section 7052 establishes a felony penalty for mutilating, disinterring, or otherwise disturbing human remains, except by relatives. Sections 5097.94 and 5907.98 of the Public Resources Code specify

a protocol to be followed when the Native American Heritage Commission receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner. If the Coroner determines that the remains are or appear to be of a Native American, he/she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission for further investigations and proper recovery of such remains, if necessary, in compliance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With compliance with these regulations, impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would not require any ground disturbance other than periodic maintenance dredging to remove sediments that continually and gradually accumulate between dredging events. This would result in removal of recent sediment accumulation to maintain the ferry terminal's design depth and would not likely result in disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. While the impact is expected to be less than significant, it will be evaluated further in the EIR.

VI. ENERGY

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

Would the project:

a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would consume energy resources in the form of gasoline and/or diesel fuel for construction equipment activity, hauling and vendor delivery trips, and gasoline fuel for worker vehicle trips. The CARB In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation²⁸ would limit wasteful or unnecessary energy consumption from diesel-fueled construction equipment. As required by the rule, construction equipment 25 horsepower (hp) or greater would be prohibited from idling for more than 5 minutes, except where necessary for operation. CARB's Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM)²⁹ would similarly limit idling in heavy-duty on-road equipment, such as any project-related hauling or vendor delivery vehicles. These limits would reduce wasteful or unnecessary fuel burn associated with idling during construction activities. Energy consumption from construction worker vehicle trips would be driven by regional traffic and transit patterns, as well as fuel economy

²⁸ CARB. 2023. In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation webpage. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/use-road-diesel-fueled-fleets-regulation>. Accessed November 30, 2023.

²⁹ CARB. 2023. Airborne Toxic Control Measures webpage. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/airborne-toxic-control-measures>. Accessed November 30, 2023.

standards, such as those stipulated for new models in the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards. Project-related construction would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during the construction period. However, further evaluation of construction methods, such as duration of construction tasks and number of truck trips, will be conducted to estimate energy consumption during project construction.

Operation of the proposed project would consume energy in the form of diesel fuel for ferry trips, gasoline fuel for maintenance vehicle activities, and electricity for visitor-serving uses, including the hotel, restaurant, and limited office. The proposed project would be subject to state, federal, and local regulations regarding fuel efficiency standards for vehicles and equipment as well as building energy efficiency standards. For instance, buildings proposed as part of the proposed project would be required to be all-electric, per Article XV of Chapter 9 of the City Code. Additionally, the proposed project is expected to result in a reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which would offset ferry emissions. However, further analysis of ferry operations, including frequency of ferry service and type/size of vessels, and visitor-serving uses will be conducted to estimate energy consumption during project operation.

Therefore, further evaluation is required to analyze if an environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources would occur during project construction or operation. Thus, a potentially significant impact may occur, and this issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.

b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction and operation of the proposed project would comply with state and local plans for renewable energy and energy efficiency, including the latest BAAQMD AQMP,³⁰ discussed in Item III.a. above,³¹ and the Redwood City Climate Action Plan (CAP) (2020),³² discussed in Item VIII.b. These plans encourage the adoption of renewable energy and increase in energy efficiency through strategies such as increasing energy efficiency of buildings, incentivizing and expanding EV charging infrastructure, and reducing emissions from the transportation sector. By providing ferry service between Redwood City and Oakland and San Francisco, the proposed project is expected to result in a reduction in car trips and VMT, which is anticipated to offset the use of diesel fuel to run the ferries. Additionally, the parking lot would meet state and local EV requirements, such as those stipulated under the current CALGreen standards and Article XV of Chapter 9 of the City Code. New buildings, including the hotel and limited office, would be required to meet California's Title 24 energy efficiency standards, as discussed in the 2020 Redwood City CAP. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Further, the ferry terminal would be designed to be updated to accommodate the possible future installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and batteries, should the technology become available. However, further evaluation of energy use associated with project construction and operations in the EIR is required.

³⁰ BAAQMD. 2017. Spare the Air, Cool the Climate. Final 2017 Clean Air Plan. Available: https://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a_-proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?rev=8c588738a4fb455b9cabb27360409529.

³¹ San Mateo County. 2022. Community Climate Action Plan. Available: <https://www.smcgov.org/media/73456/download?inline=>.

³² Redwood City. 2020. Climate Action Plan. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/22781/637426822669070000>.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

- a. **Directly or indirectly cause a 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.

Less than Significant Impact. According to the California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey (CGS) California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application (EQ Zapp), the project area is not within the California Geological Survey Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. However, the nearest fault zones are approximately 6.5 miles to the west and 12 miles to the east³³ and the project area is located within a seismically active region.³⁴ The new structures, including the ferry terminal, hotel, restaurant, limited office, and associated facilities, would be built in compliance with the most up-to-date building codes, including the California Building Code (CBC) and Redwood City Building Code, which would minimize potential impacts to the greatest degree feasible. Although impacts are anticipated to be less than significant, this potential for the proposed project to directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, related to seismic shaking will be evaluated further in the EIR.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed in Item VII.a.i. above, the project area is in a seismically active area, and there is a high potential for the project site to experience strong seismic ground shaking or earthquakes from local or regional faults. Like other projects in the tectonically active Northern California region, the proposed project would likely experience shaking effects from surrounding faults during seismic events. Incorporation of emergency planning and compliance with current building and construction design codes would minimize damage resulting from a seismic event; however, this is considered a potentially significant impact and will be evaluated in the EIR.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Potentially Significant Impact. Liquefaction is a phenomenon that occurs when soil transforms from a solid state to a liquefied condition because of the effects of increased pore-water pressure. This typically occurs where susceptible soils (e.g., medium sand, silt) are over a high groundwater table. Affected soils lose all strength during liquefaction and infrastructure damage, such as failure of structure foundations, can occur. Thus, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, at the project site is considered a potentially significant impact and will be evaluated in the EIR.

iv. Landslides?

No Impact. The project area is in an urbanized shoreline area that is predominantly flat with no significant slopes nearby. Additionally, according to the California Department of Conservation CGS Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation interactive map, the area is not in a CGS landslide zone.³⁵ There are large mounds of stockpiled material on-site that are being removed by the current leaseholder and would not pose a risk of unstable soils during project construction or operation. Therefore, the likelihood for

³³ California Department of Conservation California Geological Survey (CGS). 2023. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation EQ Zapp mapping tool. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>. Accessed November 27, 2023.

³⁴ California Department of Conservation CGS. 2023. Fault Activity Map of California. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>. Accessed November 27, 2023.

³⁵ California Department of Conservation CGS. 2023. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation EQ Zapp mapping tool. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>. Accessed November 27, 2023.

landslides at the project site is low. Thus, there is no impact associated with landslides risk at the project site and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction activities at the project area would involve grading, which would disturb soils and could generate erosion and loss of topsoil. However, all construction activities associated with the proposed project would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMP), as detailed in a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) prepared as part of compliance with the Construction General Permit from the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program (discussed in more detail in Section X). The Construction General Permit sets forth requirements to protect surface waters for construction activities involving more than one acre of ground disturbance through the preparation and implementation of project-specific construction SWPPP and BMPs. Although these measures are intended to prevent sedimentation from entering runoff from the site and in turn entering the adjacent water channels, they also prevent soil erosion and loss of topsoil occurring at a construction site and require soil stabilization and erosion control measures to be implemented during construction. Thus, with adherence to the SWPPP and required BMPs, potential erosion-related impacts during construction and operation are anticipated to be less than significant. However, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR as part of the geology and water quality analyses.

Currently, the project site is primarily covered by exposed soils and stockpiles of concrete base rock, which are subject to erosion. The current leaseholder is in the process of removing the stockpiles, which would leave the underlying soils exposed and the project site would continue to be subject to erosion. Upon completion of construction, the project site would be covered with landscaping and hardscaping, which would reduce the potential for soil erosion to occur. Other portions of the project areas are currently covered with paving, landscaping, or hard packed soils. These areas would be covered with landscaping or hardscaping following project construction, and would not cause substantial erosion or loss of topsoil. However, the development of the project site would increase the amount of impervious surface in the project area. An increase in impervious surface could result in increased stormwater runoff that generates erosion, as explained in Section X. The current leaseholder is in the process of filling a stormwater ditch and installing a drainage pipe to capture stormwater runoff from the project site; however, the potential for an increase in shore erosion to occur as a result of changes in site runoff will be further evaluated. In addition, ferry operations would generate vessel wake, which is wave energy created by the passage of a vessel through water. The vessel wake could affect erosion and the transport of sediment along the Redwood Creek shoreline. This could result in a potentially significant impact. Therefore, potential impacts related to soil erosion and loss of topsoil during project construction and operation will be evaluated further in the EIR.

c. Be located on a geological 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?

Potentially Significant Impact. As noted above under Item VII.a.iii., the project area is within a liquefaction zone. Liquefaction could lead to ground settlement and lateral spreading. Lateral spreading could damage the proposed structures and utilities. As part of the proposed project, on-site soils would be compacted in a manner consistent with CBC requirements and Redwood City's standard grading and

building review procedures such that the likelihood of damage to on-site structures would be low. However, impacts associated with soil that could be unstable are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Expansive soils generally result from specific clay minerals that expand when saturated and shrink in volume when dry. The project area is in a liquefaction zone and much of the existing on-site soils consist of artificial fill placed on marshland. These geologic deposits within the project area and previously imported fill soils could be expansive. Impacts resulting from expansive soils are expected to be controlled through incorporation of modern construction engineering and safety standards and compliance with current building regulations and engineering standards. However, the potential presence of expansive soils is considered a potentially significant impact and will be evaluated in the EIR.

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. The proposed project would not involve the installation or modification of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Currently no wastewater system exists on the proposed site. A portable restroom would be provided at the ferry terminal site and would be maintained by a contracted service provider and sanitation truck that includes aboveground holding tanks for wastewater. The wastewater would be removed and transferred by sanitation trucks to a wastewater treatment facility. New wastewater facilities would be installed to support future visitor-serving uses and provide a future permanent restroom at the ferry terminal that would connect to the Redwood City municipal sewer system. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?

Potentially Significant Impact. An analysis conducted for the property immediately to the south of the project site found that the area soils consist of artificial fill that overlay a layer of Bay mud, which in turn overlays alluvium and older Bay clay.³⁶ Soil and geological conditions of the project site are expected to be similar. Bay mud and estuarine deposits are known to contain invertebrate remains, but these may not yet be fossilized or extinct and they also occur throughout similar deposits around San Francisco Bay. Significant paleontological resources are not expected to be present; however, the EIR will evaluate whether such resources could occur and if construction of the proposed project would result in direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource.

Operation of the proposed project would not include any ground disturbance other than maintenance dredging. The maintenance dredging would occur periodically to remove sediments that continually and gradually accumulate between dredging activities. This would result in removal of recent sediment accumulation to maintain the ferry terminal's design depth, and thus, no unique paleontological resources

³⁶ Port of Redwood City. 2022. Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Ready-Mix Concrete Plant Project. Prepared by Ascent Environmental. Available: <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2021120258>.

or unique geological features are likely to be present. Therefore, impacts from project operations would be less than significant and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would generate direct greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from vehicle exhaust associated with construction-related activities, including off-road on-site construction equipment, on-road off-site hauling and vendor delivery truck trips, and on-road off-site worker vehicle trips. Operation of the proposed project would generate direct GHG emissions from maintenance-related activities and general operations of ferry service and hotel operations, including vehicle and ferry trips to and from the proposed site. Operation of the proposed project would also generate indirect GHG emissions from the generation of electricity consumed for building and equipment energy, wastewater transport and treatment, and the landfill emissions from solid waste generation and disposal. The increase in ferry ridership is expected to reduce regional VMT because passengers would drive only to the ferry terminal instead of driving to and from Redwood City and Oakland or San Francisco. Multimodal access improvements would also be provided to improve bicycle, pedestrian, and public transit connections to the project site and reduce VMT and subsequent mobile-source GHG emissions. However, an increase in vehicle trips to the project site is likely from ferry passengers who park vehicles on-site and by visitors and employees associated with the visitor-serving uses and limited office. The proposed project would generate GHG emissions, directly and indirectly, that have the potential to have a significant impact on the environment and will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Redwood City CAP,³⁷ last updated in 2020, contains a series of strategies designed to reduce greenhouse gases to 50 percent below 2005 levels by 2030 and an ultimate carbon neutrality goal by 2045. Between 2005 and 2017, Redwood City saw a 42 percent reduction in GHG emissions from the commercial and industrial sector, contributing to an overall decline of 23 percent in

³⁷ Redwood City. 2020. Climate Action Plan. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/22781/637426822669070000>.

city-wide emissions from 2005. In 2017, the transportation sector accounted for the largest share of the city's GHG emissions (56 percent) followed by the commercial and industrial sectors (27 percent). Plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions are developed with the purpose of reducing cumulative emissions related, primarily, to long-term operational emissions. The Redwood City CAP is consistent with and complementary to statewide legislation and regulatory mandates, and establishes local strategies, measures, and actions to reduce GHG emissions in Redwood City. Moreover, the Port of Redwood City became a participant of the Green Marine program in 2021, which serves as the largest voluntary environmental certification program for North America's maritime industry where participating ports, ship builders, and ship operators commit to implementing policies and practices to reduce or minimize negative environmental effects of their operations. The proposed project is expected to reduce VMT, and new development on-site would comply with the current applicable local, state, and federal green building and energy conservation requirements. Therefore, no conflict with any of the applicable GHG reduction measures included in Redwood City's CAP, Port policies adopted as part of the Port's participation in Green Marine, nor any other applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs is anticipated. However, further evaluation of GHG emissions associated with project construction and operations in the EIR is required.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evaluation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact. Project construction activities would involve the transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as petroleum, hydrocarbons, and their derivatives (e.g., gasoline, diesel, oils, and lubricants) that are used routinely during construction activities. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and their transport, storage, handling, and disposal are strictly regulated. These materials would be handled in compliance with applicable laws and regulations regarding transport, handling, storage, and disposal. Additionally, all storage, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials is regulated by agencies such as the USEPA, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the Redwood City Fire Department, and the San Mateo County Fire Department. The California Highway Patrol and Caltrans are responsible for enforcing regulations related to the transportation of hazardous materials on local roadways. All hazardous materials used during construction of the proposed project would be used, stored, and transported in compliance with applicable requirements. Such compliance would reduce the potential for the proposed project to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Landside operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to involve the transport, use, or disposal of substantial quantities of hazardous materials such that a significant hazard to the public or environment would occur. Small quantities of hazardous materials may be used on-site associated with the restroom (both portable and permanent), hotel, and limited office and would generally include materials (e.g., commercial cleaners, lubricants, paints) associated with janitorial, maintenance, and repair activities. Fueling and maintenance of the ferry vessels would occur off-site.

Operation of the ferry vessels would be limited to the docking and loading of vessels and no routine transport of hazardous materials on the ferry route would occur. However, the increased ferry operations could increase the potential for fuel spills to occur, which will be addressed further in the EIR as identified in Item X.a. below and under the topic of water quality.

The proposed project would be required to comply with existing laws and regulations regarding the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. These regulations are specifically designed to protect the public health and the environment and must be adhered to during project construction and operation. Compliance with applicable regulations would ensure that this impact would be less than significant; however, this impact will be evaluated further in the EIR. Additionally, as identified above, the potential

for ferry operations to increase fuel spills will be further addressed in the EIR as part of the hydrology and water quality impacts assessment.

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would involve ground disturbance associated with activities such as site clearing, grading, dredging, pile installation, and construction of new structures including the hotel and limited office.

According to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker data management system,³⁸ one closed leaking underground storage tank (LUST) cleanup site is located east of the project site at the Pacific Shores Center.³⁹ An area of impacted soils was identified and remediated east of Seaport Boulevard south of the public parking lot, outside of the project boundaries. Additionally, GeoTracker identifies one informational item that was reviewed in 2000 pertaining to an unexpected discovery of hydrocarbon impacted soil immediately south of the project site,⁴⁰ a Voluntary Cleanup site southeast of the entrance to the Pacific Shores Center,⁴¹ and an open cleanup site southeast of the entrance to the Pacific Shores Center.⁴² Additionally, while there is no known soil or groundwater contamination at the project site, the project site and other project areas may contain unknown contamination related to existing and/or past uses on-site or surrounding properties. Therefore, there is the potential for soil or groundwater contamination associated with past or existing uses to be encountered during excavation which could create a hazard to the public or the environment, and this will be evaluated in the EIR.

As discussed under Item IX.a. above, construction activities would require the use and transport of hazardous materials such as asphalt, paints, and other solvents and the use of equipment that contains oil, gas, or hydraulic fluids that could be spilled during normal usage or during refueling. Quantities would be small and routine construction practices would include measures to prevent/contain/clean-up spills and contamination from fuels, solvents, concrete wastes, and other waste materials. In-water construction activities have a small potential for hazardous material releases into surrounding waterways from accidents or upsets. Spill prevention and cleanup procedures for the proposed project would be addressed in a SWPPP that would be implemented by the construction contractor. The SWPPP would define actions to minimize potentials for spills (such as the proper storage of materials, perimeter control measures, and use of appropriate waste disposal practices, such as leak-proof containment) and provide efficient responses to spill events (i.e., timely locate the release, prevent further releases, contain release, clean-up) to minimize the magnitude of the spill and extent of impacts. This would include compliance with California Water Code Sections 13271 and 13272, which require that the Office of Emergency Services (OES) be notified in the event of a discharge in or on any waters of the state. Implementation of such construction provisions would minimize the potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials during construction activities and ensure there would not be a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and this will be evaluated in the EIR.

³⁸ California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2023. GeoTracker database. Available: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Accessed December 4, 2023.

³⁹ Pacific Shores Development (T0608185737), 1000 Seaport Boulevard.

⁴⁰ RMC Pacific Materials (T10000008783), 876 Seaport Boulevard.

⁴¹ Sims Metal Management – Redwood City (60002852), 699 Seaport Boulevard.

⁴² ARCO Bulk Plan #69209, Former (T0608179358), 775 Seaport Boulevard.

As discussed above, small quantities of hazardous materials may be used or stored on-site during project operations on the landside. These materials would be handled in compliance with applicable rules and regulations and impacts would be less than significant and will not be discussed further in the EIR. The increased ferry operations could increase the potential for fuel spills to occur, which is a potentially significant impact and will be addressed further in the EIR.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. According to the Redwood City interactive geographic information system (GIS) tool, the closest school is Summit Preparatory Charter High School, approximately 1.7 miles from the project area at 890 Broadway.⁴³ Since no schools are located within 0.25 mile of the project area, potential construction and operations at the project site would not emit hazardous emissions that could affect a school. Thus, no impact would occur and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project site is not listed on the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List that is maintained by DTSC, pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, as identified under Item IX.b. above, GeoTracker identifies a closed LUST site at the Pacific Shores Center east of Seaport Boulevard and south of the public parking lot outside of the project boundaries, an informational item, closed LUST site, and open cleanup program site in the vicinity of the project area. The EIR will review if there is the potential for the proposed project to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment relative to the proximity of hazardous material sites. This is a potentially significant impact and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The San Carlos Airport is approximately three miles from the project area in San Carlos, California. The airport is classified as a Local Reliever Airport, which is an airport that serves general aviation flights and provides improved general aviation access to the community. The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) as identified in the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Environs of the San Carlos Airport.⁴⁴ The AIA is broken down into Area A, which requires real estate disclosure of the presence of the airport; and Area B, which requires new plans and projects to demonstrate consistency with the goals and policies of the ALUCP. Area A includes the project area, except for the shipping routes in San Francisco Bay, as well as a large portion of San Mateo County; Area A is outside of the airport safety zones and noise contours. Given that the project

⁴³ Redwood City. 2023. Redwood City Community GIS tool. Available: <http://webgis.redwoodcity.org/community/>. Accessed November 27, 2023.

⁴⁴ City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. October 2015. Final Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Carlos Airport. Prepared by ESA. Available: https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/SQL_FinalALUCP_Oct15_read.pdf.

area is approximately three miles from the airport and outside of the airport safety zones and noise contours, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. While the proposed project is expected to have a less than significant impact related to airport safety hazards or excessive noise, it will be evaluated further in the EIR.

f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Redwood City Police Department, Redwood City Fire Department, Redwood City Emergency Operations Center, and the San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services collaborate to provide emergency services to Redwood City.⁴⁵ Recent updates to the Redwood City General Plan Public Safety Element policies and implementation programs ensure that adequate emergency response and evacuation procedures are planned for and maintained on a development-by-development basis with the City.⁴⁶ All major public streets serve as principal evacuation routes; however in an evacuation, the exact emergency routes used would depend on the type, scope, and location of the incident.

In the event of an emergency, Seaport Boulevard would provide the first vehicle evacuation route from the project site to the greater transportation network. The proposed project would widen a portion of this roadway to improve site accessibility. During roadway widening, temporary lane closures would occur. This could result in a temporary interference with emergency response. However, any on-street construction activities or closures would conform to traffic work plan and access standards, including coordination with emergency service providers in accordance and the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Section 9).

The roadway improvements would widen Seaport Boulevard to accommodate a Class I bicycle trail and sidewalk. These improvements would not affect emergency access. Further, all access improvements and development at the project site would be required to comply with state and local fire and building codes, including providing sufficient space around the new structures for emergency personnel and equipment access and emergency evacuation.

Additionally, the proposed project would provide an alternative mode of transit in the case that roads, other transit, bridges, and/or tunnels are disabled during a natural or man-made event. As such, the proposed ferry terminal would provide an alternative form of transit allowing people to travel between the Redwood City region and Oakland and/or San Francisco during an emergency and providing an additional evacuation route.

Given compliance with code requirements, improvements to Seaport Boulevard, and the addition of an additional evacuation route, construction and operation of the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and the impact is considered less than significant. However, impacts relative to

⁴⁵ Redwood City. 2010. Redwood City General Plan. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/departments/community-development-department/planning-housing/planning-services/general-plan-precise-plans/general-plan>.

⁴⁶ Redwood City. 2023. Redwood City Focused General Plan Update Final EIR. State Clearinghouse Number 2022100449.

emergency access associated with roadway and site access modifications during operation and construction will be further addressed in the transportation analysis in the EIR (see Item XVII.d. below).

g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. Public Resources Code Sections 4201–4204 direct the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) to map fire hazards based on relevant factors such as fuels, terrain, and weather. CalFire, through its Fire and Resources Assessment Program (FRAP), has mapped areas of significant fire hazards throughout the state. As such, CalFire establishes local and state responsibility areas for wildfire protection and identifies areas within fire hazard severity zones (FHSZ)—classified as moderate, high, and very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ).

The project area is not in or near a state responsibility area or lands classified as VHFHSZ. Furthermore, San Mateo County maps the broad scope of potential fire hazards within county limits and defines areas in selected wildfire hazard areas. The project area is not located within a County-designated wildfire severity zone. The project area and surrounding area are flat and not located near steep slopes that could exacerbate wildfire risk or contribute to post-fire hazards, such as erosion and slope instability. There is no vegetation on-site and the limited vegetation surrounding the project site could not contribute to the spread of wildfire. According to the U.S. Census Urban Area Maps, the project area is designated as an urbanized area⁴⁷ and is not within the wildland-urban interface, areas where structures meet or intermingle with wildland vegetation and therefore experience wildfires more often.⁴⁸ In summary, the project area is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as VHFHSZ; therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts related to exposing people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No further evaluation in the EIR is required.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁴⁷ United States Census Bureau. 2021. 2010 Census Urban Area Reference Maps. Map ua78904_san_francisco—oakland_ca/ section 7. Available: <https://www.census.gov/geographies/reference-maps/2010/geo/2010-census-urban-areas.html>. Accessed November 2, 2023.

⁴⁸ U.S. Fire Administration. 2022. What is the WUI? webpage. Available: <https://www.usfa.fema.gov/wui/what-is-the-wui.html>. Accessed December 1, 2023.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

- a. **Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The project area is located along Redwood Creek to the west and Westpoint Slough to the north. These surface waters drain into the San Francisco Bay. The applicable water quality standards for San Francisco Bay where the proposed project is situated are set forth in the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin (Basin Plan), which is administered by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).⁴⁹

The proposed project would include construction in water and near surface waters. Major waterside construction activities would include dredging, marine pile installation, marine float installation, fixed pier construction, and marine utility and outfitting. Construction of the waterside improvements may result in erosion and temporary water quality impacts such as turbidity and re-suspension of sediments in the adjacent waters. Any activity involving the use of construction products and heavy equipment could also result in the incidental release of construction materials (e.g., sawdust, metal fragments, concrete), or the accidental spill of construction materials (e.g., paints and solvents) or substances commonly used in construction equipment (e.g., fuels, oil, grease). In addition, landside construction could result in erosion, sedimentation, and other potential sources of surface water pollutants if not properly controlled and managed. Compliance with federal, state, and regional regulations and permits governing discharge of pollutants and wastes would reduce construction impacts on water quality. However, due to the extent of the construction activities and the need for in-water work, water quality impacts associated with

⁴⁹ San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2023. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin. Available: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/basin_planning.html.

construction of the proposed project are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

A stormwater ditch with a tide gate is currently located along the eastern edge of the project site. A portion of the 9-acre project site and CEMEX marine terminal property drain into the ditch. Per the lease agreement, CEMEX is in the process of filling the ditch and installing a drainage pipe to convey stormwater to the outlet in Westpoint Slough. Project operations, including construction of a new on-site system that would connect to the drainage pipe or a new outlet, would comply with the San Francisco Bay RWQCB NPDES MS4 Permit (Order No. R2-2022-0018, NPDES Permit No. CAS612008)⁵⁰ and the Redwood City Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Program (Ordinance No. 2090, Section 1, 6-12-95), which intends to protect and enhance water quality consistent with the NPDES program. The objectives of NPDES MS4 permits are to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges through municipal storm sewers to surface waters, to reduce the discharge of pollutants in stormwater to the maximum extent practicable, and to implement other pollutant controls as necessary to achieve water quality standards. The MS4 permit requires low-impact development measures that include filtering stormwater through vegetated areas (e.g., bioswales) to promote infiltration and reduce stormwater runoff from the project site.

The proposed project includes the construction and operation of permanent structures and hardscaping, such as the hotel, parking lot, and new sidewalk and Class I bicycle trail, that would increase the amount of impervious surface on the project site. This could increase the rate or amount of stormwater runoff from the project site, increasing the potential for stormwater runoff to transfer pollutants, such as oil and grease from the roadway and parking areas, into nearby surface waters. Additionally, the operation of ferries in-water would carry the risk of accidental release of fuels that could contaminate surface waters. Therefore, despite compliance with the NPDES MS4 permit and implementation of low impact development measures, further evaluation is required to determine if operation of the proposed project could impact water quality. Construction and operational impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project area is near the eastern edge of the San Mateo Plain Subbasin (DWR Basin number 2-009.03) of the Santa Clara Valley Basin.⁵¹ This basin is considered very low priority under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) according to the California Department of Water Resources, and is therefore not required to have a Groundwater Sustainability Plan.⁵² The basin has shallow groundwater levels and it is not heavily used as a source for potable water.⁵³ Additionally,

⁵⁰ San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2022. Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (Order No. R2-2022-0018, NPDES Permit No. CAS612008). Available:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/board_decisions/adopted_orders/2022/R2-2022-0018.pdf.

⁵¹ California Department of Water Resources. 2023. Groundwater Basin Boundary Assessment Tool. Available:

<https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/bbat/>. Accessed November 17, 2023.

⁵² California Department of Water Resources. 2023. Groundwater Sustainability Plans webpage. Available:

<https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management/Groundwater-Sustainability-Plans>. Accessed November 17, 2023.

⁵³ California Water Boards. 2021. San Mateo Plain Groundwater Subbasin (2-009.03). Available:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/groundwater/BasinLinks/San_Mateo_Plain_Basin.pdf.

according to the 2018 San Mateo Plan Groundwater Basin Assessment, the basin is in a relatively full and stable condition.⁵⁴

The proposed project would increase impervious areas from the construction of new development and hardscape. The increase in impervious surfaces is not expected to result in a substantial change in groundwater recharge and would not impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. While the impact is expected to be less than significant, it will be evaluated further in the EIR.

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would result in alterations to the surface water runoff, including through the addition of impervious surfaces and construction of an on-site stormwater system that drains towards the existing stormwater ditch or another outfall, in compliance with the NPDES MS4 permit and Redwood City Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Program. During construction there is the potential for erosion or siltation to occur, particularly during dredging and in-water construction and also during site clearing and grading activities on the landside. Construction would comply with the requirements in the NPDES Construction General Permit and SWPPP, which would minimize the amount of runoff from the project site and potential for substantial erosion or siltation to occur. A site grading and drainage plan, subject to review and approval by the City of Redwood City Engineer, would further minimize the potential for on- and off-site erosion or siltation to occur.

The proposed project includes new structures and hardscaping. This would reduce the potential for erosion of on-site soils. Additionally, although an increase in impervious surface could result in increased stormwater runoff, a new on-site stormwater system would be constructed to handle increased flows; thus, no substantial increase in erosion or siltation is expected. However, this will be further evaluated in the EIR.

The potential for the existing drainage pattern of the site to be altered in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation to occur on-site or off-site during construction and operation of the proposed project is considered potentially significant and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project includes new permanent structures and hardscaping, such as the hotel, parking lot, and Class I bicycle trail and sidewalk which would increase the amount of impervious surface area on the project site. The proposed project would include a new stormwater system designed to accommodate the projected runoff that complies with the NPDES MS4 permit as well as Redwood City Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Program. Therefore, it is anticipated that adequate storm drain capacity would be provided and surface runoff would not result in flooding on or off-site. However, because the amount of impervious surface on the project site would

⁵⁴ San Mateo County. 2018. San Mateo Plan Groundwater Basin Assessment. Available: https://www.smcsustainability.org/wp-content/uploads/filebase/energy-water/groundwater/SMP-Groundwater-Basin-Assessment_July-2018.pdf.

increase, which could change the rate or amount of stormwater runoff from the project site, the potential for flooding associated with a change in drainage patterns on the project site will be further evaluated in the EIR.

iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

Potentially Significant Impact. As described under Item X.a. above, a stormwater ditch with a tide gate is located along the eastern edge of the project site. The proposed project would include a new stormwater system that drains into the new stormwater pipe or another outfall and is designed to accommodate the projected runoff associated with the proposed project. The modifications to the on-site storm drain system would comply with drainage and runoff guidelines pursuant to the NPDES MS4 permit and Redwood City Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Program. Therefore, it is anticipated that adequate storm drain capacity would be provided and impacts would be less than significant. However, as described above, there would be changes in the configuration and extent of landside impermeable surfaces that could change stormwater peak flows and volumes. Changes in the drainage pattern of the project site are considered potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows.

Potentially Significant Impact. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0189F (dated April 5, 2019),⁵⁵ the eastern portion of the project site and other portions of the project area are in Zone AE, a Special Flood Hazard Area, that is subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event. The western portion of the project site is in Zone X, an area of minimal flood hazard. The proposed project includes new development within flood zones and thus could involve construction of structures that may impede or redirect flood flows. Impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. A seiche is a standing wave generated during earthquakes within enclosed bodies of water such as reservoirs and lakes. According to the 2022 Redwood City General Plan EIR, the project site could experience seiche or seiche-related effects during seismic activity due to its proximity to the San Francisco Bay.⁵⁶ However, the project site is buffered by Bair Island and other islands, thus lowering the probability of seiche-induced impacts. In addition, seiches historically have not resulted in substantial flooding or damage in the San Francisco Bay Area. Therefore, the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation from a seiche would be less than significant and will not be further evaluated in the EIR.

As identified in Item X.c.iv. above, the eastern portion of the project site and other portions of the project area are located in a FEMA-designated floodplain (Zone AE).⁵⁷ The project site is also in a tsunami hazard area according to the California Department of Conservation.⁵⁸ Tsunami-induced flooding at the project

⁵⁵ FEMA National Flood Insurance Program. April 2019. Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0189F.

⁵⁶ Redwood City. 2023. Redwood City Focused General Plan Update Final EIR. State Clearinghouse Number 2022100449.

⁵⁷ FEMA National Flood Insurance Program. April 2019. Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0189F.

⁵⁸ California Department of Conservation. 2023 California Tsunami Maps. Available: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps>. Accessed December 11, 2023.

site could damage the ferry terminal or a moored vessel, or other site improvements, and thereby pose a risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation.

Models suggest that sea levels along the California coast could rise substantially over the next century as a result of climate change. Risks associated with rising sea levels include inundation of low lying areas along the coast, exposure of new areas to flood risk, an increase in the intensity and risk in areas already susceptible to flooding, and an increase in shoreline erosion in erosion prone areas.

Therefore, potential impacts associated with the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation from flooding, tsunamis, and sea level rise are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. As identified in Item X.a., the San Francisco Bay RWQCB Basin Plan sets forth the regulatory water quality standards for surface waters and groundwater within the region. The water quality standards address both the designated beneficial uses for water bodies and the water quality objectives to meet them. Project construction would comply with all applicable water quality permits and requirements, including the Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit, State Construction General Permit, and preparation of a SWPPP. Compliance with these permits would reduce construction impacts on water quality. However, due to the extent of the construction activities and the need for in-water work, water quality impacts from construction are considered potentially significant and could conflict with the Basin Plan. This impact will be evaluated further in the EIR.

As identified under Item X.a., operation of the proposed project would comply with the NPDES MS4 Permit, which would require the implementation of measures to reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff from the project site. However, given alterations to the site drainage patterns as discussed under Item X.c., including an increase in the amount of impervious surface on the project site, stormwater runoff from the project site would change, which could affect the potential for stormwater runoff to transfer pollutants into nearby surface waters. Additionally, the operation of ferries in-water would carry the risk of accidental release of fuels that could contaminate surface waters. Therefore, water quality impacts from project operation are considered potentially significant and could conflict with the Basin Plan. This impact will be evaluated further in the EIR.

As identified in Item X.b., the project area is underlain by the San Mateo Plain Subbasin of the Santa Clara Valley Basin.⁵⁹ This basin is considered very low priority under the SGMA according to the California Department of Water Resources, and is therefore not required to have a Groundwater Sustainability Plan.⁶⁰ As such, project construction and operations would not conflict with or obstruct a sustainable groundwater management plan and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

⁵⁹ California Department of Water Resources. 2023. Groundwater Basin Boundary Assessment Tool. Available: <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/bbat/>. Accessed November 17, 2023.

⁶⁰ California Department of Water Resources. 2023. Groundwater Sustainability Plans website. Available: <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management/Groundwater-Sustainability-Plans>. Accessed November 17, 2023.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The proposed project involves constructing a ferry terminal, access improvements, and visitor-serving uses on a site that is primarily undeveloped and being vacated by the current leaseholder. The project site is located at the confluence of Redwood Creek and Westpoint Slough and is not within or surrounded by an established community. Implementation of the ferry terminal and the visitor-serving uses would occur within the existing project site boundaries. Site access improvements would occur along the existing Seaport Boulevard, which separates the Pacific Shores Center and Port uses. Access improvements would occur along this existing roadway and no new roadways would be constructed. Construction activities on Seaport Boulevard are likely to result in temporary lane closures. These closures would be subject to a traffic control plan and would not be allowed to obstruct access to the adjacent properties. The relocated railroad would be with a portion of the existing Frontage Road that would be abandoned and would connect to the existing railroad with a switch; it would not divide an established community. During operations, the proposed roadway and multimodal connectivity improvements, as well as the Bay Trail extension into the project site, would improve the connectivity to the project site, waterfront park, and the Pacific Shores Center and would not physically divide an established community. Furthermore, ferry services provided by the proposed project would increase connectivity across the region. For these reasons, there would be no impacts from project construction or operations on established communities, and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Potentially Significant Impact. The General Plan land use map designates the project site as Marina and the zoning district is General Industrial (GI). The Marina land use allows for private and public marinas, ferry terminals, and other uses complimentary to those maritime activities. Restaurants, retail shops, and other visitor-serving uses supportive of boating and ferry transportation may also be established. Permitted uses in the General Industrial zoning district include railroad yards, freight stations, trucking or motor terminals, boat service establishments, and parking lots or garages; accessory uses include offices; and conditional uses include public or quasi-public uses.

The project site is identified on the General Plan land use map as proposed ferry terminal. Further, General Plan Policy BE-21-3 identifies that a plan should be prepared that accommodates a passenger ferry

terminal at the Port. Therefore, while certain uses such as the proposed ferry terminal would be allowed under the existing land use designation, the visitor-serving uses, including a hotel, associated retail and restaurant uses, and limited office would be inconsistent. The proposed project includes a proposed zone change from GI to GC (General Commercial). With approval of the zone change, the conflict with the zoning code would be removed. Further review would be required to determine if the proposed project with a proposed zone change would result in a conflict with any other land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The impact is considered potentially significant and will be further evaluated in the EIR. The proposed access improvements, extension of the Bay Trail, and the relocation of the railroad tracks and maintenance building would not establish any new uses and would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; however this will be further evaluated in the EIR.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

- a. **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**
- b. **Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

No Impact (Items a-b). According to the 2022 Redwood City General Plan Draft EIR, Redwood City is not in an area known to contain significant mineral resources, nor is it recognized by the General Plan as possessing important mineral resources.^{61,62}

According to the 2022 Redwood City General Plan Draft EIR, there are no active or idle oil and gas wells within the project area.

The project site is being vacated by the current leaseholder who was using the site for stockpiling of materials for recycling and sale of concrete base rock. No mineral extraction occurs at the project site or elsewhere within the project area.

⁶¹ Redwood City. 2023. Redwood City Focused General Plan Update Final EIR. State Clearinghouse Number 2022100449.

⁶² Redwood City. 2010. Redwood City General Plan. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/departments/community-development-department/planning-housing/planning-services/general-plan-precise-plans/general-plan>.

Because mineral, gas, and oil resources are absent from Redwood City, the proposed project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource of value to the region or state, nor would it result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur with the implementation of the proposed project and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE: Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project result in:

- a. **Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would generate noise from construction equipment and vehicles. Upon the completion of construction, the predominant source of noise in the project vicinity would be generated from ferry operations, traffic associated with vehicle trips to and from the project site, and on-site activity within the project site. This may increase noise levels; therefore, a noise analysis will be prepared to determine if the proposed project would result in significant impacts associated with construction and/or operational noise. Noise impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

- b. **Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project could generate vibration from heavy equipment and activities such as pile driving and soil compacting. A vibration analysis will be prepared to determine if the level of groundborne vibration and or groundborne noise generated during construction would be excessive. This is considered a potentially significant impact and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

Operation of the proposed project would not perceptibly increase groundborne vibration or groundborne noise due to the nature of the proposed project (i.e., there are no notable sources of vibration associated with the proposed ferry terminal, ferry operations, access improvements, or visitor-serving amenities). Therefore, groundborne vibration and or groundborne noise levels generated during project operation would be less than significant and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

- c. **For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

Less than Significant Impact. The San Carlos Airport is approximately three miles from the project area in San Carlos, California. The airport is classified as a Local Reliever Airport that serves general aviation flights and provides improved general aviation access to the community. As discussed in Item IX.e. above, the project site is located within the AIA as identified in the ALUCP for the environs of the San Carlos Airport.⁶³ The AIA is broken down into Area A, which requires real estate disclosure of the presence of the airport; and Area B, which requires new plans and projects to demonstrate consistency with the goals and policies of the ALUCP. Area A includes the project area, except for the shipping lanes in San Francisco Bay, and a large portion of San Mateo County; Area A is outside of the airport noise contours. Given that the project area is approximately three miles from the airport and outside of the airport noise contours, the construction and operation of the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from airport operations. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to excessive noise associated with airstrips or airports. While the impact is expected to be less than significant, it will be evaluated further in the EIR.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

⁶³ City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. October 2015. Final Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Carlos Airport. Prepared by ESA. Available: https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/SQL_FinalALUCP_Oct15_read.pdf.

Would the project:

- a. **Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

No Impact. The proposed project would not establish new residential uses or sufficient new employment opportunities that would result in the relocation of substantial numbers of people from outside of the region. While the proposed project would include roadway access improvements, public transit access improvements, and the establishment of utilities at the project site, these improvements would not have a direct or indirect impact on unplanned population growth.

The proposed project would result in temporary construction jobs, but the project is in a well-established urban community that has a large population base and large workforce. The U.S. Census estimates the City population was 80,512 in 2022 and the San Mateo County population was 726,353. Given the relatively common nature of the construction anticipated, there would be a sufficient existing labor market in the City and the region as a whole to fill the jobs. If some of the construction workers do live outside of the local area, these workers would not be likely to relocate given the short-term duration of the jobs and a challenging housing market. Those workers would instead be expected to commute rather than relocate such as that substantial population growth would occur. Commuting occurs regularly in the region; the City's Housing Element identifies that in 2018, Redwood City had 40,418 workers living within the City borders and an estimated 69,400 jobs.⁶⁴ Plan Bay Area 2050 identifies that there were four million jobs within the Bay Area in 2015 with an expected increase of 1.4 million jobs in 2050. Of this increase, eight percent or 112,000 new jobs are projected for San Mateo County by 2050.⁶⁵ Therefore, employment growth is planned in the region and the proposed project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth.

Operation of the proposed project would result in new employment opportunities. However, operation of the ferry terminal is not anticipated to substantially increase the number of employees to support maintenance and/or operational functions of the ferry terminal and associated facilities because, as described above, there is a large existing labor pool in the region. The ferry terminal itself would not be staffed and any new employment opportunities associated with the terminal would likely be in the ferry industry across WETA's service area. This would include ferry operators, as well as on-board support for operation, passenger assistance, ticketing, and maintenance. It is anticipated that 8 crews of four people would be needed for ferry operations. Existing ferry operators are not large employers in the context of overall employment in the region and employees may not necessarily live in Redwood City. However, these new employees may include people currently residing in the region. Additionally, any job opportunities that are created as a result of the proposed project are anticipated to occur incrementally as the full buildout service is expected to be phased in over time. As such, the proposed project would not result in a substantial number of new employees in Redwood City, and, therefore, would not result in unplanned population growth.

⁶⁴ Redwood City. February 13, 2023. 2023 – 2031 Housing Element. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/26396/638137962943070000>.

⁶⁵ Association of Bay Area Governments. October 21, 2021. Plan Bay Area 2050. Available: [Plan Bay Area 2050 October 2021.pdf \(planbayarea.org\)](https://planbayarea.org).

The operation of recreation and visitor-serving uses would also result in up to approximately 400 new employment opportunities associated with the hotel and related facilities, restaurant, and the limited office uses. Given the proposed project's location within a well-established urban community with a large population base, existing housing stock, and established infrastructure, new employment demand would likely be met within the existing and future labor market in the City and the region. As described above, the projected job growth in San Mateo County is 112,000 new jobs by 2050. The proposed project would be consistent with this planned growth in employment and would not induce substantial new unplanned population growth.

Implementation of the proposed project would require new infrastructure to improve site access and establish utilities at the project site. The new access and infrastructure would only serve the project area and would not encourage or facilitate substantial population growth in the vicinity. The establishment of a new water transit service would expand commuting options in the Bay Area, and as such, could result in a small number of commuters choosing to relocate because of new transit options. However, given the large population base within the Bay Area, any population changes as a result of new employment opportunities and/or expanded public transit options from the proposed project would be insignificant compared to the number of people projected to move to the City, County, and the region in general.

As such, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, resulting in no impact. No further evaluation in the EIR is required.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. No existing housing is located at, or in the vicinity of, the project area. Therefore, no displacement of existing people or housing would occur and no construction of replacement housing would be required. There would be no impact and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

- a. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

i. **Fire protection?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Redwood City Fire Department (Fire Department) provides fire protection and emergency response services to the City and the nearby City of San Carlos. The project site is in Fire District #9,⁶⁶ which is serviced by Fire Station #9 (755 Marshall Street) located 2.7 miles southwest of the project site. Fire Station #9 is the department headquarters and is equipped with several engines, trucks, and a fire boat. Station #9 also houses the Alternate Emergency Operations Center for Redwood City and the Alternate Fire Dispatch Center for San Mateo County Communications.

The proposed project would be designed to meet current fire safety codes, including access requirements and fire suppression and emergency response systems. In addition, the Redwood City Fire Department would check and review site design plans for compliance with appropriate safety codes prior to construction.

The Fire Department has a daily staffing requirement of a minimum of 20 on-duty staff per day, which facilitates reaching a goal of responding to calls for service within five minutes at least 85 percent of the time.⁶⁷ The proposed project is not expected to increase fire response times because it is located within the existing service area of the Fire Department and it would include site access improvements, including a widening of Seaport Boulevard. The proposed ferry terminal and visitor-serving uses would require additional fire protection; however, this increase in demand for personnel, equipment, facilities, or firefighting capabilities is expected to be minimal, as the project area is already served by the Fire Department, and the existing land station and fireboat serving the project site are located in the vicinity. Thus, the proposed project is not expected to require new or physically altered fire protection facilities or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities that could cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant. However, because roadway modification would be implemented and new uses would be established at the project site, the potential for a significant impact to occur relative to fire services will be evaluated in the EIR.

⁶⁶ Redwood City. 2023. Redwood City Community GIS tool Fire District Layer. Available: <http://webgis.redwoodcity.org/community/>. Accessed November 6, 2023.

⁶⁷ Redwood City. 2023. Redwood City Focused General Plan Update Final EIR. State Clearinghouse Number 2022100449.

ii. Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Redwood City Police Department headquarters is approximately two miles southwest of the project site at 1301 Maple Street in Redwood City. The Department polices a 19 square-mile area that includes the project site. The Redwood City Police Department Patrol Unit has a Marine Unit that is responsible for investigating crimes and conducting marine rescues occurring on areas of the San Francisco Bay south of the San Mateo Bridge. The Unit also tows abandoned boats and assists the U.S. Coast Guard and other agencies as needed.

The General Plan identifies that local response times standard of responding to emergency calls and arriving on scene within five minutes are currently being exceeded.⁶⁸

The proposed ferry terminal and visitor-serving uses would require additional police protection, although this increase in demand is expected to be minimal as the project site is already served by the Police Department. Thus, the proposed project is not expected to require new or physically altered police protection facilities or the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities that could cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, it is expected that the proposed project would have less than significant impacts. However, because roadway modification would be implemented and new uses would be established at the project site, the potential for a significant impact to occur relative to police protection will be evaluated in the EIR.

iii. Schools?

No Impact. The demand for new schools is generally associated with increases in the school-aged population or decreases in the accessibility and availability of existing schools. The proposed project consists of a new ferry terminal, access improvements, and visitor-serving uses, and would not include residential uses that could increase school-age population or modify school facilities in the area. The proposed project could result in a small increase in the number of employees in the region, but there is a large existing labor pool in the local area and region as a whole and no substantial change in population is expected to occur. Thus, no increased demand on schools is anticipated. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact with respect to new or altered school facilities that could cause significant environmental impacts and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

iv. Parks?

Potentially Significant Impact. Generally, an increase in demand for parks is associated with population growth within a given area. Because the proposed project would not result in notable population growth within the City, it is unlikely that it would increase the citywide demand for parks and open space. However, as discussed further under Items XVI.a. and b. below, the proposed project would result in access and connectivity improvements, including expansion of the Bay Trail. The expansion of the Bay Trail could result in an increase in park users. This potential increase is expected to be small and not result in an increased demand for parks. However, the construction of the proposed project, including the trail expansion, would result in potentially significant impacts and therefore, the potential impacts of construction and operation of the proposed project relative to parks will be further evaluated in the EIR.

⁶⁸ Redwood City. 2023. Redwood City Focused General Plan Update Final EIR. State Clearinghouse Number 2022100449.

v. Other public facilities?

No Impact. The proposed project would not increase population growth; thus, it would not require expansion of any public services such as libraries or hospitals. Therefore, no increased demand on other public facilities is anticipated. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact with respect to new or altered other public facilities that could cause significant environmental impacts and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

XVI. RECREATION

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project area is located in the vicinity of many parks and recreational resources, and includes a portion of the waterfront park and Bay Trail immediately to the southeast of the project site. Bair and Greco Islands are also located to the northwest and northeast of the project area, respectively. These islands are part of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, which allows for waterfowl hunting.⁶⁹ Additionally, the Bair Island Trail provides public hiking access to the southern-most portion of the island, approximately 1.5 miles away from the project site.⁷⁰ In addition, kayakers, rowers, and boaters use the adjacent Redwood Creek and Westpoint Slough for recreational uses.

The proposed project would include a ferry terminal that would provide service between Redwood City and San Francisco and Oakland and would also establish access improvements and visitor-serving uses. The ferry service would begin as a commute-period only service that is likely to shuttle commuters, rather than recreationalists. Commuters coming from San Francisco and/or Oakland to work in the commercial campuses are likely existing employees who may already use neighboring parks, trails, and other recreational opportunities during their lunch hours and/or before or after work. Increased ferry service

⁶⁹ USFWS. Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge – Waterfowl Hunting Program webpage. Available: <https://www.fws.gov/refuge/don-edwards-san-francisco-bay/visit-us/activities/hunting>. Accessed December 1, 2023.

⁷⁰ USFWS. Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge – Trails webpage. Available: <https://www.fws.gov/refuge/don-edwards-san-francisco-bay/visit-us/trails>. Accessed December 1, 2023.

would be phased in over time and may include midday and weekend service. This could increase the number of visitors to Redwood City that take advantage of recreational resources, including those near the project site (the Bay Trail, waterfront park, and waterways), and within the greater region.

The proposed project would also improve connectivity to the waterfront at and near the project area by establishing improved multimodal connectivity to the new ferry terminal and the waterfront park, and by expanding the Bay Trail and providing new visitor-serving uses, including a hotel. This could increase the number of visitors coming to the area to use the recreational resources. Additionally, the proposed hotel use could increase the length of time that visitors are in the area. Nonetheless, given the large number of existing parks in the area and the amenities currently provided, it is unlikely that implementation of the proposed project would result in a substantial physical deterioration of local parks, trails, and other recreational facilities.

The proposed project is not expected to result in substantial physical deterioration as result of increased use of recreational facilities. However, given the prominence of existing recreational resources in the project area and the proposed access and connectivity improvements, this topic will be further evaluated in the EIR. The EIR will also evaluate if the transiting of ferries to and from the ferry terminal would result in the physical deterioration of adjacent recreational uses, including Bair and Greco Islands and the local waterways.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to the project site. This includes a new Class I bicycle trail and sidewalk on the western portion of the Seaport Boulevard loop. Bicyclists and pedestrians would benefit from improved connectivity to the ferry terminal, the waterfront park, and the Bay Trail. The proposed project also includes the expansion of the Bay Trail from the existing trail terminus in the waterfront park to the ferry terminal. Construction and operation of those recreational facilities are evaluated in this IS as part of the overall proposed project. As identified herein, construction and operation of the proposed project, including the proposed recreational facilities, may have an adverse impact on the environment and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would include construction of a new ferry terminal, new visitor-serving uses, and recreational improvements. There would also be ground access improvements, including widening of Seaport Boulevard loop to accommodate a new bicycle trail and sidewalk. The ground access improvements are expected to improve area circulation and provide multimodal options and are thereby not expected to conflict with a program, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. Further, the new ferry service would provide a new mode of transportation in the region which is expected to reduce VMT while offering a new transit option connecting Redwood City to Oakland and/or San Francisco. While bicycle access to the ferry terminal and secure parking for bicycle/micromobility devices (such as scooters) would be constructed and transit options such as bus and shuttle service to the project site are expected to be established, vehicle trips to the project site would increase from ferry passengers who park vehicles on-site and visitors and employees associated with the visitor-serving uses and limited office.

RWCmoves (2018) is Redwood City's Transportation Plan. Within the plan, "Signature Projects" are identified as proposed projects that would initiate major changes to infrastructure, such as railroad grade separations, redesigned interchanges, or new transit services and stations. Signature projects represent some of the larger and more complex concepts identified during development of the Plan. Commuter Ferry Service is listed as Redwood City Signature Project #62 and is one of ten that made RWCmoves final list of proposed Signature Projects.⁷¹ The proposed project is also in sync with Redwood City's pedestrian and bicycle plan, RWC Walk Bike Thrive (2022), as it would expand the Class I shared-use bicycle and pedestrian Bay Trail.^{72,73} The 2010 Redwood City General Plan makes frequent reference to development of a commuter ferry service.⁷⁴ Ferry service is listed as one of many integral modes in the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (2017).⁷⁵ The 2021 San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan lists ferry service, in conjunction with bicycle and pedestrian connections, as instrumental

⁷¹ Redwood City. July 2018. RWCmoves. Available: <https://rwcmoves.com/final-plan>.

⁷² Redwood City. June 2022. RWC Walk Bike Thrive. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/25615/638016840641870000>.

⁷³ Redwood City. 2023. RWC Walk Bike Thrive Plan Explore interactive map. Available: <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/85e4e2668ff147378b141da82cae7039>. Accessed November 9, 2023.

⁷⁴ Redwood City. 2010. Redwood City General Plan. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/departments/community-development-department/planning-housing/planning-services/general-plan-precise-plans/general-plan>.

⁷⁵ City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. 2017. San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan 2040. Available: https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/SMCTP-2040-FINAL_.pdf.

in reducing trips by private vehicles.⁷⁶ In addition, WETA's 2016 Strategic Plan envisions ferry service as a part of the future critical emergency response.⁷⁷

A traffic analysis will be prepared for the proposed project to assess changes in VMT and travel patterns associated with the proposed project and to determine if impacts are potentially significant. As part of this analysis, further analysis will be conducted to determine if the proposed project could conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subsection (b)?

Potentially Significant Impact. Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines provides criteria for analyzing transportation impacts that apply to land use projects and transportation projects, with the main focus of the impacts analysis being on VMT.

The proposed project is located within Redwood City and is subject to the Redwood City Transportation Analysis Manual (TAM). The TAM is Appendix F in RWCMoves and provides the technical approach for evaluating projects and their effects on the City's transportation system and services. The TAM provides the required methodology and thresholds with which to evaluate VMT impacts consistent with the latest CEQA Guidelines.⁷⁸

As identified above, the proposed project would generate new vehicle trips to the area during operation as it would be adding ferry service and visitor-serving uses and limited office; however, the establishment of new ferry service may also reduce vehicle trips and VMT in the project area and within the greater region. A traffic analysis will be prepared for the proposed project consistent with the TAM to assess changes in VMT associated with the proposed project. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project includes roadway and access improvements, including widening of the western portion of the Seaport Boulevard loop to provide a Class I bicycle trail and sidewalk. Additionally, the southwestern driveway to the public park east of the project site off Seaport Boulevard would be reconfigured to provide a connecting roadway between Seaport Boulevard and the project site. A portion of the public parking lot would also have to be reconfigured to accommodate this connection, resulting in the elimination of one of two entrances to the parking lot and removal of five parking stalls. The portion of the existing railroad east of the project site would be abandoned and relocated so entrance to the project site would not have a railroad crossing. A new switch and new track would be constructed at the existing track east of the CEMEX marine terminal. No railroad

⁷⁶ City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. 2021. San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. 2021. Available: <https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/San-Mateo-County-Comprehensive-Bicycle-and-Pedestrian-Plan-Update-Final-Plan.pdf>.

⁷⁷ Water Emergency Transportation Authority. 2016. 2016 Strategic Plan. Available: <https://weta.sanfranciscobayferry.com/sites/default/files/weta/strategicplan/WETAstrategicPlanFinal.pdf>. Accessed November 9, 2023.

⁷⁸ Redwood City. July 21, 2020. RWCMoves Appendix F, Redwood City Transportation Analysis Manual. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/22106/637311118467370000>.

crossings of public streets would occur. Frontage Road would continue to connect to the CEMEX marine terminal south of the project site, but this road would not connect to the project site. While all roadway, site access improvements, and rail road modifications would occur in compliance with engineering and design safety standards, and no hazardous design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses are proposed, further evaluation will be required in the EIR to determine if construction and operation of these improvements would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed under Item IX.f. above, emergency vehicle access to the project site would be from Seaport Boulevard. The proposed project would widen Seaport Boulevard to public street standards which would contribute to improved accessibility for emergency responders. However, during construction, temporary lane closures would be required. Any on-street construction activities or closures would conform to traffic work plan and access standards and construction contractor(s) would be required to notify emergency response providers prior to construction activities in the roadways so that appropriate alternative routes could be planned or established by the emergency response providers, if warranted. Therefore, construction of the proposed project is expected to have a less than significant impact on emergency response. However, this will be further evaluated in the EIR.

All roadway, project site access improvements, and new development would be required to comply with state and local fire and building codes which would ensure that emergency access would be available. Site access modifications would include abandonment of Frontage Road adjacent to the CEMEX marine terminal site and it would not connect with the project access road or project site. The improved access into the project site would ensure that adequate emergency access is available from Seaport Boulevard and would not be negatively affected by the loss of access from Frontage Road. The portion of the railway that extends east of the project site would be abandoned and an equivalent length of track relocated to the portion of Frontage Road to be abandoned. The relocated tracks would not cross any public roads or otherwise affect emergency access.

The roadway improvements would be designed to handle the increase of people using the ferry system, visitor-serving uses, and limited office. All project facilities would comply with applicable federal and state design standards. The project design plans would be reviewed by the City Building Division for compliance with accessibility requirements and the Fire Department would review project design plans to ensure compliance with requirements for adequacy of emergency vehicle access.

In addition, one of the goals of the proposed project is to provide an alternative form of transit for commuter travel that would be able to continue to operate in the event of a natural or human-made emergency event or catastrophe that disables roads, other transit, bridges, or tunnels. Given the Bay Area's susceptibility to earthquakes and proximity to water, the new ferry service would provide a viable transit option that would be expected to be able to continue operations after such an emergency event, unless severe unanticipated damage to the terminal facilities were to occur.

Because all roadway and site access modifications would comply with emergency access requirements and the proposed project would provide a new transit option in the event of an emergency event, impacts are expected to be less than significant. However, as part of the evaluation of transportation impacts, the

potential for construction and operation of the proposed project to result in inadequate emergency access will be further evaluated in the EIR.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

- a. **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:**
 - i. **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or**
 - ii. **A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.**

Potentially Significant Impact (Items a.i-a.ii). The project area is located in a developed area that was previously graded and disturbed. However, the potential for construction of the proposed project to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource—defined in PRC Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and

scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe—will be evaluated in the EIR. Specifically, the EIR will evaluate whether construction of the proposed project would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is: (1) listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k); or (2) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, with consideration of the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. Thus, construction of the proposed project would have potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

Operation of the proposed project would not require any ground disturbance other than periodic maintenance dredging to remove sediments that continually and gradually accumulate between dredging events. This would result in removal of recent sediment accumulation to maintain the ferry terminal's design depth, and, therefore, no impacts on tribal cultural resources from project operation are anticipated and will not be further evaluated in the EIR.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, or local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

- a. **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**
- b. **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?**
- c. **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

Potentially Significant Impacts (Items a-c). The current leaseholder is in the process of filling a stormwater ditch and installing a drainage pipe to convey stormwater from the project site to an outlet in Westpoint Slough. The project site does not have any other existing utility connections. New connections to the existing utility network would be required to serve landside and waterside elements, including electrical, communication, and water utilities. Electric utilities would be required to operate the adjustable boarding ramp lift system, lighting, and vessel lay berth shore power. Lighting would be provided on the access pier, gangway and float, passenger waiting area, and the parking lot. Potable water would be used for hose bibs on the float. Additionally, all new development on-site, including the hotel, restaurant, and limited office, would require new utility connections. General operations and a fire water system would be established, consistent with Redwood City Fire Department requirements. Communication utilities would be provided to operate the security system, public address system, Clipper card readers, and to connect to the hotel and limited office uses.

Construction of expanded utilities are evaluated in this IS as part of the overall project. As identified herein, construction and operation of the proposed project, including new utilities, may have an adverse impact on the environment and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

During construction, water would be used for various purposes, primarily for dust suppression, which is generally performed by water trucks, but it would also be used for mixing and pouring concrete, soil compaction, and other construction activities. Water usage during construction would be temporary and insubstantial and would not exceed the existing supply. Water used for dust suppression percolates into the ground after use or evaporates, requiring no wastewater treatment.

Operation of the proposed project would result in new water demand and wastewater generation associated with new development, including the hotel, restaurant, and limited office. The capacity of the local water supply and the capacity of local wastewater infrastructure to accommodate this new water demand and wastewater generation will be evaluated in the EIR. Thus, the proposed project would have potentially significant impacts relative to construction of new utilities at the project site and potentially significant impacts during operations relative to water supply and wastewater generation and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

- d. **Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**
- e. **Comply with federal, state, or local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

Less Than Significant Impact (Items d and e). The proposed project would generate a small amount of construction debris from site clearing, existing dock removal, dredged material, and new construction. This material would be recycled or reused to the degree feasible in compliance with Redwood City requirements set forth in Chapter 9, Article XI of the municipal code. Redwood City requires a minimum of 60 percent of total construction and demolition waste and 100 percent of inert solids (non-liquid solid waste including, but not limited to, soil and concrete, that does not contain hazardous waste or soluble pollutants) to be recycled or salvaged. Compliance with this requirement would reduce the amount of material requiring landfill disposal.

Operation of the proposed project would generate increased amounts of solid waste as compared to the existing development, as the proposed project would include new uses, such as ferry service, a hotel, limited office, and restroom (both portable and permanent) that would generate solid waste.

Approximately 90 percent of the solid waste collected in Redwood City is sent to Corinda Los Trancos (Ox Mountain) Sanitary Landfill. Corinda Los Trancos has an estimated capacity of 22,180,000 tons and an estimated closure date of January 2034. Solid waste generation from project construction and operation would not exceed permitted landfill capacity. Further, the proposed project would be required to comply with waste reduction and diversion requirements, which would reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal in a landfill. This includes compliance with AB 939, the California Solid Waste Management Act, which requires each city in the state to divert at least 50 percent of their solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. Therefore, impacts related to solid waste are considered less than significant. However, these impacts will be evaluated further in the EIR.

XX. WILDFIRE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structure to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:

- a. **Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**
- b. **Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**
- c. **Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**
- d. **Expose people or structure to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

No Impact (Items a-d). Public Resources Code Sections 4201–4204 direct CalFire to map fire hazards based on relevant factors such as fuels, terrain, and weather. CalFire, through its Fire and Resources Assessment Program (FRAP), has mapped areas of significant fire hazards throughout the state. As such, CalFire establishes local and state responsibility areas for wildfire protection and identifies areas within fire hazard severity zones (FHSZ)—classified as moderate, high, and very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ).

The project area is not included in the CalFire mapping tool since it is not in a State Responsibility Area (SRA), areas where CalFire is the primary emergency response agency responsible for fire suppression and prevention. According to the CalFire SRA viewer, the project area is in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA).⁷⁹ However, the San Mateo County Executive’s Office Multijurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Resources interactive Hazard Mapping Tool shows that the proposed project area is not within a FHSZ and, therefore, is not within a VHFHSZ.⁸⁰ Furthermore, San Mateo County maps the broad scope of potential fire hazards within county limits and defines areas in selected wildfire hazard areas. The project area is not located within a County-designated wildfire severity zone. The project area and surrounding area are flat and not located near steep slopes that could exacerbate wildfire risk or contribute to post-fire hazards, such as erosion and slope instability. Additionally, there is limited vegetation in the project area that could contribute to the spread of wildfire. According to the U.S. Census Urban Area Maps, the project area is designated as an urbanized area⁸¹ and is not within the wildland-urban interface, areas where structures meet or intermingle with wildland vegetation and therefore experience wildfires more often.⁸² In summary, the project area is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as VHFHSZ; therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts related to wildfire and no further evaluation in the EIR is required.

⁷⁹ California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2023. State Responsibility Area (SRA) Viewer interactive map. Available: <https://bof.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer/>. Accessed November 2, 2023.

⁸⁰ San Mateo County Executive’s Office. 2023. Multijurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Resources Hazard Mapping Tool. Available: <https://www.smcgov.org/ceo/multijurisdictional-local-hazard-mitigation-plan-resources>. Accessed November 2, 2023.

⁸¹ United States Census Bureau. 2021. 2010 Census Urban Area Reference Maps. Map ua78904_san_francisco—oakland_ca/ section 7. Available: <https://www.census.gov/geographies/reference-maps/2010/geo/2010-census-urban-areas.html>. Accessed November 2, 2023.

⁸² U.S. Fire Administration. 2022. What is the WUI? webpage. Available: <https://www.usfa.fema.gov/wui/what-is-the-wui.html>. Accessed December 1, 2023.

Emergency evacuation will be discussed further in the EIR as part of the transportation analysis.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Potentially Significant Impact. As described in this IS, the proposed project could result in significant impacts on the quality of the environment with regard to several resource areas including biological resources and cultural resources. These potential impacts will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Cumulative impacts are defined as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.”⁸³ In accordance with CEQA, the lead agency must consider whether a cumulative impact is

⁸³ 14 California Code of Regulations. Section 15355, Cumulative Impacts.

significant and, if so, whether the project's incremental contribution to that impact is cumulatively considerable.

The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, has the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts when the independent impacts of the proposed project and the impacts of cumulative projects combine to create impacts greater than those of the proposed project alone. A list of the cumulative projects or growth projections will be developed for the EIR. Environmental factors associated with the proposed project determined as having "No Impact" would, by definition, not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Project-related environmental factors identified as being a "Less than Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Impact" will be further evaluated in the EIR, which will include analysis of cumulative impacts.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project could result in environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly; therefore, environmental impacts from the proposed project will be evaluated in the EIR.

Section 5

List of Preparers and Contributors

Lead Agency

Port of Redwood City

675 Seaport Boulevard

Redwood City, CA 94063

Kristine Zortman – Executive Director

Don Snaman – Project Manager

Initial Study Preparation

CDM Smith

220 Montgomery Street, Suite 1418

San Francisco, California 94104

Bill Hurrell – Project Manager

Katie Owston – CEQA Manager

Emma Argiroff – Environmental Planner

Questa Gleason – Environmental Planner

PlaceWorks

2040 Bancroft Way, Suite 400

Berkeley, California 94704

Lance Park – Air Quality Specialist

Erika Lindstrom – Environmental Planner

JBG Environmental

4368 Niagara Avenue

San Diego, California 92107

Julie Gaa – CEQA Specialist

Section 6

Acronyms

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AIA	Airport Influence Area
ALON	aluminum oxynitride
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ATCM	Airborne Toxic Control Measure
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BCDC	San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
BMP	Best Management Practices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalFire	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CBOMF	Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CGS	California Geological Survey
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EQ Zapp	California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application
EV	electric vehicle
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHSZ	fire hazard severity zones
FRAP	Fire and Resources Assessment Program

GHG	greenhouse gas
GIS	geographic information system
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plans
hp	horsepower
IS	Initial Study
LRA	Local Responsibility Area
LUST	leaking underground storage tank
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NCCP	National Community Conservation Plan
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
O3	ozone
OES	Office of Emergency Services
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PM	particulate matter
PM2.5	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
PM-10	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
PRC	California Public Resources Code
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMCTA	San Mateo County Transportation Authority
SRA	State Responsibility Area
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAM	Transportation Analysis Manual
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VHFHSZ	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
WETA	Water Emergency Transportation Authority
ZEV	zero emission vessel

Section 7

References

14 California Code of Regulations. Section 15355, Cumulative Impacts.

Association of Bay Area Governments. October 1, 2021. Plan Bay Area 2050. Available:
[Plan Bay Area 2050 October 2021.pdf \(planbayarea.org\)](https://www.planbayarea.org/plan-bay-area-2050-october-2021.pdf).

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). 2023. Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status. Available: <https://www.baaqmd.gov/about-air-quality/research-and-data/air-quality-standards-and-attainment-status>. Accessed November 30, 2023.

BAAQMD. 2017. Spare the Air, Cool the Climate. Final 2017 Clean Air Plan. Available:
<https://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a-proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?rev=8c588738a4fb455b9cabb27360409529>.

Bay Area Conservation Lands Network. 2023. Conservation Lands Network Explorer. Available:
<https://www.bayarealands.org/explorer-tool/>. Accessed December 8, 2023.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2023. Airborne Toxic Control Measures webpage. Available:
<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/airborne-toxic-control-measures>. Accessed November 30, 2023.

CARB. 2023. In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation webpage. Available:
<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/use-road-diesel-fueled-fleets-regulation>. Accessed November 30, 2023.

California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2023. State Responsibility Area (SRA) Viewer interactive map. Available: <https://bof.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer/>. Accessed November 2, 2023.

California Department of Conservation. 2023. California Important Farmland Finder. Available:
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed October 26, 2023.

California Department of Conservation. 2023 California Tsunami Maps. Available:
<https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps>. Accessed December 11, 2023.

California Department of Conservation California Geological Survey (CGS). 2023. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation EQ Zapp mapping tool. Available:
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>. Accessed November 27, 2023.

California Department of Conservation CGS. 2023. Fault Activity Map of California. Available:
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>. Accessed November 27, 2023.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2023. Biographic Information and Observation System (BIOS) Viewer. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/BIOS>. Accessed November 29, 2023.

- CDFW. 2023. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) Rarefind. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Maps-and-Data>. Accessed November 29, 2023.
- CDFW. 2023. Marine Protected Areas Frequently Asked Questions webpage. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/FAQs#27530610-what-are-marine-protected-areas-mpas->. Accessed December 8, 2023.
- CDFW. 2023. NCCP Plan Summaries webpage. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning/NCCP/Plans>. Accessed November 29, 2023.
- CDFW. 2023. Bair Island Ecological Reserve webpage. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Lands/Places-to-Visit/Bair-Island-ER#1049290-recreation>. Accessed December 6, 2023.
- CDFW. 2016. San Francisco Bay Marine Protected Areas website. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/San-Francisco-Bay#29097813-marine-protected-areas>. Accessed December 8, 2023.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2023. California State Scenic Highway System Map mapping tool. Available: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>. Accessed November 29, 2023.
- California Department of Water Resources. 2023. Groundwater Basin Boundary Assessment Tool. Available: <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/bbat/>. Accessed November 17, 2023.
- California Department of Water Resources. 2023. Groundwater Sustainability Plans webpage. Available: <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management/Groundwater-Sustainability-Plans>. Accessed November 17, 2023.
- California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2023. GeoTracker database. Available: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Accessed December 4, 2023.
- California Water Boards. 2021. San Mateo Plan Groundwater Subbasin (2-009.03). Available: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/groundwater/BasinLinks/San_Mateo_Plain_Basin.pdf.
- City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. 2021. San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. 2021. Available: <https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/San-Mateo-County-Comprehensive-Bicycle-and-Pedestrian-Plan-Update-Final-Plan.pdf>.
- City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. October 2015. Final Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Carlos Airport. Prepared by ESA. Available: https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/SQL_FinalALUCP_Oct15_read.pdf.
- City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. 2017. San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan 2040. Available: https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/SMCTP-2040-FINAL_.pdf.
- FEMA National Flood Insurance Program. April 2019. Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081CO189F.

- Port of Redwood City. 2022. Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Ready-Mix Concrete Plant Project. Prepared by Ascent Environmental. Available: <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2021120258>.
- Port of Redwood City. June 2, 2022. Redwood City Ferry Business Plan. Prepared by CDM Smith.
- Port of Redwood City. January 8, 2020. Port of Redwood City 2020 Vision Plan. Prepared by Vickerman & Associates, LLC. Available: [2020 Vision | Port of Redwood \(redwoodcityport.com\)](#).
- Port of Redwood City. November 2001. Mitigated Negative Declaration for the RMC Pacific Materials Construction Materials Park. Prepared by Science Applications International Corporation.
- Redwood City. February 13, 2023. 2023 – 2031 Housing Element. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/26396/638137962943070000>.
- Redwood City. 2023. RWC Walk Bike Thrive Plan Explore interactive map. Available: <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/85e4e2668ff147378b141da82cae7039>. Accessed November 9, 2023.
- Redwood City. June 2022. RWC Walk Bike Thrive. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/25615/638016840641870000>.
- Redwood City. July 21, 2020. RWCmoves Appendix F, Redwood City Transportation Analysis Manual. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/22106/637311118467370000>.
- Redwood City. July 2018. RWCmoves. Available: <https://rwcmoves.com/final-plan>.
- Redwood City. 2010. Redwood City General Plan. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/departments/community-development-department/planning-housing/planning-services/general-plan-precise-plans/general-plan>.
- Redwood City. 2023. Redwood City Community GIS tool. Available: <http://webgis.redwoodcity.org/community/>. Accessed November 27, 2023.
- Redwood City. 2023. Redwood City Focused General Plan Update Final EIR. State Clearinghouse Number 2022100449.
- Redwood City. 2020. Climate Action Plan. Available: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/22781/637426822669070000>.
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). September 2023. Draft San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan. Prepared by the Seaport Planning Advisory Committee. Available: <https://bcdcc.ca.gov/BPA/BPASEaportPlan.html>.
- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2023. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin. Available: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/basin_planning.html.

- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2022. Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (Order No. R2-2022-0018, NPDES Permit No. CAS612008). Available: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/board_decisions/adopted_orders/2022/R2-2022-0018.pdf.
- San Mateo County Executive's Office. 2023. Multijurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Resources Hazard Mapping Tool. Available: <https://www.smcgov.org/ceo/multijurisdictional-local-hazard-mitigation-plan-resources>. Accessed November 2, 2023.
- San Mateo County. 2022. Community Climate Action Plan. Available: <https://www.smcgov.org/media/73456/download?inline=>.
- San Mateo County. 2018. San Mateo Plan Groundwater Basin Assessment. Available: https://www.smcsustainability.org/wp-content/uploads/filebase/energy-water/groundwater/SMP-Groundwater-Basin-Assessment_July-2018.pdf.
- U.S. Fire Administration. 2022. What is the WUI? webpage. Available: <https://www.usfa.fema.gov/wui/what-is-the-wui.html>. Accessed December 1, 2023.
- United States Census Bureau. 2021. 2010 Census Urban Area Reference Maps. Map ua78904_san_francisco—oakland_ca/ section 7. Available: [2010 Census Urban Area Reference Maps](#). Accessed November 2, 2023.
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2023. Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge – Trails website. Available: [Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge | Visit Us - Trails | U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service \(fws.gov\)](#). Accessed December 1, 2023.
- USFWS. 2023. Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge – Waterfowl Hunting Program webpage. Available: <https://www.fws.gov/refuge/don-edwards-san-francisco-bay/visit-us/activities/hunting>. Accessed November 30, 2023.
- USFWS. 2023. National Wetlands Inventory Wetlands Mapper. Available: [Wetlands Mapper | U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service \(fws.gov\)](#). Accessed November 30, 2023.
- USFWS. 2012. The Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan for Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Available: <https://ecos.fws.gov/ServCat/DownloadFile/205121>.
- USFWS. N.d. Overview Map of Hunt Program - Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Available: https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/hunt_map1_overview_layout-508.pdf.
- Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA). 2024. Water Emergency Transportation Authority San Francisco Bay Ferry Service. Available: <https://weta.sanfranciscobayferry.com/>.
- Water Emergency Transportation Authority. 2016. 2016 Strategic Plan. Available: <https://weta.sanfranciscobayferry.com/sites/default/files/weta/strategicplan/WETAstrategicPlanFinal.pdf>. Accessed November 9, 2023.
- WRA Environmental Consultants. June 6, 2007. Biological Resources Assessment Redwood City Ferry Terminal, Port of Redwood City, San Mateo County California. Prepared for Michael Fajans, CHS Consulting Group, 130 Sutter Street, Suite 468, San Francisco CA 94104.