



Implementation Plan Update RFP – Response to Consultant Questions February 11, 2026

1. Could the City provide a link to the EIR prepared for the 2020 GP/LCP Update?

The Coastal Commission's process and review is considered CEQA-equivalent. No CEQA documents are required for Local Coastal Programs. The Implementation Plan also would not require a CEQA document. However, other municipal code updates included in this update will require an Initial Study at a minimum.

2. Is the City working with HCD and Coastal Commission on approval of an updated ADU ordinance, or would that be part of this project?

An updated ADU ordinance would be part of this project.

3. Is the City's GIS zoning layer parcel-based (i.e., zoning is identified as an attribute of each parcel/APN)?

No, the City's zoning layers are not parcel-based.

4. Has the City initiated any work or discussions with property owners regarding the development of a Transfer of Development Rights Program (LUP Policy 2-22)?

The City has not initiated any work or discussions regarding a TDR program. There is a chance that the Coastal Commission could require the City to develop a TDR program as described in the LUP policy; however, it is not a priority for the City in this Implementation Program update and was not called out in the LCP grant from the Coastal Commission. City staff would work with Coastal Commission staff to postpone the development of any such program.

5. Is the City requesting that specific noise standards be established for home occupations and short-term rentals that are more restrictive than Municipal Code Chapter 9.23 (Noise) (LUP Policies 2-75 and 2-76)?

The City is not requesting the development of noise standards. Like the response to #4 above, the Coastal Commission could require this, but it is not in the grant and City staff would work to postpone setting noise standards to a later date.

6. What is the amount of general fund dollars available for supplemental code amendments not included in the IP?

The City is interested in seeing estimates from consultants before committing to a specified maximum cost.

7. Please describe the anticipated role of the working group.

The working group is more like an Ad Hoc committee of the Planning Commission. There are two Planning Commissioners plus one staff member from the California Coastal Commission. This group would give early input, review, and comment on drafts before they are made public. We anticipate meetings approximately every other month and believe that this group's input will alleviate the need for more frequent check-ins with the Planning Commission and will make the LCP Certification process go smoothly with the Coastal Commission.

8. How many community meetings and decision maker study sessions does the City have in mind?

We anticipate that an outreach and engagement plan will develop a more complete scope for meetings and we can do some minor renegotiating for the number of meetings where the consultant is expected to attend. Generally, we find that large community meetings are not the draw they once were and that smaller workshops generate more engagement and meaningful participation. We expect that the code amendments will be broken into phases and that we would aim for something like two small community meetings for each phase, so three phases would be six meetings. Alternatively, two of the small meetings can be substituted for one larger meeting, for example to kick off the project.

The Planning Commission and Council can hold two joint workshops for their initial review. Again, if the project is phased, each phase requiring a vote would have at least one Planning Commission meeting and one Council meeting.

9. Bullet point on page 2 of the RFP states "consider mapping the Workforce Housing Overlay identified in the LUP. However, the LUP says:

"This overlay designation is unmapped and will be applied through policy to specific parcels or portions of parcels suitable for medium or high density residential development with Horticultural Business, Rural Coastal, Regional Public Recreation, or Public Facilities and Institutions land use designations. The residential development is intended to be affordable, and located within the underlying designations as follows:" (names three zoning districts)

Does the city have the data to support this mapping effort? The policy intent seems to indicate a "floating zone" that applicants could request if the property meets certain criteria. Is the City anticipating mapping all the areas that would be eligible, but not actually designated?

The City is considering mapping the workforce housing overlay, but we are not sure whether we will. If the City moves forward with mapping the overlay, we would likely map the designated areas only; however, we are not clear on whether HCD would impose more extensive mapping.

10. #6 on Page 10 of the RFP states "The Firm must provide "Certificate of Liability" on the limits of the individual professional liability insurance. Is a statement that the firm maintains commercial and professional liability insurance and if selected, a Certificate of Liability will be provided prior to commencement of work, adequate or does the City want a copy of the certificate included in the proposal?

For the purpose of submitting a proposal, it is fine to submit a statement that the firm maintains commercial and professional liability insurance that will be provided if selected.

11. Similar question regarding #7 on Page 10 of the RFP regarding the business license. Is a statement that if selected, each firm will obtain a Half Moon Bay business license adequate?

For the purpose of submitting a proposal, it is fine to submit a statement that the firm will obtain a Half Moon Bay business license. If selected, it is important to apply for the business license as soon as possible and ensure that the business license is active while working for the City.

12. Does the City have a general list of Municipal Code sections that will be updated outside of the Implementation Plan?

Title 14 (14.37) Architectural review (Create an architectural review and site plan review permit outside of the Coastal Development Permit requirements consistent with CCR Title 14, Section 13250, Coastal Act Section 30610

Title 15 Sign permits- clarify code and update to streamline review

Title 7 (7.40) Tree permits- update code

Title 3 (3.50) Mobile vendors- work with the City's Economic Development team to complete updates to the code that are consistent with state law and provide more reasonable provisions for food trucks and other mobile vendors.

13. What is the estimated budget associated with Task 5?

A budget of about \$10,000 assumes that the analysis will not extend beyond an Initial Study and Notice of Exemption for the four code sections outside of the Implementation Plan. The City recognizes that this estimate may require adjustment and can negotiate on this item.

14. Does the Implementation Plan anticipate new growth that was not accounted for in other plan-level documents?

No.

15. Does the City of Half Moon Bay have an in-house GIS specialist that the consultant may coordinate with for preparation of maps, or should the consultant assume full responsibility for GIS mapping?

City staff will provide the consultant with data files required for mapping. The consultant will perform the mapping.

16. If the consultant is expected to provide mapping services, are there existing City maintained GIS zoning maps and/or GIS layers that can be shared and used as a base for preparing updated maps and new map deliverables?

Yes. The City would provide necessary data to the consultant. See the [LUP maps](#) and/or the [online map application](#) for a look at some of the layers.

17. Does the City have an anticipated range or target number of community engagement events or meetings to be held as it pertains to the community outreach and engagement plan?

See answer to Question 8.

18. Does the City typically prepare CEQA documentation in-house, or should the proposal include a subconsultant for CEQA services?

The proposal should include a bid to complete the CEQA process, either within your own firm and with a subconsultant.

19. If a CEQA subconsultant is needed, does the City have an on-call list of environmental consulting firm(s) or preferred consultants that proposers should coordinate with?

The City does not have a list of preferred CEQA consultants.

20. Beyond the identified working group as noted in the RFP, does the City envision any other city or community based advisory commissions, committees, and/ or organizations that would require individual meetings with?

The City has not formed any groups beyond the working group. See answer to Question 8.

21. The cover page and two references on page 9 list the deadline as February 23 at 5:00 PM, while the bottom of page 9 states the deadline as March 2 at 5:00 PM. Could you please confirm the correct proposal due date?

Sorry for the confusion. The correct due date is February 23, 2026 at 5:00 PM.