# COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
# PLANNING DIVISION
(650) 330-6702

# ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:**
   110 and 175 Linfield Drive

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
   City of Menlo Park
   Community Development Department
   701 Laurel Drive
   Menlo Park, CA 94025

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
   Justin Murphy, (650) 330-6702

4. **Project Location:**
   110 & 175 Linfield Drive, Menlo Park, CA 94025

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
   110 Linfield Drive
   110 Linfield Project, LLC
   490 Grand Avenue, Suite 200
   Oakland, CA 94610
   (510) 452-1433

   175 Linfield Drive
   Consolidated Freightways
   Kevin Fryer
   115 SE 164th Avenue
   Vancouver Washington, 98683
   (925) 899-5065

6. **General Plan Designation:**
   Existing: Professional and Administrative Offices
   Proposed: Medium Density Residential

7. **Zoning:**
   110 Linfield Drive
   Existing Zoning: C-1 (Administrative and Professional, Restrictive)
   Proposed Zoning: R-3-X (Medium Density Residential - Conditional Development Permit)

   175 Linfield Drive
   Existing Zoning: C-1 (Administrative and Professional, Restrictive)
   Proposed Zoning: R-3-X (Medium Density Residential - Conditional Development Permit)

**8. Description of the Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)**

The project sites (5.36 acres total) are on Linfield Drive between Middlefield Road and Waverley Street. The sites are located generally across Linfield Drive from each other. The 2.07-acre 110 Linfield Drive site is north of Linfield Drive, and the 3.29-acre 175 Linfield Drive site is south of Linfield Drive. (In addition to the acreage within the site boundaries, the projects would affect 0.11 acre and 0.16 acre, respectively, of land within the Linfield Drive right of way. With this acreage, the total project area would be 5.63 acres.) The 110 Linfield Drive site is currently developed with a vacant, one-story, 17,500-square-foot masonry block building, a parking lot, and landscaped areas. The site is directly adjacent to and accessed from Homewood Place, a cul-de-sac along the site's western edge. The 175 Linfield Drive site is currently developed with a vacant, one-story 38,000-square-foot wood-framed office building, including a basement below the southeastern wing. The building is surrounded by a parking lot with driveways, and landscaped areas.

The project sponsors propose the following: to demolish the existing buildings on the project sites, remove 62 trees (including 50 heritage trees) and relocate 2 trees (including 1 heritage tree), construct 56 single-family detached homes (22 units at 110 Linfield and 34 units at 175 Linfield), construct private roads and guest parking spaces (18), provide about 32,250 square feet of landscaped common open space within the site boundaries and about 16,750 square feet of landscaped area within the Linfield right of way (a total of 49,000 square feet), and reduce the width of Linfield Drive along the projects' frontage.

In addition, the proposed projects involve the following applications:

1. Amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map to change the land use designations of the properties from Professional and Administrative Offices to Medium Density Residential
2. Amendments to the Zoning Map to change the zoning on the sites from C-1 (Administrative and Professional, Restrictive) to R-3-X (Medium-Density Residential – Conditional Development Permit)
3. Conditional Development Permits
4. Tentative Subdivision Maps
5. Narrowing the roadway along Linfield Drive
6. Heritage Tree Removal Permits

The proposed changes require a recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council. For graphics showing the sites and project characteristics, please see the attachments to this Initial Study.

**9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)**

The properties to the immediate east of the two project sites are zoned C-1 and contain office buildings and parking lots. The property immediately to the north of 110 Linfield Drive is zoned P-F (Public Facility) and contains an office building occupied by the United States Geological Service (USGS), while the property immediately to the west of 110 Linfield is zoned C-1 and contains a commercial building formerly occupied by the USGS. Apartment buildings (zoned R-3 [Medium Density Apartments]) are located immediately to the west of 175 Linfield Drive and an office building (zoned C-1) is located directly to the south of 175 Linfield Drive. San Francisquito Creek is approximately one-quarter mile south of the 175 Linfield Drive site.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

Menlo Park Fire Protection District
West Bay Sanitary District
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would 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.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | Land Use and Planning | ☐ | Biological Resources | ☑ | Aesthetics |
| ☐ | Population and Housing | ☐ | Energy and Mineral Resources | ☐ | Cultural Resources |
| ☐ | Geological Problems | ☐ | Hazards | ☐ | Recreation |
| ☐ | Water | ☐ | Noise | ☑ | Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| ☑ | Air Quality | ☐ | Public Services | | |
| ☑ | Transportation and Circulation | ☐ | Utilities and Service Systems | | |

**DETERMINATION**: (To be completed by the Lead Agency.)

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. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Signature | For the City of Menlo Park |
| Name, printed | Date |

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

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 will 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) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Potentially Significant Unless 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.

5) Earlier analysis 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.

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:** | | | | | |
| a. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? | | | **X** | | **1,2,3** |
| b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? | **X** | | | | **1,2,3** |
| c. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? | | | | **X** | **3** |
| d. Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impact to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? | | | | **X** | **4** |
| e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? | | | | **X** | **1,2,3** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**1a.** According to the Menlo Park *General Plan*, the 110 and 175 Linfield Drive project sites are designated for Professional and Administrative Offices and zoned C-1 (Administrative and Professional, Restrictive).[1,2] The proposed projects would not be consistent with the existing *General Plan* land use designations and zoning.

The project sponsors propose to amend the *General Plan* Land Use Map to change the land use designations from Professional and Administrative Offices to Medium Density Residential, and to amend the Zoning Map to change the zoning districts from C-1 to R-3-X (Medium-Density Residential – Conditional Development Permit.) The Conditional Development Permit would allow for adjustments to the zoning requirements in order to ensure special design features possible with the comprehensive planning of the sites. For both sites, this permit would be required to allow for a decrease in minimum lot size, a decrease in minimum lot dimensions, a decrease in setbacks, and encroachments into minimum garage dimensions.[3] Approval of the *General Plan* and Zoning amendments and the approval of Conditional Development permits would reconcile inconsistency with the *General Plan* and Zoning.

**1b.** Refer to **1a** and to the other subsections of this checklist**.** As discussed elsewhere in the checklist, the projects would not result in significant physical changes or issues in most environmental topic areas that could lead to policy inconsistencies. Therefore, the projects would not conflict with most of the applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the projects. The checklist indicates that there could be significant impacts in the areas of traffic, air quality, and aesthetics; consistency with policies in those areas will be considered as part of the analysis in the EIR.

**1c.** Existing land uses in the vicinity of the project sites include office buildings, apartment buildings, and parking lots. The proposed projects would consist of single-family units with private streets and common ownership areas. These residential units would range in size from 1,473 square feet to 1,950 square feet, and would be two- to three-stories tall (with a maximum height of 35 feet).[3] The proposed residential units would be similar in height to other office buildings in the vicinity, and slightly taller in comparison to other residential units in the surrounding area. Compatibility impacts related to noise are discussed in **Section 10: Noise**, and impacts related to air quality (including dust and odors) are discussed in **Section 5: Air Quality**.

**1d.** According to the San Mateo *Important Farmlands Map*, the project sites and adjacent sites are designated as Urban and Built-Up Land.[4] Furthermore, the project sites are fully developed with commercial buildings and paved roadways. Therefore, the proposed projects would not affect agricultural resources or operations.

**1e.** Typically, this issue relates to the construction of or placement of a dividing feature or barrier within an area of existing uses, such that the layout, land use pattern, or circulation within a community is affected. The project sites themselves do not constitute an established community, in that they are unoccupied office buildings. The projects would replace vacant office buildings with a

residential neighborhood, but there are already residential uses in the vicinity. The projects would result in the narrowing of a portion of Linfield Drive, but Linfield Drive would remain a public road and would still be available as a through street. Therefore, the proposed projects would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:** | | | | | |
| a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? | | | **X** | | **5,6,7** |
| b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or major infrastructure)? | | | **X** | | **1,2,3,5** |
| c. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? | | | | **X** | **3** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**2a, b.** Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in population of approximately 137 residents (based on 56 residential units with an average household size of 2.45).[5] This increase in population would be less than 1 percent of the estimated population of Menlo Park in 2004. (The 2004 population of Menlo Park was 30,400 persons, down from 30,450 persons in 2003.)[6]

According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 2003, the population in the City of Menlo Park (and its Sphere of Influence) is expected to grow to 31,700 persons by 2005.[5] Near-term residential development projects (other than the Linfield projects) include 329 net housing units, for a projected increase of 806 residents.[7] Thus, the cumulative population increase of the proposed projects and near-term development would equal 943 persons. With this increase, the population of Menlo Park would be 31,343, below the ABAG-projected population.

**2b.** Growth-inducement issues will be analyzed in the EIR. However, the proposed projects are not in an undeveloped area and would not alter or require alteration of existing infrastructure. The population accommodated by the projects would directly contribute to growth in Menlo Park, but the numbers would be small.

**2c.** The project sites are currently developed with office buildings. Implementation of the proposed project would replace the office buildings with 56 residential units.

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:** | | | | | |
| a. Fault rupture? | | | | **X** | **8** |
| b. Seismic ground shaking? | | | **X** | | **8** |
| c. Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | **X** | **8** |
| d. Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? | | | | **X** | **9** |
| e. Landslides or mudflows? | | | | **X** | **8** |
| f. Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill? | | **X** | | | **8,10** |
| g. Subsidence of the land? | | | | **X** | **8** |
| h. Expansive soils? | | **X** | | | **8** |
| i. Unique geologic or physical features? | | | | **X** | **10** |

**EXPLANATION:**

In 2002, Treadwell & Rollo prepared a *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* for the 175 Linfield Drive site.[8] The conclusions and recommendations in the investigation have been applied to both the 110 and 175 Linfield Drive sites. According to the investigation, proposed development was determined to be feasible from a geotechnical engineering standpoint. The primary geotechnical issue identified was the presence of moderately to highly expansive surface soil. Conformance with the measures included in the geotechnical investigation would reduce impacts from expansive soils to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, the projects are required to adhere to the current Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements, which are intended to reduce seismic risks to an acceptable level.[8] More detailed information from the investigation and analysis of the issues are detailed below.

**3a.** The major active faults in the vicinity are the Monte Vista (which is within the Santa Cruz Mountains), San Andreas, and Hayward Faults, all of which are 6 miles or more from the project sites. The project sites are outside any Earthquake Fault Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and no known active or potentially active fault exists on the project sites. The probability of fault rupture at the sites is low.[8]

**3b.** Strong to very strong ground shaking from a moderate to large earthquake on one of the nearby faults is likely to be felt at the project sites over the life of the projects. However, the projects are required to adhere to the current Uniform Building Code (UBC) regulations, which are intended to reduce seismic risks to an acceptable level. [8]

**3c.** Sand layers at the project sites are sufficiently dense and/or have sufficient cohesion to resist liquefaction. There is little to no potential for lateral spreading or differential compaction at the project sites. [8]

**3d.** Seiches are waves in enclosed bodies of water. Tsunamis are large oceanic waves. A review of area maps show that the project sites are not adjacent to any large enclosed bodies of water, and are over 10 miles from the Pacific Ocean. The United States Geologic Survey (USGS) map of California Volcanoes and Volcanics indicates that no volcanoes are within 50 miles of the project sites.[9]

**3e.** The project sites are flat and are not adjacent to any steep slopes. There is little to no potential for landslides or mudflows to occur at the project sites.[8]

**3f.** The project sites are flat and are not adjacent to any steep slopes. Both projects would require minor grading to create flat lots for the proposed homes, and there would be only minor changes in ground elevation. Therefore, there is little to no potential for impacts related to erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions.[8,10]

**3g.** See **3c.** There is little to no potential for subsidence at the project sites.[8]

**3h.** The 175 Linfield Drive project site is blanketed by about 9 to 14 feet of very stiff to hard, moderately to highly expansive clay, which is subject to volume changes during seasonal fluctuations in moisture content. Conditions at the 110 Linfield Drive project site are likely to be similar in nature. These volume changes can cause cracking of foundations, floor slabs, and sidewalks, as well as distortion to building frames. The presence of expansive soils is considered a potentially significant impact without mitigation; this impact would apply to both projects. Measures such as site preparation and grading techniques, specific foundation design, concrete slab-on-grade floors, a capillary moisture barrier, and adherence with UBC seismic design as shown in the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* (see **Mitigation Measure 3.1** below) would reduce impacts related to expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.[8]

**3i.** There are no unique geologic or physical features on the project sites, which have already been graded and developed.

**Mitigation Measure 3.1**

The project applicants shall incorporate all the recommend measures set forth in the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* prepared by Treadwell & Rollo. These recommended measures include: specific site preparation and grading techniques, specific foundations design (footings, post tension slab, drilled cast-in-place concrete piers), concrete slab-on-grade floors, a capillary moisture barrier, and adherence to UBC seismic design.[8]

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4. WATER. Would the proposal result in:** | | | | | |
| a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? | | | | **X** | **3,11,12** |
| b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? | | **X** | | | **11,13,14,15** |
| c. Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality, e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity? | | **X** | | | **16,17** |
| d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? | | | | **X** | **11** |
| e. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements? | | | | **X** | **11** |
| f. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? | | | | **X** | **11** |
| g. Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? | | | | **X** | **11** |
| h. Impacts to groundwater quality? | | **X** | | | **11** |
| i. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? | | | | **X** | **11** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**4a**. Locally, the project sites are located within the sub-watershed delineated by Middlefield Road, Ravenswood Avenue, the Caltrain tracks, and San Francisquito Creek. The storm drain system that drains runoff from the sub-watershed discharges into San Francisquito Creek at Middlefield Road.[11]

Currently, the two project sites include a series of on-site pipes and inlets that collect storm water from roofs and parking areas and then convey the storm water from the sites to the existing 27-inch storm drain line along Linfield Drive. The 27-inch pipe connects to a 36-inch storm drain line along Middlefield Road and then discharges to the creek approximately 1,500 feet to the south.[3] The 36-inch pipe discharges to San Francisquito Creek via two outfalls: a 36-inch outfall located at the end of Middlefield Road, and a 48-inch outfall located at the end of Baywood Avenue just downstream of the San Francisquito Bridge. The latter outfall was constructed as part of the drainage improvements for the Burgess Drive subdivision, located at the corner of Burgess Drive and Laurel Street.[11]

BKF Engineers conducted a citywide drainage study for the City of Menlo Park, with the purpose of identifying deficiencies in the existing storm drain system and developing a list of capital improvement projects and priorities related to these deficiencies. The study concluded that the Middlefield drainage system does not currently have sufficient flow capacity to handle the 10-year storm event. It is estimated that this system is capable of handling between 10 and 30 percent of the 10-year storm event, thereby indicating that the system floods at more frequent intervals than 10-year storms (more closely to the 2- and 3-year storm events).[11]

Problems in the system can be attributed to the insufficient capacity of the existing drainage infrastructure and the fact that Middlefield Road slopes away from San Francisquito Creek, causing flooding at the low points in the system. Additionally, during 10-year storm events, flows in San Francisquito Creek are near the top of the creek bank and thus limit flows in the storm drain line leading to the creek. Localized flooding occurs at Linfield Drive and Middlefield Road, Waverley Street and Linfield Drive, and Middlefield Road between Ravenswood Avenue and Oak Grove Avenue. During peak flows, Middlefield Road is closed in the vicinity of Menlo-Atherton High School.[11]

The citywide drainage study classified deficiencies in the Middlefield drainage system as Priority 2. Improvements identified as Priority 2 are intended to eliminate flooding that causes frequent closure of key roadways. The citywide drainage study recommended that a parallel storm drain be installed along Middlefield Road. The storm drain would connect to the recently constructed 48-inch diameter pipe and outfall at San Francisquito Creek. The proposed parallel storm drain would relieve flooding that requires road closures of Middlefield Road, Ravenswood Avenue, and Oak Grove Avenue. Funding for these improvements has not yet been allocated by the City.[11]

Project development at 110 Linfield Drive would result in a reduction in impervious surface area of about 1,410 square feet (2.8 percent) compared to existing conditions.[12] The weighted runoff coefficient, which is used to calculate peak flows from an area, would decrease slightly, from 0.59 to 0.58, and peak runoff flows would decrease by about 1 percent.[11]

The proposed drainage for the 110 Linfield Drive project would consist of a standard underground drainage system that would convey flows to the existing storm drain system at Linfield Drive. Yard, driveway and roof runoff would be collected from each residence and would discharge to the street. This flow would follow the curb until entering the underground pipe system. The system would be comprised of 24-inch storm drainpipes along the interior streets of the development and an 8-inch storm drainpipe at Homewood Place, where the drainage would be conveyed to Linfield Drive. The 8-inch pipe would constrict flows and allow for in-pipe detention on the project site.[11]

This detention system was designed for the purpose of detaining the 10-year storm event so as not to exceed the pre-development conditions off site in the Linfield Drive storm drainage system. However, the applicant has not determined the length of the 24-inch pipe needed to successfully detain the water on site, and therefore, has not demonstrated that the 10-year storm event would be detained on site. Given the existing drainage problems downstream of the project site, **Mitigation Measure 4.1** is required to ensure that the potential impact would be less than significant. Maintenance of the detention system would be the responsibility of the homeowners association (called a maintenance association) for the proposed project and would be included as part of the Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs) for the project.[11]

Development at 175 Linfield Drive would result in about 24,320 square feet (0.56 acre) less impervious surface area than under existing conditions (a 22.4 percent decrease).[12] The weighted runoff coefficient would decrease from 0.73 to 0.60 (by about 18 percent), and peak runoff flows would decrease by roughly 10 percent to 15 percent. The proposed drainage system at 175 Linfield Drive includes a series of 12-, 15- and 24-inch storm drainpipes that would collect water from the interior streets of the proposed development and a 10-inch pipe where the system is conveyed to Linfield Drive. The 10-inch pipe would constrict flows and allow for in-line pipe detention in the system similar to the system proposed at 110 Linfield Drive. The detention system would be maintained by the homeowners association (as a condition of project approval) and would further reduce peak flows discharged from the project site to the existing downstream storm drains. Therefore, the impact of the 175 Linfield project on downstream storm drainage would be less than significant.[11]

With development of either project, Linfield Drive would be narrowed, and the land outside the new edges of the roadway would be converted to landscaped right of way. This decrease in impervious surfaces would help to further reduce peak flows in the project area,

**4b**. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) indicate that the project site is located outside of the 100-year floodplain for San Francisquito Creek.[13] However, as previously mentioned, the Middlefield Drainage System has been characterized as having inadequate flow conveyance capacity for the peak flow for the 10-year storm event, resulting in localized flooding along Linfield Drive. Improvements have been identified to address the issue but the improvements have not been funded.[11] Therefore, there could be localized flooding in the vicinity of the project site, potentially affecting the proposed homes.

The City of Menlo Park standard is a minimum top-of-curb elevation of one foot above the storm drain hydraulic grade line (HGL, or water surface level) during a 10-year storm event. At the 110 Linfield site, the estimated future 10-year HGL along Linfield Drive would be 51.2 feet, but the proposed highest top-of-curb elevations along Linfield Drive be only 51.0 feet. To meet the City's top-of-curb requirement, the proposed highest top-of-curb elevation should be at least 52.2 feet. The proposed garage and finished floor elevations at the 110 Linfield project site would be at or above the 100-year HGL per FEMA standards, and thus would provide adequate protection.[14] **Mitigation Measure 4.2** would reduce the potential impacts from localized flooding at the 110 Linfield

project site to a less-than-significant level.

Although the grading plan for 175 Linfield Drive does not show proposed top-of-curb elevations along Linfield Drive, top-of-curb elevations along either side of the entrance to the access road are 50.3 feet. To meet the City's top-of-curb standard, the proposed highest top-of-curb elevation along Linfield Drive should be 51.2 feet. The proposed finished floor elevations would range from 52.7 feet to 54.9 feet.[15] As with the top-of-curb elevations, it is not clear whether the proposed finished floor elevations would be adequate. **Mitigation Measure 4.2** would also apply to the 175 Linfield project site and would reduce the potential impacts from localized flooding at to a less-than-significant level.

**4c**. The project sites are located within the San Francisquito Creek watershed. San Francisquito Creek is considered the last riparian free-flowing creek and the last remaining run of steelhead trout (a federally listed threatened species) on the southern peninsula of San Francisco Bay. The creek is currently listed as impaired by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) due to excessive sediment/and siltation. In October 2003, the RWQCB released the San Francisquito Creek Sediment Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Project Plan. The primary water quality objectives of the plan were to reduce turbidity, sediment, suspended material, and settleable material in the watershed.[16]

The Clean Water Act (CWA) has nationally regulated the discharge of pollutants to waters of the United States from any point source since 1972. In 1987, amendments to the CWA added section 402(p), which established a framework for regulating non-point source storm water discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).[17] The Phase I NDPES storm water program regulates storm water discharges from major industrial facilities, large and medium-sized municipal separate storm sewer systems (those serving more than 100,000 persons), and construction sites that disturb five or more acres of land.

To comply with the CWA, San Mateo County and the 20 cities and towns in the County formed the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP). STOPPP holds a joint municipal NPDES permit from the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The permit includes a comprehensive plan to reduce the discharge of pollutants to creeks, San Francisco Bay, and the ocean to the maximum extent possible.

The projects are required to comply with the Phase I NPDES program for construction activities. Construction activities that would be covered under the program include, but are not limited to: clearing, grading, demolition, excavation, construction of new structures, and reconstruction of existing facilities involving removal and replacement that results in soil disturbance. The project applicants can obtain coverage under the NPDES program by filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resource Control Board's Division of Water Quality Storm Water Permit Unit. Generally, a site is considered to be covered by the program upon filing the NOI and submitting the appropriate annual fee. The NOI must be submitted, and the permit obtained, before construction starts. In addition to submitting the NOI, the discharger must develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction activities and develop and implement a monitoring and reporting plan. The SWPPP is a documented step-by-step process that outlines the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented during construction to prevent sediment, hazardous materials, and other pollutants from entering the formal storm drain system. With the implementation of these requirements by both projects, construction-related impacts to water quality would be less than significant.[16]

Once the projects have been constructed, non-point source (NPS) pollutants from the project sites could have detrimental effects on downstream waters. NPS pollutants are washed by rainwater from residential areas, landscape areas, and streets and parking areas into the formal drainage network. The most common NPS pollutants are sediment and nutrients. Other common NPS pollutants include pesticides, salts, oil, grease, and heavy metals. Pollutants from the project sites would likely be consistent with suburban medium density residential areas, parking lots, and roads and would likely consist mostly of oil, grease, petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and possibly nutrients. NPS pollutants from site runoff could have detrimental effects on downstream waters and the water quality of San Francisquito Creek.

The City will require the applicants to implement water quality treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable, per the City's Grading and Drainage Plan Guidelines and Checklist.[18] This requirement has been incorporated into **Mitigation Measure 4.3** to reduce the potential water quality issues to a less-than-significant level.

**4d-e**. See response to **4a**.[11]

**4f**. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) defines state groundwater basins based on geologic and hydrogeologic

conditions. According to the DWR, the project sites are located within the San Mateo Groundwater Subbasin. The subbasin is part of the larger Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin and is composed of alluvial fan deposits formed by tributaries to San Francisco Bay. This subbasin has a history of groundwater overdraft as early as the 1920s. Overdraft of the subbasin occurred until 1965 when supplemental surface supplies were delivered by the State of California from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. Since 1965, imported surface water supplies have met approximately 90 percent of the demand in San Mateo County.

The California Water Service Company (CWSC) is the district agency responsible for providing water service for this area of Menlo Park. The CWSC's water supplies are derived from local reservoir water and purchases from the City of San Francisco. No groundwater wells would be required to serve the project sites.

Generally, groundwater recharge occurs by infiltration of water from streams and by percolation of precipitation that falls directly on the ground. The proposed projects would result in reductions in impervious surfaces at the two project sites. This decrease in impervious surface would result in a slight increase in groundwater recharge at the project sites.

When compared to existing conditions, the proposed projects would not result in the depletion of groundwater supplies nor result in a decrease in net recharge. No impacts to groundwater resources would occur. [11]

**4g**. See response to **4f**.

**4h**. See response to **4c**.

**4i**. See response to **4f.**

**Mitigation Measure 4.1**
Detailed hydrology/hydraulic calculations shall be prepared and approved by the City prior to Tentative Map approval. The developer of the 110 Linfield Drive site shall provide detailed calculations showing the volume of water required for on-site detention of the 10-year storm event. If needed, larger underground storm drainpipes shall be installed.

**Mitigation Measure 4.2**
The applicants shall provide detailed hydrology/hydraulic calculations indicating the estimated hydraulic grade line at each site for the 10-year and 100-year storms. Top-of-curb elevations for each project shall be modified as needed (per consultation with the City) to meet City requirements. Finished floor elevations shall be modified as needed per consultation with the City. These revisions shall be made and approved by the City prior to Tentative Map approval.

**Mitigation Measure 4.3**
The project applicants shall implement Best Management Practices for water quality treatment on the project site to the maximum extent practicable, per the City of Menlo Park Grading and Drainage Plan Guidelines and checklist. Specific guidelines that would apply to the project site include (but would not be limited to) #1 (use of on-site infiltration as much as possible as a means of handling roof and site drainage); #4 (Design of the site drainage so the storm water will flow to on-site lawn or pervious landscaped areas, or detention/retention and filtration systems through vegetated/grassed swales or underground pipes), #5 (drainage from roof downspouts to on-site lawn or pervious landscaped areas, or detention/retention and filtration systems through vegetated/grassed swales), and #11 (use of on-site infiltration, vegetated swales or other comparable BMPs prior to discharge). The BMPs shall be shown on the drainage plan and reviewed by the City prior to approval of the Tentative Map.

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:** | | | | | |
| a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? | **X** | | | | **1,2,3,19** |
| b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? | **X** | | | | **1,2,3,19** |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| c. | Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? | | | | **X** | **1,2,3,19** |
| d. | Create objectionable odors? | | | | **X** | **1,2,3,19** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**5a-b.** During construction, the projects would generate dust and other pollutants that could affect sensitive receptors or contribute to poor air quality. After they are completed, the projects would generate traffic that emits pollutants. The pollutants could affect sensitive receptors and could contribute to local and regional air quality degradation. These air quality impacts will be discussed in the EIR. [1,2,3,19]

**5c.** The project sites are located in an area of the City that is completely built out with commercial and residential development. The project sites are currently developed with unoccupied office buildings and parking areas. The proposed projects are similar in their uses and in their physical design to other residential developments in the area. Although the construction of any building can alter localized air currents, the proposed buildings are relatively small in scale and height. Air movement, moisture, temperature or changes in climate at the sites are not anticipated to change substantially. Therefore, impacts related to air movement, moisture, temperature or changes in climate would not be significant. [1,2,3,19]

The proposed roofs and other unshaded surfaces on the project sites could contribute toward what are known as "heat island" effects. Heat islands are the increases in temperature that occur when heat from the sun is absorbed by dark, non-reflective surfaces and radiated back into the air. Heat-island-generated increases of more than 10 degrees have been documented in some urban areas. The project contribution toward this impact would be hard to measure and would likely be very small; therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. However, the City could encourage the developers to use highly reflective/high emissivity roofing and to maximize shaded areas on the project sites.

**5d.** The project sites are located in an area of the City that is completely built out with commercial and residential development. The proposed project is similar to other residential development in the area. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), typical uses that may result in significant odor impacts include wastewater treatment plant, sanitary landfill, transfer station, composting facility, petroleum refinery, asphalt batch plant, chemical manufacturing, fiberglass manufacturing, painting/coating operations, rendering plant, and coffee roasters. The proposed projects do not include these land uses. Thus, no significant air quality impacts related to odors would occur.[1,2,3,19]

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:** | | | | | | |
| a. | Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? | **X** | | | | **20** |
| b. | Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or danger intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? | **X** | | | | **20** |
| c. | Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? | **X** | | | | **20** |
| d. | Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? | **X** | | | | **20** |
| e. | Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? | **X** | | | | **20** |
| f. | Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | **X** | | | | **20** |
| g. | Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? | | | | **X** | **3** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**6a-f.** The projects would add traffic to the local and regional transportation network. The additional traffic could add to congestion and could exceed established thresholds. These transportation/circulation impacts, as well as the adequacy of the project circulation system and parking and impacts to pedestrians and cyclists, will be discussed in the EIR.[20]

**6g.** The proposed projects do not involve transportation or circulation elements related to rail, waterborne, or air traffic.

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in:** | | | | | |
| a. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals or birds)? | | **X** | | | **21,22** |
| b. Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees)? | | **X** | | | **23,24,25** |
| c. Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? | | **X** | | | **21,22** |
| d. Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)? | | | | **X** | **17** |
| e. Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? | | | | **X** | **1** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**7a.** The project sites do not contain suitable habitat for any special-status plant or wildlife species known to occur in the project region. The project sites are partly paved and currently include vacant commercial buildings. The only remaining habitat on the sites consists of several eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.), oak (*Quercus* sp.), pine (*Pinus* sp.), and various ornamental species of trees. Given the urban location of the project sites, the scattered location of the existing trees, and that the sites are not adjacent to an area providing foraging habitat, no special-status bird species are expected to nest on the sites.

However, the trees on the project sites provide suitable nesting habitat for a variety of common bird species known to occur in the project area. Construction-related activities could result in the direct loss of active nests or the abandonment of active nests by adult birds during that year's nesting season. Bird nests with eggs or young are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code.[21,22] **Mitigation Measures 7.1 through 7.3,** applied to both projects when construction activities could disturb nests, would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**7b.** Tree Survey Reports for both 110 and 175 Linfield Drive were prepared by Arborwell.[23] (The Tree Survey Reports are on file and available for review at the City.) The survey reports provide information on the health, location, and type of trees on the project sites and recommendations on their preservation and relocation.

The 110 Linfield Drive project would result in the removal of 26 trees (of which 19 are Heritage trees); no trees would be relocated. Thirty-seven trees, including 22 Heritage trees, would be retained. (Of the trees to remain, eight [all heritage trees] are within the City's right of way along Homewood Place, and seven [all non-heritage trees] are just outside the northern site boundary.)

The 175 Linfield Drive project would result in the removal of 36 trees (of which 31 are Heritage trees) and relocation of 2 trees (of which 1 is a Heritage tree). Twenty-nine trees, including 28 Heritage trees, would be retained. (Of the trees to be removed, one non-heritage tree is within the City's right of way along Linfield Drive. Of the trees to be retained, six [all heritage trees] are along Linfield Drive, six [all heritage trees] are just outside the eastern site boundary, and one heritage tree is just outside the southern site boundary. In addition, a row of trees not included in the inventory would remain just outside the southern site boundary.)

The proposed projects would be required to comply with the Menlo Park Heritage Tree Ordinance and the City's Heritage Tree Replacement procedures, which delineate the ratio of trees a developer must replace for every Heritage tree removed.[24] For residential projects, applicants who are granted approval to remove a Heritage tree are required to replace lost Heritage trees on a 1:1 basis. However, City staff may exercise discretion on the size and number of trees an applicant may be required to install.[24] In the case of these projects, City staff have indicated that ratios of 2:1 replacement of Heritage trees and 1:1 replacement of other trees will be required, providing the sites can accommodate the trees at maturity without overcrowding.[25]

Based on these ratios, the 110 Linfield project would be required to plant 38 Heritage trees and 7 non-Heritage trees. The 175 Linfield project would be required to plant 62 Heritage trees and 5 non-Heritage trees. Combined, the projects would need to plant 100 Heritage trees and 12 non-Heritage trees. Current landscape conceptual plans provided by the applicants show that both of the proposed projects could feasibly meet the tree planting requirements set by City staff. **Mitigation Measure 7.4** would require compliance with the City's tree planting requirements and would ensure that the impact would be less than significant.[25]

In addition, a tree protection and preservation plan was included in the survey reports to assist in the protection of the trees during the demolition and construction of the proposed project.[23] **Mitigation Measure 7.5**, applied to both projects when construction activities could result in disturbance to trees, would reduce the potential impacts from disturbance to a less-than-significant level.

**7c.** See response to 7a.

**7d.** The project sites are developed; there is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities on the project sites and no aquatic features or other resources on the project sites protected by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.[17]

**7e.** The project sites are in an urban area, are completely developed, and are bordered on all sides by urban/residential development. Consequently, the project sites do not link two or more large regional open space areas and are not considered to be part of a regional wildlife movement corridor.[1]

**Mitigation Measure 7.1**
The applicants shall retain a qualified biologist (with selection to be approved by the City) to conduct nest surveys on the site prior to construction or site preparation activities occurring during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species (typically February through August). The survey area shall include all potential nesting habitat on the project site within 200 feet of the grading boundaries. If the 200-foot distance encompasses trees on adjacent properties, the biologist shall survey the trees using binoculars. The survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to commencement of construction activities.

**Mitigation Measure 7.2**
If active nests of bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code (which, together, apply to all native nesting birds) are present in the construction zone or within 200 feet of this area, temporary construction fencing shall be erected within the project site at a minimum of 100 feet around the nest site. This temporary buffer may be greater depending on the bird species and construction activity, as determined by the biologist.[21,22]

**Mitigation Measure 7.3**
At the discretion of the biologist, clearing and construction within the fenced area shall be postponed or halted until juveniles have fledged and there is no evidence of a second nesting attempt. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities will occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests will occur.

**Mitigation Measure 7.4**
The project applicants shall comply with the Menlo Park Heritage Tree Ordinance and the City's Heritage Tree Replacement procedures, and with the tree replacement ratios recommended by City staff. The final landscaping plans for the projects shall reflect compliance with the Ordinance and procedures, and the applicants shall demonstrate that the required number of trees have been planted prior to project occupancy.

**Mitigation Measure 7.5**
The project applicants must adhere to the tree protection and preservation plan included in the Tree Survey Reports prepared by Arborwell. The plan includes measures related to the tree protection zone (TPZ), pruning and brush clearance, fencing and signage, fertilization, pest and disease control, and tree health and maintenance (including root cutting).[23]

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in:** | | | | | |
| a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? | | | | **X** | **26** |
| b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? | | | | **X** | **26** |
| c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state? | | | | **X** | **26** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**8a-c.** The proposed project sites are developed with vacant commercial office buildings and parking. Redevelopment of these sites with housing would constitute infill development and would not involve use of a "greenfield" site, or impacts to the associated resources. Furthermore, there are no adopted City energy conservation plans that would be affected by the project. (The Public Works Department does offer rebates for purchase of energy efficient appliances, and project residents could participate.) Therefore, the energy demands of the proposed project would not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans or use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner. With respect to mineral resources, the project sites are currently developed and located in an urbanized area. There are no known significant mineral resources that would be affected by the proposed projects. Per the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance, the projects would be required to recycle approximately 65 percent of the debris from each parcel. According to the project applicants, the demolition waste alone would be about 7,500 tons, with recycling required for about 4,870 tons of debris.[26]

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **9. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:** | | | | | |
| a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)? | | | **X** | | **27,28,29** |
| b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | **X** | **30,34** |
| c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? | | | **X** | | **27,28,29** |
| d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? | | | **X** | | **27,28,29** |
| e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass or trees? | | | | **X** | **30** |

**EXPLANATION:**

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted for 175 Linfield Drive by PES Environmental. The assessment concluded that there do not appear to be significant environmental concerns with respect to current and historical hazardous materials use and storage at the subject property, or off-site releases of hazardous materials. The report did indicate that asbestos containing building materials and lead based paint might be present in the building. The ESA recommends that prior to demolition of the building, lead-based paint and asbestos surveys should be conducted. If asbestos or lead-based paint is found, the applicants would be required to comply with regulations and guidelines pertaining to abatement of and protection from exposure to asbestos and lead-based paint. This recommendation has been incorporated into **Mitigation Measure 9.1**, which would ensure that the impact on both project sites would be less than significant.[27]

The building at 110 Linfield Drive (also known as Building 6) was mostly used by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) for office space. However, a portion of the northeastern section was used as a laboratory. The laboratory was used for studies involving arsenic, selenium and mercury compounds. Mineral acids, some organic solvents and formaldehyde were also used in the lab. From 1997 to 2002, the 110 Linfield Drive site underwent decontamination/remediation. The "Summary of Cleanup Activity and Results" Memorandum from the USGS concluded that at the end of decontamination/remediation, any remaining contamination of the 110 Linfield Road, Menlo Park site is at least 150 times below existing guidelines."[28]

A letter issued from the Health Services Agency, County of San Mateo, confirmed the closure of the laboratory, under San Mateo County supervision, and stated "with the provision that the information provided to this agency was accurate and representative of existing conditions, it is our position that no further action is required at this time."[29]

**9a, c, d.** The proposed projects would replace vacant office buildings with residential development. With the exception of common household cleaning solvents, paints, landscape fertilizers, and pesticides typically used in a residential setting, the proposed projects would not involve the routine use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials. The potential for accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances is low to none.

**9b.** The proposed projects would replace vacant office buildings with residential development. Implementation of the projects would not interfere with any City emergency response plans or an emergency evacuation plan. Emergency response and evacuation would fall under the Menlo Park Police Department and Menlo Park Fire Protection District jurisdiction.

**9e.** The project sites are currently developed and are surrounded by urban uses. The projects would include landscaping typical of residential development. According to the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, the 110 and 175 Linfield Drive sites are not in a fire hazard area.[30]

**Mitigation Measure 9.1**

Prior to demolition of the existing buildings, the applicants shall survey the building for the presence of asbestos and lead-based paint. If asbestos is found, the applicant shall comply with Bay Area Air Quality Management District Regulation 11, Rule 2 (Hazardous Materials, Asbestos Demolition, Renovation, and Manufacturing) when demolishing the building. If lead-based paint is present, the applicant shall determine whether paint must be separated from the building materials (e.g., chemically or physically). The paint waste shall be evaluated independently from the building material to determine its proper management. According to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, if paint is not removed from the building material during demolition (and is not chipping or peeling), the material could be disposed of as construction debris (a non-hazardous waste). The appropriate landfill operator shall be contacted in advance or determine any specific requirement they any have regarding the disposal of lead-based paint materials.

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **10. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:** | | | | | |
| a. Increase in existing noise levels? | | | **X** | | **1,20,31** |
| b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels? | | | **X** | | **32,33** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**10a.** The Menlo Park *General Plan* Noise Element provides information on land use compatibility for community noise environments. Figure 4 from that report indicates that for residential use, an exterior $L_{dn}$ (Day-Night Noise Level) of up to 60 dB(A) (A weighted decibels) is normally acceptable, an $L_{dn}$ from 60-70 dB(A) is conditionally acceptable, and an $L_{dn}$ of 70 dB(A) or higher is unacceptable.[1]

Two short-term (15 minute) noise measurements and one long-term (24-hour) noise measurement were taken to characterize existing noise levels at the project sites. These measurements were taken during peak hours (between the hours of 4PM and 6PM). The short-term noise levels or "$L_{eq}$" (the average A-weighted sound level measured over a given time interval) did not exceed 57 dB(A). As a general rule, in areas where the noise environment is dominated by traffic, the $L_{eq}$ during the peak hour is roughly equivalent to the $L_{dn}$ at that location. Thus, the existing $L_{dn}$ at the project sites do not exceed 57 db(A), which is below the normally acceptable threshold for community noise exposure. Furthermore, the long-term $L_{eq}$ noise levels did not exceed 52.6 db(A). As noted below, future noise levels at the project sites are not expected to be substantially different than the existing measured noise levels. For these reasons, the projects would not be exposed to noise levels in excess of those established in the *General Plan*.[31]

The proposed projects would involve the development of residential units that would be similar in nature to other uses in the vicinity and would not significantly increase existing noise levels. However, the projects would generate additional traffic that would add to traffic levels on roads in the area. In order to cause an appreciable change in noise levels, traffic levels must double. A doubling of traffic levels would cause a 3 dB(A) increase, which is considered a perceptible change in noise.
The roadways that contribute most to existing noise levels in the area are Linfield Drive and Middlefield Road. Residences, which are considered noise-sensitive uses, are present west of the project sites along Linfield Drive. According to DKS Associates, the existing average daily traffic (ADT) level along the segment of Linfield Drive west of the project sites (to Waverley Street) is 1,799 vehicles.[20] Along the same segment, the future cumulative plus project ADT is projected to be 2,415 vehicles. This projected increase of 616 trips would not constitute a doubling in traffic. On the segment of Linfield Drive east of the project sites, there would be a doubling of traffic but noise-sensitive uses are not adjacent to that part of the road. Therefore, the expected increase in average noise levels at noise-sensitive uses as a result of future traffic would be imperceptible (less than 3 dB(A)), and the project would not cause a significant impact related to a substantial change in ambient noise in the vicinity. For a discussion of construction noise, see **10b**.

**10b.** See **10a.** Construction activities for the proposed projects could result in increased short-term noise levels. These noise levels would be temporary and would occur intermittently during the 18-month construction process. After demolition of the existing buildings, the sites would be graded and voids would be backfilled with engineered fill. As the site is relatively flat, the grading period (the noisiest period of construction) would be short in duration (30 to 45 days for each project).

The closest sensitive receptors to the project sites are apartments to the west of the 175 Linfield Drive site (southwest of the 110 Linfield Drive site). The homes are located just beyond the 175 Linfield Drive site boundary, and are separated from the site by a fence and trees. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has compiled data on typical noise levels of construction equipment, which indicate that noise levels generated by heavy equipment can range from 76 dB(A) to 89 dB(A) at 50 feet.[32] Based on the types of equipment used, duration, and proximity, the construction activities of the proposed projects could result in intermittent (outdoor) noise levels of up to 89 dB(A) at the nearest sensitive receptors. The applicants would be required to comply with the City of Menlo Park Noise Ordinance, which would limit noise levels from construction to 85 dB(A) or less, on weekdays only (construction noise is not allowed on holidays or weekends) between the hours of 8AM and 6PM.[33] In addition, **Mitigation Measure 10.1** identified below would require the applicants to use standard noise reduction control measures such as mufflers, use of silencers, shields, ducts, and engine enclosures. These are technically feasible measures that would reduce the noise levels of the construction equipment to 75 to 80 dB(A) at 50 feet. As with all construction equipment, noise levels would diminish rapidly with

distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dB(A) per doubling of distance. Therefore, project construction noise impacts from activities on the sites would be less than significant.

The projects would require about 7,400 cubic yards of fill (2,400 for the 110 Linfield site and 5,000 for the 175 Linfield site). Fill dirt is typically hauled to a site in trucks with a 12- or 24-cubic yard capacity. Using the smaller trucks, project construction would involve about 617 round trips (1,234 trips total) over the 30-to 45-day grading period. With a 30-day grading period, there would be about 21 round trips (42 total trips) each day. The noise levels produced by heavy-duty trucks such as haul trucks can reach 82 dB(A) at 50 feet from the noise source. **Mitigation Measure 10.2** would prevent significant impacts from haul truck noise by requiring that the project contractors use main arterials for the haul routes.

**Mitigation Measure 10.1**
The project applicants shall incorporate noise reduction measures into project construction activities. These measures may include, but shall not be limited to, the use of mufflers and other devices on equipment, locating stationary construction equipment away from sensitive receptors, shutting off idling equipment, notifying adjacent residences and businesses in advance of construction work, and installing temporary barriers around construction noise sources.

**Mitigation Measure 10.2**
The project construction contractors shall use designated haul routes for all hauling-related trips to and from the project sites. The routes shall be chosen by the City with the intent of minimizing noise impacts. Haul trucks shall not use any streets within the Linfield Oaks neighborhood other than Linfield Drive (between the project sites and Middlefield Road).

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **11. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:** | | | | | |
| a. Fire protection? | | | **X** | | **30** |
| b. Police protection? | | | **X** | | **34** |
| c. Schools? | | | **X** | | **35,36** |
| d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? | | | | **X** | **37** |
| e. Other governmental services? | | | | **X** | **37** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**11a.** Fire services to the project sites are provided by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District. The nearest firehouse to the project sites is Firehouse 1, which is also the District Headquarters. Firehouse 1 is located at 300 Middlefield Drive, less than a quarter mile from the project sites. In the event that Firehouse 1 could not respond to a fire call at the project sites, Firehouse 6 on 700 Oak Grove Avenue would respond. Firehouse 1 has one fire engine, one ladder truck and one battalion chief vehicle. Typically, Firehouse 1 is staffed with 9-full time firefighters each day. Firehouse 1 provides firefighting, emergency medical technician (EMT) and Advanced Life Support (ALS) paramedic services. According to the Fire District, Firehouse 1 would be able to adequately provide fire protection services to the project sites with current staffing and equipment.[30]

**11b.** Police services to the project sites are provided by the Menlo Park Police Department. The Police Department is located at 701 Laurel Street, and is less than a mile from the project sites. The Police Department employs 50 sworn officers and 20.5 non-sworn staff (dispatchers, records, officers parking officers, code enforcement officers, evidence/traffic coordinators, a secretary and an administrative assistant). Equipment includes 21 patrol vehicles, one speed trailer, and one DUI trailer. According to the Police Department, they would be able to adequately provide police services to the project sites with current staffing and equipment.[34]

**11c.** The project sites are served by the Menlo Park City School District (the elementary school district) and the Sequoia Union High School District. The schools serving the project sites include Laurel School (grades K-2), Encinal School (grades 3-5), Hillview School (grades 6-8), and Menlo Atherton High School (grades 9-12).[35]

Project development at 110 Linfield Drive would generate approximately 19 additional students (11 elementary and 8 high school) and project development at 175 Linfield Drive would generate approximately 29 additional students (17 elementary and 12 high school) for a total increase of 48 students.

State law (Government Code 65996) specifies that the payment of a school impact fee (prior to issuance of a building permit) is an acceptable way to offset a project's effect on school facilities. In Menlo Park, applicants wishing to build residential projects can either negotiate directly with the affected school districts, or they can make a "presumptive payment" of $2.14 per square foot for the residential units. In the case of the proposed project, the Sequoia Union High School District and the Menlo Park City School District would share the fee.[29] The school districts are responsible for implementing the specific methods of mitigating school impacts under the Government Code. The school impact fees and the school districts' methods of implementing measures specified by Government Code 65996 would partially offset the costs of serving project-related increases in school enrollment.

The proposed projects would result in increased enrollment at the schools noted above. State law requires that impacts to schools be mitigated through the payment of fees. The projects would comply with the school impact fee requirements of the State of California and the City of Menlo Park. Therefore, the proposed projects would not result in significant impacts to school facilities.

Project and cumulative development combined would result in an additional 194 units served by the Menlo Park City School District and 273 units served by the Sequoia Union High School District.[36] Based on the ratios noted above, cumulative development would generate an additional 97 elementary school students and an additional 96 high school students at the schools noted above. However, all developers would be required to comply with school impact fee requirements. Therefore, the project and cumulative development would not result in significant impacts to school facilities.

**11d-e.** Maintenance of public facilities, including roadways and other governmental services, is already being provided to the project sites by the City. The City of Menlo Park Public Works Department will continue to maintain the public roads (Linfield Drive and Homewood Place) in the vicinity of the project sites. The streets for the project on-site circulation would be private. [37]

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:** | | | | | |
| a. Power or natural gas? | | | **X** | | **38** |
| b. Communications systems? | | | **X** | | **3** |
| c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? | | | **X** | | **39** |
| d. Sewer or septic tanks? | | | **X** | | **3** |
| e. Storm water drainage? | | | | | **see Section 4** |
| f. Solid waste disposal? | | | **X** | | **40** |
| g. Local or regional water supplies? | | | **X** | | **39** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**12a.** Power and natural gas are currently provided to the project sites by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). Implementation of the proposed projects would not substantially change the existing infrastructure, which would be sufficient to serve the project sites.[38]

**12b.** Telephone service is currently provided to the project sites by SBC and cable television service is provided by Comcast. Implementation of the proposed projects would not substantially change the existing infrastructure, which would be sufficient to serve the project sites.

**12c.** The project sites are currently being provided with water service by the California Water Service Company (CWSC) via an 8-inch water main in Linfield Drive. The redevelopment of the sites and occupancy of residential units would have a minimal impact on

water demand and the water distribution system, and the CWSC has the capacity to accommodate the proposed projects. According to the CWSC, its demand is currently under the water supply allotment guarantees from the San Francisco Water Department.[39]

**12d.** The project sites are currently being provided with sanitary sewer service by the West Bay Sanitary District (WBSD). Sanitary sewer flows are treated at the South Bayside Systems Authority (SBSA) treatment plant in Redwood Shores. The proposed projects would construct 6- and 8-inch sanitary sewer lines on the sites (within the proposed roadways) to serve the residential units. According to WBSD, there are no existing or projected capacity issues associated with the Linfield sewer system or at the South Bay Sanitary District plant. A recently installed 24-inch sewer line in Linfield Drive would adequately serve the project sites.[3]

**12e.** Refer to **Section 4: Hydrology and Water Quality.**

**12f.** Solid Waste services would be provided by BFI Peninsula. According to BFI Peninsula, there is sufficient capacity to provide solid waste services to the project sites, and that upon request, they would restore service (service is currently cancelled because the buildings are unoccupied). In addition, the projects would be required to comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling and Salvage Requirements Ordinance and would have to recycle approximately 65 percent of the debris from each parcel.[40]

**12g.** Refer to **12c.**

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **13. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:** | | | | | |
| a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? | | | **X** | | **1** |
| b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? | | | **X** | | **3** |
| c. Create light or glare? | | | **X** | | **41** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**13a.** In the Menlo Park *General Plan*, only Sand Hill Road is considered part of a scenic vista. The proposed project sites are not identified as part of a scenic vista or are located in the vicinity of a scenic highway. The project sites are previously developed with office buildings and are located in a built-out urban area. Therefore, the projects would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.[1]

The impacts of tree removal will be considered in their context of their value as a scenic resource and their contribution to visual character in the EIR.

**13b.** See **13a.** In general, the visual character of the existing sites is of office buildings surrounded by parking lots and associated landscaping. The visual character of the surrounding land uses includes a mix of office buildings with parking lots, and residential developments with yards and driveways. Buildings in the area vary in height (one- and two-story) and mass.[3]

The proposed projects would result in the development of residential units similar in nature to other residential developments in the vicinity. The proposed structures would be two to three stories and would be relatively close to one another. The visual character of the project sites would change from single-story office buildings to two-and three-story residential units. The residential units would replace the relatively open space of the existing parking lots and replace it with buildings. However, the vicinity of the sites already has a mix of commercial and residential development. Further, the proposed residential units are similar in nature to other residential developments in the vicinity and their design would be subject to approval from the Planning Department, Planning Commission and City Council. For those reasons, the projects would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the sites and their surroundings.

**13c.** The project sites are currently developed with one-story vacant office buildings that have exterior lighting (on the buildings and in the parking lots). In addition, street lighting contributes to light and glare in the project area. The proposed projects would involve the development of two- and three-story residential units that would also have exterior lighting and windows. Although the residential

uses would introduce additional (e.g., interior) sources of light, the buildings directly adjacent to 110 Linfield Drive and 175 Linfield Drive are either office buildings or are separated from the sites by fences and vegetation.[41] For those reasons, the projects would not create a new source of substantial light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views.

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **14. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:** | | | | | |
| a. Disturb paleontological resources? | | | **X** | | **27,42** |
| b. Disturb archaeological resources? | | **X** | | | **27,42** |
| c. Affect historical resources? | | | **X** | | **27,42** |
| d. Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? | | | **X** | | **27,42** |
| e. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? | | **X** | | | **27,42** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**14a-e.** The project sites are located in an area of Menlo Park that is generally underlain by alluvium. This alluvium is weathered, unconsolidated to moderately consolidated gravel, sand, and silt of the late Pleistocene age.[27] Typically, alluvium does not contain unique paleontological resources.

A records search conducted by the Northwest Information Center (NWIS), at Sonoma State University, indicated that there are no known archeological resources on the project sites, and no known historic properties are located within the project area.[42] The project sites have already been developed, so the likelihood of finding buried resources is reduced. However, construction activities such as excavation and grading could result in the discovery of previously unidentified archeological resources, a significant impact. **Mitigation Measure 14.1**, involving standard recovery procedures should resources be found, would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Both project sites are completely developed and are occupied by office buildings. The proposed projects would develop the sites with single-family homes, similar to other residential development in the area. Therefore, the projects would not cause a physical change that would affect unique ethnic cultural values. Furthermore, the project sites are not known to have any religious or sacred uses. The possibility that human remains could be discovered during excavation would be addressed by **Mitigation Measure 14.1**.

**Mitigation Measure 14.1**

If archeological resources such as chipped stone or groundstone, historic debris, building foundations, or human bone or any other indicators of cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities will halt and a qualified archeologist shall be consulted to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives of the City, construction contractor, and the archaeologist shall meet to determine the appropriate course of action. In the event that human remains are discovered, an appropriate representative of the Native American groups and the County Coroner shall be notified and consulted, as required by state law. All cultural materials recovered as part of the monitoring program would be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and report prepared according to current professional standards.

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **15. RECREATION. Would the proposal:** | | | | | |
| a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? | | | **X** | | **37,43** |
| b. Affect existing recreational opportunities? | | | **X** | | **37,43** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**15a.** The proposed projects would generate an increase in population of 137 residents. According to the Community Services Department, the City of Menlo Park has approximately 50 acres of parkland (not including Bay Front Park) to serve its residents. Currently, the City is renovating Burgess Park. The closest park to the project sites is Burgess Park, whose amenities include picnic areas, baseball fields, soccer pitch, playground tennis courts, gymnasium and a swimming pool. The renovations at Burgess Park will expand the park facilities to include 3 pools (originally there was 1 pool).[43]

According to City staff, the City has no formal park standards for CEQA review. According to the Community Services Department, the City has adequate parkland and recreational activities (programming including classes and public events) to provide parks and recreation opportunities to the 137 project residents. The project applicants would be required to pay a "Recreation-in-lieu" fee. The formula for this development is 0.008 x # of units x current market value. The exact fee would be calculated by the City of Menlo Park Public Works Department prior to building permit issuance (so that current market value can be determined).[37]

**15b.** Refer to **15a.**

| ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES | POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | NO IMPACT | SOURCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.** | | | | | |
| a. Does the project have the potential to 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, 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? | | | **X** | | **3,17,21,22,23,24,25,27,42** |
| b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? | | | **X** | | **3; see also sources for other checklist sections** |
| c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project that are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) | **X** | | | | **1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 11, 14, 17, 20, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43** |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| d. | Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | **X** | | | | **1, 2, 3, 20, 8, 9, 10, 14, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34** |

**EXPLANATION:**

**14a.** Refer to **Section 7. Biological Resources** and **Section 14, Cultural Resources.**

**14b.** The proposed project would replace existing unoccupied office buildings with housing. The project site is already developed and impacts to existing environmental resources would be minimal.

**14c.** Impacts that are individually limited but can be cumulatively considerable include impacts related to air pollutants, noise, population, public services, storm runoff/water, public utilities, impacts to parks and recreation, and traffic. For discussion of these issues, please refer to **Section 2: Population and Housing, Section 4: Water, Section 5: Air Quality, 10: Noise, 11: Public Services, 12: Utilities and Service Systems, 15 Recreation.** Air quality impacts and traffic impacts will be addressed in the EIR; the other cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

**14d.** Environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly include impacts related to **Section 3: Geologic Problems, Section 5: Air Quality, Section 9: Hazards,** and **Section 10: Noise.** Air quality impacts will be addressed in the EIR; the other impacts of the projects would be less than significant.

**17. SOURCE REFERENCES**


| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | General Plan and General Plan Land Use Map |
| 2 | Menlo Park Zoning Map, November 1967, as amended |
| 3 | Project Plans (BKF, HMH Engineers, and The Dahlin Group), January 21, 2005 and April 7, 2005 |
| 4 | San Mateo County Important Farmlands Map |
| 5 | Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), *Projections 2003*, June 2003 |
| 6 | Table E-1. City/County Population Estimates for 2003 and 2004, California Department of Finance, January 1, 2003 and January 1, 2004 |
| 7 | Current List of Near-Term Development Projects, City of Menlo Park, February 3, 2005 |
| 8 | Treadwell & Rollo Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, August 9, 2002 |
| 9 | USGS California Volcanoes and Volcanics Potential Area of Volcanic Hazards Map, 1989 |
| 10 | Treadwell & Rollo, personal communication with John Gouchon, August 17, 2004 |
| 11 | Questa Engineering, Drainage Review for 110 & 175 Linfield Drive, Menlo Park, California, March 3, 2005 |
| 12 | Questa Engineering, Revised Drainage Review for 110 & 175 Linfield Drive, Menlo Park, California, March 24, 2005 |
| 13 | FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) |
| 14 | White, Kelly, Questa Engineering, personal communication, March 9, 2005 |
| 15 | Revised Project Grading Plan, 175 Linfield Drive, HMH Engineers, February 8, 2005 |
| 16 | White, Kelly, Questa Engineering, personal communication regarding water quality issues |
| 17 | Clean Water Act (CWA) |
| 18 | City of Menlo Park, Grading and Drainage Plan Guidelines and Checklist, February 2005 |
| 19 | Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines |
| 20 | DKS Associates |
| 21 | Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act |
| 22 | California Fish & Game Code |
| 23 | Arborwell Tree Report, January 5, 2003, as revised |
| 24 | Menlo Park Heritage Tree Ordinance & Heritage Tree Replacement Guidelines |
| 25 | Consultation with Justin Murphy, Development Services Manager, Community Development Department, via e-mail, August 20, 2004 |
| 26 | City of Menlo Park Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance |
| 27 | Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, PES, August 16, 2000 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 28 | Final Closure Plan for Termination of Occupancy of 110 Linfield Road, Menlo Park CA, prepared by Terry Fries, USGS, June 20, 2002 |
| 29 | Gipe, Lindsay, Hazardous Materials Specialist, Health Services Agency, County of San Mateo, personal communication (letter) to Terry Fries of the USGS, June 27, 2002 |
| 30 | Menlo Park Fire Protection District, personal communication with Randy Shurston, July 14, 2004 |
| 31 | Noise Measurements taken by Impact Sciences staff, July 17, 2004 |
| 32 | Environmental Protection Agency, typical noise level data |
| 33 | Menlo Park Noise Ordinance |
| 34 | Menlo Park Police Department, personal communication with Nicole Acker and Commander Greg Rothaus, July 22, 2004 |
| 35 | Menlo Park City School District web site, http://www.mpcsd.k12.ca.us/; Ricci, Annette, Maintenance and Operations, Sequoia Union High School District, personal communication, March 10, 2005. |
| 36 | Residential Development Projects of 6 or More Dwelling Units in the City of Menlo Park, February 17, 2005 |
| 37 | Menlo Park Public Works Department (DPW), Ruben Niño, Director of Engineering Services, personal communication, July 24, 2004 |
| 38 | Avanzato, Nora, Customer Service Representative, Pacific Gas and Electric, personal communication, July 22, 2004 |
| 39 | Duncan, Darin, District Manager, California Water Service Company (CWSC), personal communication, July 23, 2004 |
| 40 | BFI Peninsula, personal communication with Lisa Smith, customer service agent, July 14, 2004 |
| 41 | Visit to project area by Impact Sciences staff, March 5, 2005 |
| 42 | Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, July 8, 2004 |
| 43 | Menlo Park Public Works Department, personal communication with Rob Rossler, July 20, 2004 |


**ATTACHMENTS**

Figure 3.0-1, Project Location

Figure 3.0-2, Proposed Site Plan for 110 Linfield Drive

Figure 3.0-3, Exterior Elevations for Typical Two-Story Home

Figure 3.0-4, Exterior Elevations for Typical Three-Story Home

Figure 3.0-5, Proposed Site Plan for 175 Linfield Drive