

Summary

S.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Proposed Project

The Bohannon Development Company (project sponsor) has submitted a proposal to the City of Menlo Park (City) to amend the General Plan to create a new land use designation of “Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park” and to amend the City’s Municipal Code zoning ordinance to include a new Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park or “M-3” zoning district. Simultaneously, the project sponsor submitted a site-specific development application to develop a mix of office, research and development (R&D), retail/commercial, hotel, health club and restaurant uses on two blocks that make up the project area; one set of parcels on Independence Drive (Independence site) and another set on Constitution Drive (Constitution site) (collectively, the project area). The project area is bounded by US 101 to the south, the Marsh Road/US 101 interchange to the west, Bayfront Expressway to the north, and Chrysler Drive to the east. The block bounded by Independence and Constitution Drives in the center of the project area is not a part of this project.

For the purposes of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), the “project” consists of the proposed General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Amendment (GPA/ZOA) and the development proposed for the Independence and Constitution sites that would be allowed under the GPA/ZOA. The site-specific development proposal for the Independence site and the Constitution site offers information about the types of mixed-use commercial business, the proposed floor-to-area ratio (FAR), and a conceptual site plan. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) the proposed project will be evaluated on a project-specific level. Analysis of the potential effects of adoption of the GPA/ZOA and the resulting specific development application for the project area is presented in this DEIR for purposes of evaluating environmental impacts under CEQA, pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15168.

General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Amendment (GPA/ZOA)

The proposed project would create a new General Plan land use designation that may be applied within the project area called Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park. Allowable uses within the project area would continue to include light manufacturing and assembly, R&D facilities, and offices allowed under the existing General Plan land use designation of Limited Industry. Under the new Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park, new uses would be permitted, including services to accommodate businesses in the area (e.g., restaurants and health/fitness centers) and hotel/motel uses. The current maximum FAR under Limited Industrial is 45 percent for office uses and 55 percent for industrial uses. The GPA/ZOA would increase the allowable FAR in the project area to a combined 137.5 percent for office, R&D, commercial, and hotel/motel uses, discussed below.

The proposed project would also amend the City’s Municipal Code zoning ordinance to include a new Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park (M-3) district that would define development regulations

tailored to implement the new Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park land use designation. The proposed M-3 district would permit administrative and professional offices, R&D uses, light industrial uses, motel or hotel uses, health and fitness centers, restaurants/cafés, convenience stores, daycare facilities, parking structures, community facilities, personal services, and storage associated with the main use. Under the proposed M-3 zoning district, the maximum FAR for office and R&D would be 100 percent. Health/fitness center, convenience retail/commercial, and café/restaurant would have a FAR of 12.5 percent, and hotel or motel uses would have a FAR of 25 percent. Development standards for the M-3 zoning district are described in Chapter 2, Project Description. Appendix D of this document provides the proposed ZOA.

Specific Development Proposal

Independence Site. Existing buildings at 100 to 190 Independence Drive (Independence site) are one-story and two-story tilt-up-construction buildings currently housing approximately 85,000 square feet (s.f.) of office and R&D uses. These buildings would be demolished as part of the proposed project.

The project is proposing construction of approximately 200,000 s.f. of office and R&D; a 230-room (approximately 171,600 s.f.) hotel; up to approximately 68,500 s.f. of health club space; up to approximately 4,200 s.f. of restaurant space; and to 1,230 parking spaces in a parking structure on the Independence site.

Constitution Site. Existing buildings at 101 to 155 Constitution Drive (the Constitution site) are one-story and two-story tilt-up-construction buildings currently housing approximately 134,000 s.f. of office and R&D uses. These buildings would be demolished as part of the proposed project.

Development on the Constitution site includes construction of approximately 495,000 s.f. of office and R&D space; approximately 7,400 s.f. of convenience retail/commercial uses and 1,649 parking spaces in a combination of parking structures and surface parking.

Required Approvals. Upon certification of this EIR, the following approvals would be required prior to development of the project (please see Chapter 2, Project Description, for a complete list of required project approvals).

- **General Plan Amendment.** The General Plan would be amended to create a new land use designation and the General Plan Land Use Map would be amended to change the designation of the project area to Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park. This would require City Council approval.
- **Zoning Ordinance Amendment.** The project proposes rezoning the project area from the existing M-2 district to the new M-3 district. The rezone would require approval by the City Council.
- **Development Agreement.** The project sponsor proposes to enter into a Development Agreement with the City to create vested rights in project approvals, address implementation of

the proposed design and infrastructure improvements in the project area, and specify benefits to the City. This would require City Council approval.

- **Architectural Review.** Architectural Control approval would be required for design review of the specific development proposed for the Independence site and the Constitution site.
- **Parcel Map.** The project sponsor proposes a parcel map on the Independence site and a parcel map on the Constitution site to merge lots, adjust lot lines, and establish easements.
- **Tree Removal Permit.** A tree removal permit would be required for each Heritage tree proposed for removal, per Municipal Code 13.20.030.
- **Mitigation Monitoring Plan.** Approval of the mitigation measures identified in the DEIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan would be required by City Council.

S.2 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY, ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released for the Bohannon Office/Hotel Mixed Use General Plan Amendment and Rezoning Project (renamed Menlo Gateway project) on May 24, 2007 for a 30-day public review period. Two public scoping meetings were held before the Planning Commission on June 4, 2007 and the City Council on June 19, 2007. The close of the public review period was extended to July 10 to enable the City Council to continue its scoping session. From these meetings, the City received valuable input on areas of concern to local residents. In addition, responses to the NOP identified additional issues for consideration in the EIR and the development review process. Issues identified during the outreach efforts include:

- Visual quality given the increase in permitted building heights and FAR.
- Biological resources given the proximity to the Bay and the potential disturbance to heritage trees, as defined by the City ordinance.
- Noise impacts given the location of the site near US 101.
- Traffic given the increase in permitted FAR and the resultant effect on local intersections, traffic volumes on nearby residential streets, and freeway operations.
- Shadow impacts from the increased building heights.
- Growth inducement resulting from rezoning in the area.
- Possible hazardous materials on the sites.
- Impacts from a rise in the sea level that could result from global warming.
- Impacts on the nearby airport.
- Impacts on public services from the potential for induced growth from the project.
- Bicycle access and facilities.
- Sustainable design.

All of the issues listed above are addressed in the EIR with the exception of impacts on nearby airports. The closest airports to the project area include the Palo Alto Airport, approximately 3.5 miles from the project and the San Carlos Airport, approximately 4 miles from the project area. The project would not affect the flight path of either airport or change air traffic patterns; therefore, impacts to local airports are not addressed in this EIR. Key planning issues include whether the mix and location of the proposed land uses are desirable, whether the maximum FAR is acceptable, and whether other development alternatives should be explored. However, CEQA requires that a public agency is responsible for avoiding or minimizing environmental damage where feasible. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15021). The DEIR notes there are significant unavoidable impacts that would result from the proposed project. Accordingly, if the City decides to approve the proposed project with these significant effects that cannot substantially be mitigated, the City must make certain findings that support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. This is known as a “Statement of Overriding Considerations.” In preparing this statement, CEQA requires that the City balance the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in making a determination of approving or denying the proposed project. If the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

S.3 EIR CONCLUSIONS

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table 1-1 (at the end of this chapter) summarizes the environmental impacts and mitigation measures contained in this DEIR. The description of some impacts and mitigation measures in Table 1-1 has been abbreviated consistent with the format of a summary section, and the reader is referred to the main DEIR text for a complete discussion of environmental impacts and mitigation measures (refer to the numbering sequence for location).

S.4 ALTERNATIVES

The purpose of the alternatives discussion is to focus on project solutions capable of avoiding or substantially lessening significant environmental effects of a project, even if those alternatives would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly. The range of alternatives includes those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects.

Significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project are related to traffic and circulation, water supply, and air quality. All other identified significant and/or potentially significant impacts can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the range of alternatives presented in the DEIR seeks to substantially reduce traffic, water supply, noise, and air quality impacts. The project alternatives are as follows:

- Alternative 1 – Existing Buildings Reoccupied (No Project)

- Alternative 2 – M-2 Build-Out with Maximum FAR of 45 percent
- Alternative 3 - M-2 Build-Out with Office at 45 percent FAR and Hotel, Health Club per proposed zoning
- Alternative 4 - Total FAR 110 percent with Hotel, Office, Health Club, Restaurant, Retail per proposed zoning
- Alternative 5 – Reduced Intensity with Total FAR of 117 percent and Hotel, Office, Health Club, Restaurant, Retail per proposed zoning

Under Alternative 1 there would be no GPA/ZOA and the project area would remain designated for Limited Industry and General Industrial zoning consistent with the City’s General Plan and underlying zoning. The current uses would continue in the existing buildings. Under existing conditions in the project area, however, not all buildings are operating at full occupancy. Alternative 1 assumes that existing buildings in the project area could be reoccupied or occupied at a higher level than current conditions.

Alternative 2 seeks to lessen the project’s significant and unavoidable traffic and circulation, noise and air quality impacts. Under Alternative 2, the proposed GPA/ZOA would still occur, although the maximum FAR would remain at 45 percent for office/R&D uses, the same as under the existing M-2 zoning. Under this scenario, the office components of the proposed project would be reduced from 200,000 s.f. to 138,967 s.f. at the Independence site, and from 494,669 s.f. to 173,660 s.f. at the Constitution site. This alternative represents a 65 percent reduction in building space and represents 33 percent of the maximum FAR for the office uses under the proposed project. In addition, the restaurant, health club, and hotel components would not be included in Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 also seeks to lessen the project’s significant and unavoidable traffic and circulation, noise and air quality impacts. Under Alternative 3, the proposed GPA/ZOA would still occur, although the maximum FAR for office and R&D uses would remain at 45 percent, rather than increasing to 100 percent for the office/R&D component under the proposed project. The GPA/ZOA and increased FAR would apply to the Independence site and the Constitution site. Under this scenario, the office components of the proposed project would be reduced from 200,000 s.f. to 138,967 s.f. at the Independence site, and from 494,669 s.f. to 173,660 s.f. at the Constitution site, which represents 45 percent of the maximum FAR for the office uses. Alternative 3 includes the restaurant, health club, retail, and hotel components of the proposed project.

As with the other alternatives, Alternative 4 seeks to lessen the project’s significant and unavoidable traffic and circulation, noise, utilities and service systems, and air quality impacts. Under Alternative 4, a proposed GPA/ZOA would still be required. The square footage of the office components on the Independence site would stay the same as the proposed project, while development on the Constitution site would be reduced in size as compared to the proposed project. This would account for a total of 110 percent of the FAR for both sites combined. Under this scenario, the office components of the proposed project would remain 200,000 s.f. at the Independence site, and would be decreased from 494,669 s.f. to 303,677 s.f. at the Constitution site. This equals a total reduction from the proposed

project of 190,992 s.f. and represents a FAR of 72.5 percent for the office uses. Alternative 4 would also include the restaurant, health club, retail, and hotel components of the proposed project.

Alternative 5 also further reduces the traffic, noise, utilities and service systems, and air quality impacts identified under the proposed project. Under this alternative, a GPA/ZOA would still be required; however, the total FAR would be 117 percent. This alternative assumes the health club, hotel, restaurant and retail uses would still be included; however, the total amount of office/R&D uses would be reduced from 694,669 s.f. to a total of 554,042 s.f. for an office FAR of 79.8 percent.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Based on the comparative assessment presented in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of this DEIR, Alternative 1 would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, under CEQA, if the Environmentally Superior Alternative is the “No Project” Alternative, then at least one of the other alternatives must be designated as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Under Alternative 2, construction-related impacts would be similar to those identified for the proposed project, although they would be less severe under this alternative than for the proposed project. In addition, under Alternative 2, on-site population would not reach the levels predicted for the proposed project, Alternative 3, Alternative 4, or Alternative 5. Therefore, operational impacts, including water demand, would be less severe with Alternative 2 than with Alternative 3, Alternative 4, or Alternative 5. Additionally, the traffic study found that Alternative 2 would avoid significant and unavoidable impacts to one intersection, one roadway segment, and two routes of regional significance that would occur under the proposed project. Alternative 2 would also avoid the significant unavoidable impacts to air quality that would occur with the proposed project, Alternative 3, Alternative 4, and Alternative 5. Therefore, the Environmentally Superior Alternative is Alternative 2.

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
3.1 Aesthetics			
Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project area and its surroundings? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<u>Impact AE-1</u> Development proposed for the project area would substantially alter the existing visual character. However, compliance with the City’s design review and landscaping requirements would help reduce the potential aesthetic degradation to the visual character of the surroundings.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project create a substantial new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Impact Criterion #2)			
<u>Impact AE-2</u> Implementation of the proposed project would create new sources of light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views.	(PS)	<u>Mitigation Measure AE-2.1</u> <i>Design Lighting to Meet Minimum Safety and Security Standards.</i> The project sponsor shall incorporate lighting design specifications to meet minimum safety and security standards. The following measures shall be included in all lighting plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Luminaires shall be designed with cutoff-type fixtures or features that cast low-angle illumination to minimize incidental spillover of light onto adjacent private properties. Fixtures that shine light upward or horizontally shall not spill any light onto adjacent private properties. • Luminaires shall provide accurate color rendering and natural light qualities. Low-pressure sodium and high-pressure sodium fixtures that are not color-corrected shall not be used, except as part of an approved sign or landscape plan. 	(LTS)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Luminary mountings shall be downcast and pole heights minimized to reduce potential for back scatter into the nighttime sky and incidental spillover light onto adjacent properties and undeveloped open space. Light poles shall be no higher than 20 feet. Luminary mountings shall be treated with non-glare finishes. 	
Cumulative Development			
Impact AE-1CM: The proposed project, in combination with surrounding development, would not result in significant cumulative visual, light, or glare impacts. (LTS)			
3.2 Air Quality			
Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<u>Impact AQ-1</u> Development within the project area would result in an increase in pollutant emissions; however, it would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Clean Air Plan.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Impact Criterion #2)			
<u>Impact AQ-2</u> Construction activities associated with the proposed project would temporarily generate dust or diesel emissions exposing people to particulate matter.	(PS)	<u>Mitigation Measure AQ-2.1</u> <i>Implement Recommended Dust Control Measures.</i> To reduce particulate matter emissions during project demolition, excavation and construction phases, the project contractor(s) shall comply with the dust control strategies developed by the BAAQMD. The project sponsor shall include in all construction contracts the following requirements, or measures shown to be equally effective.	(LTS)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose construction and demolition debris from the site shall be covered, or all such trucks shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard. • All exposed or disturbed soil surfaces in active construction areas shall be watered at least twice daily. • All unpaved parking areas and staging areas shall either be paved, watered three times daily, or treated with (non-toxic) soil stabilizers. • All paved parking areas and staging areas shall be swept daily (with water sweepers). • Mud and dirt carried onto paved streets from the construction areas shall be cleaned daily. • Exposed stockpiles (i.e., dirt, sand, etc.) shall be enclosed, covered, watered twice daily or non-toxic soil binders applied. • Traffic speeds shall be limited on unpaved roads to 15 mph. • Sandbags or other erosion control measures shall be used to prevent silt runoff to public roadways. • Vegetation in disturbed areas shall be replanted as quickly as possible. • Wheel washers shall be installed for all exiting trucks, or truck tires and tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site shall be washed. • Wind breaks at the windward side(s) of construction areas shall be installed. 	

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavation and grading activity shall be suspended when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour over a 30-minute period or more. • To the extent possible, the area subject to excavation, grading, and other dust-generating construction activity shall be limited to only one activity. <p><u>Mitigation Measure AQ-2.2</u> <i>Reduce Emissions from Heavy-duty Diesel-powered Equipment.</i> The project sponsor shall include in all construction contracts the following requirements, or measures shown to be equally effective, to reduce the emissions generated by heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment operating in the project area by the following means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All construction equipment shall be maintained in proper working condition in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. • Diesel-powered construction equipment shall comply with the BAAQMD requirements or meet Tier 3 or Tier 4 EPA/ARB standards. • To the extent feasible, the existing electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction sites shall be used rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines. 	
<p><u>Impact AQ-3</u> Operation of the proposed project would create new area and mobile sources of air pollutants that would generate emissions of NO_x, and PM₁₀ that would exceed BAAQMD's significance thresholds.</p>	(S)	None available.	(SU)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<u>Impact AQ-4</u> The addition of project-related traffic would result in increased concentrations of carbon monoxide around intersections in the project vicinity, but not to the extent that the ambient air quality standards for CO would be exceeded.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Impact Criterion #3)			
<u>Impact AQ-5</u> The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air contaminants.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Impact Criterion #4)			
<u>Impact AQ-6</u> The proposed project would not be expected to create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Cumulative Development			
Impact AQ-1CM: The proposed project, combined with other development within the City, would be consistent with the Ozone Attainment Plan and the Clean Air Plan. (LTS)			
Impact AQ-2CM: Construction activities associated with the project combined with other construction activities in the City could generate dust or diesel emissions, thus exposing people to particulate matter. (PS) Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2.1 and AQ-2.2 would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative construction emissions to less than cumulatively considerable. In addition, these same measures would apply to other construction projects that might occur in the vicinity of the project area. As a result, the cumulative impact would be considered to be less than significant. (LTS)			
Impact AQ-3CM: Implementation of the proposed project combined with other cumulative development in the City would create new area and mobile sources of air pollutants that would generate emissions of NO _x , and PM ₁₀ . (S) It is conservatively assumed that the TDM measures would not reduce impacts for NO _x or PM ₁₀ to a less-than-significant level. As a result, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative effects would remain significant and unavoidable. (SU)			
Impact AQ-5CM: Cumulative development in the project vicinity would not result in carbon monoxide concentrations above the ambient air quality standards. (LTS)			
Impact AQ-6CM: The proposed project, combined with other foreseeable development in the project vicinity would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air contaminants. (LTS)			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
3.3 Biological Resources			
Would the project create a substantial adverse effect either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<u>Impact BR-1</u> Removal of trees, shrubs, or woody vegetation within the project area could result in impacts to nesting birds.	(PS)	<u>Mitigation Measure BR-1.1</u> <i>Pre-construction nesting bird surveys.</i> To facilitate compliance with State and federal law (Fish and Game Code and the MBTA) and prevent impacts to nesting birds, the project sponsor shall avoid the removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation between February 1 through August 31 during the bird nesting period. If no vegetation or tree removal is proposed during the nesting period, no surveys are required. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting period, a survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no earlier than seven days prior to the removal of trees, shrubs, weedy vegetation, buildings, or other construction activity. A) Survey results shall be valid for 21 days following the survey. The area surveyed shall include all construction areas as well as areas within 150 feet outside the boundaries of the areas to be cleared or as otherwise determined by the biologist. B) In the event that an active nest for a protected species of bird is discovered in the areas to be cleared, or in other habitats within 150 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction shall be postponed for at least two weeks or until the biologist has determined that the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts.	(LTS)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p><u>Impact BR-2</u> Demolition of buildings within the project area could result in impacts to bats that may roost in buildings.</p>	(PS)	<p><u>Mitigation Measure BR-2.1</u> <i>Conduct bat and bat roosting site surveys.</i> Prior to building demolition or tree removal activities, the project sponsor or developer shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a focused survey for bats and potential roosting sites within buildings to be demolished or trees to be removed. The surveys can be conducted by visual identification and can assume presence of pallid bats or the bats can be identified to a species-level with the use of an “Anabat” unit. If no roosting sites or bats are found, a letter report confirming absence shall be sent to the California Department of Fish and Game and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure BR-2.2</u> <i>Monitoring and Exclusion Measures.</i></p> <p>A) If bats are found roosting outside of nursery season (May 1st through October 1st), then they shall be evicted as described under (b) below. If bats are found roosting during the nursery season, then they shall be monitored to determine if the roost site is a maternal roost. This could occur by either visual inspection of the roost bat pups, if possible, or monitoring the roost after the adults leave for the night to listen for bat pups. If the roost is determined to not be a maternal roost, then the bats shall be evicted as described under (b). Because bat pups cannot leave the roost until they are mature enough, eviction of a maternal roost cannot occur during the nursery season. A 250-foot (or as determined in consultation with the Department of Fish and Game) buffer zone shall be established around the roosting site within which no construction shall occur.</p>	(LTS)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		B) Eviction of bats shall be conducted using bat exclusion techniques, developed by Bat Conservation International (BCI) and in consultation with the Department of Fish and Game, that allow the bats to exit the roosting site but prevent re-entry to the site. This would include, but not be limited to, the installation of one way exclusion devices. The devices shall remain in place for seven days and then the exclusion points and any other potential entrances shall be sealed. This work shall be completed by a BCI recommended exclusion professional. The exclusion of bats shall be timed and carried concurrently with any scheduled bird exclusion activities.	
<p>Cumulative Development</p> <p>Impact BR-1CM: Removal of buildings, trees, shrubs, or other woody vegetation associated with construction of the proposed project and other cumulative development within the City could result in impacts to nesting birds and bats. (PS) Implementation of Mitigation Measures BR-1.1, BR-2.1 and BR-2.2 would mitigate the project's contribution to a less than cumulatively considerable level. (LTS)</p>			
<p>3.4 Cultural Resources</p>			
<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (Impact Criterion #1)</p>			
<p><u>Impact CR-1</u></p> <p>The proposed project has the potential to encounter and damage or destroy previously unknown subsurface archaeological resources during construction.</p>	<p>(PS)</p>	<p><u>Mitigation Measure CR-1.1</u></p> <p><i>Perform pre-construction surveys, evaluate uncovered archaeological features, and mitigate potential disturbance for identified significant resources.</i> Prior to the initiation of earth-disturbing activities, the project sponsor shall hire a qualified archaeologist (i.e., one who meets the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualifications for archaeology or one under the supervision of such a professional) to monitor, to the extent determined necessary by the archaeologist, project-related earth-disturbing activities (e.g. grading, excavation, trenching).</p>	<p>(LTS)</p>

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>In the event that any prehistoric or historic-period subsurface archaeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil (“midden”), that could conceal cultural deposits, animal bone, obsidian, and/or mortar are discovered during demolition/construction-related earth-moving activities, all ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of the discovery shall be halted immediately, and the City of Menlo Park Community Development Department shall be notified within 24 hours. The City shall consult with the project archeologist to assess the significance of the find. Impacts on any significant resources shall be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through data recovery or other methods determined adequate by the City and that are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeological Documentation.</p> <p>If a Native American archaeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are discovered, all identification and treatment of the resources shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist and Native American representatives who are approved by the local Native American community as scholars of the cultural traditions. In the event that no such Native American is available, persons who represent tribal governments and/or organizations in the locale in which resources could be affected shall be consulted. When historic archaeological sites or historic architectural features are involved, all identification and treatment is to be carried out by historical archaeologists or architectural historians who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s professional qualifications for archaeology and/or architectural history.</p>	

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Impact Criterion #2)</p>			
<p><u>Impact CR-2</u> The proposed project has the potential to encounter or discover human remains during excavation or construction in the project area.</p>	<p>(PS)</p>	<p><u>Mitigation Measure CR-2.1</u> <i>Comply with State regulations regarding the discovery of human remains. If human remains are discovered during any construction activities, all ground-disturbing activity within 50 feet of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the County coroner shall be notified immediately, according to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of California’s Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined by the County coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The project sponsor shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience to conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant, if any, identified by the NAHC. As necessary, the archaeologist may provide professional assistance to the Most Likely Descendant, including the excavation and removal of the human remains. The City of Menlo Park Community Development Department shall be responsible for approval of recommended mitigation as it deems appropriate, taking account of the provisions of state law, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The project sponsor shall implement approved mitigation, to be verified by the Community Development Department, before the resumption of ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of where the remains were discovered.</i></p>	<p>(LTS)</p>

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
Cumulative Development			
<p>Impact CR-1CM: The proposed project, combined with other development in the City, would have a potentially significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources and human remains. (PS) Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1.1 and CR-2.1 would provide required discovery procedures for any previously unknown archaeological resources or human remains encountered during project construction. The discovery procedures are consistent with professional standards and, as they pertain to discovered human remains, compliant with State law. Compliance with these mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant cumulative impacts associated with the loss of archeological resources and the disturbance of human remains to a less-than-significant level. (LTS)</p>			
3.5 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<p><u>Impact HY-1</u> The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</p>	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Impact Criterion #2)			
<p><u>Impact HY-2</u> The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.</p>	(LTS)	None required.	—

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Impact Criterion #3)			
<u>Impact HY-3</u> The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project area, including alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate of amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Impact Criterion #4)			
<u>Impact HY-4</u> The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed pre-project levels or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Impact Criterion #5)			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<u>Impact HY-5</u> The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Impact Criterion #6)			
<u>Impact HY-6</u> The proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Impact Criterion #7)			
<u>Impact HY-7</u> Structures placed within the 100-year flood hazard area as a result of the proposed project could impede or redirect flood flow.	(PS)	<u>Mitigation Measure HY-7.1</u> <i>Prepare and obtain a CLOMR-F from FEMA prior to issuance of a grading or building permit. In accordance with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) (Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 44 Part 65), Section 65.6 (Revision of base flood elevation determinations) supporting data must include relevant hydraulic and hydrologic analyses, delineation of floodplain boundaries and all other information required by FEMA to review and evaluate the request for a CLOMR-F. The project sponsor shall perform this work. The analyses submitted by the project sponsor shall clearly show revised and new floodplain boundaries, for the project area and adjacent areas not affected by the revision.</i>	(LS)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding? (Impact Criterion #8)			
<u>Impact HY-8</u> The proposed project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Cumulative Development Impact HY-1CM: The proposed project, combined with future development within the Atherton Channel watershed for surface water, would not substantially degrade water quality. (LTS) Impact HY-2CM: The proposed project, combined with future development within the San Mateo subbasin, would not substantially degrade groundwater supplies. (LTS) Impact HY-3CM: The proposed project, combined with future development within the Atherton Channel watershed, would not substantially contribute to flooding but could be substantially affected by flooding. (LTS)			
3.6 Hazardous Materials			
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<u>Impact HM-1</u> Project-related demolition or excavation in the project area could disturb hazardous materials in existing building components, but compliance with existing regulations would prevent adverse health or safety effects.	(LTS)	None required.	—

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Impact Criterion #2)</p>			
<p><u>Impact HM-2</u> Site grading, landscaping, excavation, and construction activities in the project area could expose construction personnel and the public to existing contaminated soil and/or groundwater if approved remediation cleanup levels have not been achieved.</p>	(PS)	<p><u>Mitigation Measure HM-2.1</u> <i>Prepare and implement health and safety plan.</i> The project sponsor shall prepare and the project contractor shall implement a site-specific health and safety plan prior to any below grade excavation activities that may encounter groundwater. The site-specific health and safety plans shall follow California and federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA and OSHA, respectively) standards under California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 8, Section 5192, and 29 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1910.120, respectively, and any other applicable health and safety laws, regulations and/or standards. Health and safety plans shall include, among other things, a description of health and safety training requirements for on-site construction personnel, a description of the level of personal protective equipment to be used, and any other applicable precautions to be undertaken to minimize direct contact with contaminated soil or groundwater.</p>	(LTS)
<p>Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Impact Criterion #3)</p>			
<p><u>Impact HM-3</u> Routine use or accidental release of hazardous materials during operations in the project area could expose people or the environment to these materials; however, compliance with existing regulations would ensure the safety of people and the environment.</p>	(LTS)	None required.	—

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>Cumulative Development Impact HM-1CM: The proposed project, in combination with other related projects and buildout of the City, would not result in a significant cumulative impact associated with hazardous materials use, generation, disposal, transport, or clean-up. (LTS)</p>			
<p>3.7 Land Use</p>			
<p>Would the proposed project conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance or any specific plan), adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Impact Criterion #1)</p>			
<p><u>Impact LU-1</u> The proposed project would not conflict with the current General Plan designation and zoning district for the project area because the project is creating a new land use designation and zoning district.</p>	(NI)		
<p><u>Impact LU-2</u> The proposed project would generally be consistent with the Menlo Park General Plan policies; however, as demonstrated in Section 3.11, Traffic and Circulation, the proposed project would not satisfy the City policies regarding service at State-controlled intersections.</p>	(LTS)	<p>The proposed project is considered generally consistent with the intent of the applicable goals and policies with the possible exception of several traffic policies concerning congestion at State-controlled intersections. Section 3.11, Traffic and Circulation, addresses the project-specific impacts associated with not meeting a specific threshold set forth in the City’s policies. However, ultimately, the City Council shall determine if the proposed project is consistent with the intent of its General Plan goals and policies.</p>	—
<p>Cumulative Development Changes in the land use designation or zoning are not considered additive effects that when combined with other such actions would contribute to a cumulative effect or impact. Reviewing the consistency with applicable plans or policies is inherently project-specific and is not relevant on a cumulative level. (LTS)</p>			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
3.8 Noise			
Would the project expose persons or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinances, or the applicable standards of other agencies? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<u>Impact NO-1</u> The proposed project would result in a substantial increase in the exposure of people to noise in excess of the standards established in the Menlo Park General Plan or Menlo Park Municipal Code.	(S)	None feasible.	(SU)
Would the project expose persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? (Impact Criterion #2)			
<u>Impact NO-2</u> Construction activities associated with the proposed project would have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration.	(PS)	<u>Mitigation Measure NO 2.1</u> <i>Notify nearby businesses of construction activities that could affect vibration-sensitive equipment.</i> The project sponsor shall provide notification to adjacent property owners and occupants, prior to the start of construction, informing them of the estimated start date and duration of vibration-generating construction activities, such as would occur during site preparation, grading, and pile driving, if required. This notification shall include information warning about potential for impacts related to vibration-sensitive equipment. The project sponsor shall identify a phone number for the property owners and occupants to call if they have vibration-sensitive equipment on their site.	(SU)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p><u>Mitigation Measure NO 2.2</u> <i>Implement construction best management practices to reduce construction vibration.</i> If vibration-sensitive equipment is identified within the project vicinity, the project sponsor shall implement the following measures during construction of all project components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the extent feasible, construction activities that could generate high vibration levels at any identified vibration-sensitive locations, shall be scheduled during times that would have the least impact on nearby land uses. This could include restricting construction activities in the areas of potential impact to the early and late hours of the work day, such as from 8:00 am to 10:00 am or 4:00pm to 6:00 pm Monday to Friday. • Stationary sources, such as construction staging areas and temporary generators, shall be located as far from nearby vibration-sensitive receptors as possible. • Trucks shall be prohibited from idling along streets serving the construction site where vibration-sensitive equipment is located. 	
<p>Would the proposed project result in a substantial permanent ambient noise level increase in the project vicinity? (Impact Criterion #3)</p>			
<p><u>Impact NO-3</u> Operation of the proposed project would result in a substantial permanent ambient noise level increase in the project vicinity.</p>	(S)	None feasible.	(SU)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>Would the proposed project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels? (Impact Criterion #4)</p>			
<p><u>Impact NO-4</u> Construction of the proposed project would generate a short-term increase in noise levels that would exceed ambient noise levels in the area.</p>	<p align="center">(PS)</p>	<p><u>Mitigation Measure NO-4.1</u> <i>Implement construction best management practices to reduce construction noise.</i> The project applicant shall implement the following measures during the construction of the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the extent feasible, the noisiest construction activities shall be scheduled during times that would have the least impact on nearby residential land uses. This would include restricting typical demolition and exterior construction activities to the hours of 8:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday to Friday. • Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds) wherever feasible. • Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible, and this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible. 	<p align="center">(LTS)</p>

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction contractors, to the maximum extent feasible, shall be required to use “quiet” gasoline-powered compressors or other electric-powered compressors, and use electric rather than gasoline or diesel powered forklifts for small lifting. • Stationary noise sources, such as temporary generators, shall be located as far from nearby receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible. • If required by the City, temporary plywood noise barriers shall be erected around the construction site, to shield adjacent uses. • Trucks shall be prohibited from idling along streets serving the construction site. 	

Cumulative Development

Impact NO-1CM: The proposed project, in combination with other development within the City, could result in a substantial increase in exposure of persons to noise in excess of the standards established in the Menlo Park General Plan or Menlo Park Municipal Code; however, the proposed project’s contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (LTS)

Impact NO-2CM: Construction activities associated with project-related development and other future development in the City would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration. (LTS)

Impact NO-3CM: Operation of the proposed project and other cumulative developments would result in a substantial permanent ambient noise level increase in the project vicinity; however, the proposed project’s contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable. (LTS)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
3.9 Population and Housing			
Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses), or indirectly (for example, through the extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<u>Impact PH-1</u> Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased employment in the project area, but the projected growth would not in and of itself result in adverse direct impacts.	(LTS)	None required.	—
<u>Impact PH-2</u> The increase in on-site employment due to the proposed project could have secondary growth effects that could increase employment, population, and housing demand.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project displace a substantial number of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Impact Criterion #2)			
Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Impact Criterion #3)			
<u>Impact PH-3</u> The proposed project would have no direct effects on population in Menlo Park, because it does not involve residential development.	(NI)	None required.	—

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
3.10 Public Services			
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police and/or fire protection and emergency services facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<u>Impact PS-1</u> The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police service facilities.	(NI)	None required.	—
<u>Impact PS-2</u> The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire and emergency service facilities.	(NI)	None required.	—
Cumulative Development Impact PS-1CM: The proposed project, in combination with other development within the City or the fire district, would not result in the need for new or physically altered police, fire or emergency service facilities. (NI)			
3.11 Traffic and Circulation			
City Arterial Intersections/Local Approaches to State-Controlled Intersections: Would project traffic increment cause an intersection operating at LOS D or better to reach LOS E (greater than 23 seconds average delay per vehicle) or worse OR, would the project traffic increment cause an intersection already operating at LOS E or worse to experience an increase of more than 0.8 seconds of average delay to vehicles on all of the critical movements for City arterial intersections, or for local approaches to State controlled intersections? (Impact Criterion #1)			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>Other City Intersections (Collector and Local streets): Would project traffic increment cause an intersection operating at LOS C or better to reach LOS D or worse OR, to have an increase of 23 seconds or greater in average delay, whichever comes first? Or would the project add project traffic, causing an increase of more than 0.8 seconds of average delay to vehicles on all critical movements for intersections operating at a near term LOS D through F for collector streets? (Impact Criterion #2)</p>			
<p>State Controlled Intersections: At State-controlled intersections currently operating at LOS D or better, does the project's cumulative analysis indicate that the combination of the proposed project and future cumulative traffic demand would result in the intersection operating at a level of service that violates the standard adopted and the proposed project increases average control delay at the intersection by four (4) seconds or more? Or, for intersections operating at LOS E or F, the does the project's cumulative analysis indicate that the combination of the proposed project and future cumulative traffic demand would result in increasing the average control delay at the intersection by four (4) seconds or more? (Impact Criterion #3)</p>			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p><u>Impact TR-1</u> Increases in traffic associated with the proposed project under the Near Term plus Project Conditions would result in increased delays at several intersections during peak hours causing a significant impact to the operation of the intersections.</p>	(S)	<p><u>Mitigation Measure TR-1.1</u></p> <p>A) <i>Willow Road/Newbridge Street Intersection Improvements.</i> For impacts related to this intersection, the recommended mitigation measure is to add capacity to the southbound through movement. While this could be accomplished by restriping the southbound right lane to a through-right lane, additional receiving capacity would be needed. Due to existing right-of-way and various signal and utility equipment, this measure would require obtaining additional right-of way in order to implement significant intersection modifications, some of which are under Caltrans jurisdiction. Also, adaptive signal timing, traffic impact fees, and the transportation demand management program would serve as partial mitigation measures.</p> <p>B) <i>Bayfront Expressway/Willow Road Intersection Improvements.</i> For impacts related to the Bayfront Expressway/Willow Road intersection, the recommended mitigation measure is to convert the existing eastbound shared left-through lane into a left only lane, and add a second westbound left-turn only lane. Additionally, the addition of an eastbound right turn overlap phase and a third right turn lane have been examined. This mitigation measure would substantially reduce the average delay to an acceptable LOS D. Each of these mitigation measures may be completed separately. Additionally, adaptive signal timing, traffic impact fees, and the transportation demand management program would serve as partial mitigation measures. Implementation of this mitigation measure also would require coordination with and approval by Caltrans.</p>	<p>(SU)</p> <p>(SU)</p>

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>C) <i>Bayfront Expressway and Chilco Street Intersection Improvements.</i> For this intersection, an additional eastbound left turn lane would reduce the delay at this intersection to below No Project condition levels. This measure may require additional right of way and would require coordination with and approval by Caltrans. However, adaptive signal timing, traffic impact fees, and the transportation demand management program would serve as partial mitigation measures.</p> <p>D) <i>Bayfront Expressway and Chrysler Drive intersection Improvements.</i> For impacts related to the Bayfront Expressway and Chrysler Drive intersection, the recommended mitigation measure is to convert the existing right turn lane to a left turn lane and add a shared left turn and right turn lane to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This would result in an approach with two left turn only lanes and one shared left turn/right turn lane. However, this measure is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and would require coordination with and approval by Caltrans. Additionally, adaptive signal timing, traffic impact fees, and the transportation demand management program would serve as partial mitigation measures.</p>	<p>(SU)</p> <p>(SU)</p>

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>E) <i>Bayfront Expressway and Haven Avenue intersection Improvements.</i> For impacts related to the Bayfront Expressway and Haven Avenue intersection, there is no feasible mitigation within the current right-of-way that would significantly reduce delay. The project sponsor shall make a contribution toward installing an adaptive signal timing program to include each of the signalized intersections on Bayfront Expressway between University Avenue and Haven Avenue. This mitigation measure would improve the operation of the intersection, but would not reduce the operating conditions to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, traffic impact fees, and the transportation demand management program would serve as partial mitigation measures.</p> <p>F) <i>Independence Drive/Constitution Drive intersection Improvements.</i> For impacts related to the Independence Drive/Constitution Drive intersection, there would be less than five vehicles that would experience high delays (up to approximately 150 seconds). This impact could be mitigated by blocking access to Independence Drive from Constitution, and requiring vehicles to access Independence via Chrysler Drive, which would remove delays from this approach. However, due to the low number of vehicles experiencing high delays, re-circulating traffic for less than five vehicles would not be feasible, and these vehicles would find alternative routes on their own when conditions dictate. Additionally, traffic impact fees, and the transportation demand management program would serve as partial mitigation measures.</p>	<p>(SU)</p> <p>(SU)</p>

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>I) Upon occupancy of the first building of the proposed project, the applicant shall implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program consistent with the preliminary TDM plan (Appendix J). Any modifications to the specifics or phasing of the TDM measures shall be subject to review and approval of the City of Menlo Park and the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County. While the effectiveness of particular TDM measures varies from development to development depending upon location and the features of the surrounding transportation network, it is unlikely that the proposed TDM program would result in trip reductions substantial enough to mitigate traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>J) Prior to building permit issuance, the project applicant shall pay a fee as a contribution toward adaptive signal timing improvements based on impacts to the following four intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willow Road/Newbridge Street; • Bayfront Expressway/University Avenue; • Bayfront Expressway/Haven Avenue; and • Marsh Road/US 101 NB Off-Ramp. 	<p>(SU)</p> <p>(SU)</p>

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>Freeways (Roadways of Regional Significance): For freeway segments currently in compliance with the adopted LOS standard, would the project cause the freeway segment to operate at a level of service that violates the standard adopted? Additionally, does the project’s cumulative analysis indicate that the combination of the proposed project and future cumulative traffic demand result in the freeway segment operating at a level of service that violates the standard adopted? And would the proposed project increase traffic demand on the freeway segment by an amount equal to one (1) percent or more of the segment capacity, or cause the freeway segment volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio to increase by one (1) percent? If the freeway is not in compliance with the adopted LOS standard, would the project add traffic demand equal to one (1) percent or more of the segment capacity or cause the freeway segment volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio to increase by one (1) percent? (Impact Criterion #4)</p>			
<p>City Arterials and Collectors: Would the project increase ADT beyond that described in the following formulas for arterial or collector streets?</p> <p><i>Arterials</i>-The existing ADT is: (1) greater than 18,000 (90 percent of capacity) and there is a net increase of 100 trips or more in ADT due to project-related traffic; (2) the ADT is greater than 10,000 (50 percent of capacity) but less than 18,000, and the project-related traffic increases the ADT by 12.5 percent or the ADT becomes 18,000 or more; or (3) the ADT is less than 10,000 and the project-related traffic increases the ADT by 25 percent.</p>			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p><i>Collector Streets</i> -The existing ADT is: (1) greater than 9,000 (90 percent of capacity) and there is a net increase of 50 trips or more in ADT due to project-related traffic; (2) the ADT is greater than 5,000 (50 percent of capacity) but less than 9,000, and the project-related traffic increases the ADT by 12.5 percent or the ADT becomes 9,000 or more; or (3) the ADT is less than 5,000 and the project-related traffic increases the ADT by 25 percent. (Impact Criterion #5)</p>			
<p>Local Streets: Would the project increase ADT beyond that described in the following formula for local streets? The existing ADT is: (1) greater than 1,350 (90 percent of capacity) and there is a net increase of 25 trips or more in ADT due to project-related traffic; (2) the ADT is greater than 750 (50 percent of capacity) but less than 1,350, and the project-related traffic increases the ADT by 12.5 percent or the ADT becomes 1,350; or (3) the ADT is less than 750 and the project related-traffic increases the ADT by 25 percent. (Impact Criterion #6)</p>			
<p><u>Impact TR-2</u> Increases in traffic associated with the proposed project under the Near Term plus Project Conditions would result in increased volumes on study area roadway segments during peak hours causing a potentially significant impact.</p>	(PS)	<p><u>Mitigation Measure TR-2.1</u> A) <i>Marsh Road between Bohannon Drive and Bay Road.</i> There is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce the proposed project related traffic impacts to the segment of Marsh Road from Scott Drive to Bohannon Drive to less-than-significant levels. An additional travel lane would increase capacity, but lack of sufficient right-of-way for the improvement does not permit this as a feasible measure.</p>	(SU)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>B) <i>Constitution Drive between Independence Drive and Chrysler Drive.</i> There is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce this impact to less than significant. An additional lane of travel would provide an increase in capacity, but lack of sufficient right-of-way for the improvement does not permit this as a feasible measure.</p> <p>C) <i>Constitution Drive between Chrysler Drive and Chilco Street.</i> There is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce this impact to less than significant. An additional lane of travel would provide an increase in capacity, but lack of sufficient right-of-way for the improvement does not permit this as a feasible measure.</p> <p>D) <i>Independence Drive between Constitution Drive and Chrysler Drive.</i> There is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce this impact to less than significant. An additional lane of travel would provide an increase in capacity, but lack of sufficient right-of-way for the improvement does not permit this as a feasible measure.</p> <p>E) <i>Chrysler Drive between Bayfront Expressway and Constitution Drive.</i> There is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce this impact to less than significant. An additional lane of travel would provide an increase in capacity but lack of sufficient right-of-way for the improvement does not permit this as a feasible measure.</p>	<p>(SU)</p> <p>(SU)</p> <p>(SU)</p> <p>(SU)</p>

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		C) <i>US 101 North of Marsh Road</i> . There is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce this impact to less than significant. An additional travel lane would increase capacity but adding a lane to the freeway is not a feasible mitigation measure.	
<u>Impact TR-4</u> Under Near Term plus Project conditions the project would not result in any impacts to the local transit system.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities: Would the project provide adequate pedestrian or bicycle facilities to connect to the area circulation system, or would vehicles cross pedestrian facilities on a regular basis without adequate design and/or warning systems, causing safety hazards, or would project design cause increased potential for bicycle/vehicle conflicts? (Impact Criterion #7)			
Impact TR-5 Under Near Term plus Project conditions, the proposed project would not result in any impacts to local bicycle or pedestrian facilities.	(LTS)	None required.	—

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
Cumulative Development			
<p><u>Impact TR-1CM</u> Increase in traffic associated with the proposed project under Long Term plus Project Conditions would result in increased delays at ten study intersections causing a significant cumulative impact to the operation of these intersections under Criteria #1, #2 and #3.</p>	(S)	<p>Mitigation Measure TR-1CM.1 Implement Mitigation Measures TR-1.1 (A) through (G) as well as the following mitigation measures: A) Marsh Road/Bohannon Drive. A preliminary design has found that the addition of a westbound right turn lane of 350 feet would mitigate the impact and the addition of a right turn lane of 150 feet would alleviate some of the vehicle delay associated with this turning movement. The necessary right-of-way for improvements at either 150 feet or 350 feet appears to exist. The right-of-way is located within the City of Menlo Park, but the single-family residences and driveways that front Marsh Road are located in the City of Redwood City. The 350-foot improvement would necessitate the removal of two heritage walnut trees and abuts approximately seven residences. The 150-foot improvement would necessitate the removal of one heritage walnut tree and abuts three residences, but only two driveways. Additionally, traffic impact fees, and the transportation demand management program, also would serve as partial mitigation measures. An option that is currently being implemented at other busy roadways in Menlo Park would be the implementation of an adaptive signal timing program that would operate in real time, adjusting signal timing to accommodate changing traffic patterns. The timing programs adjust the split, offset, cycle lengths, and phase order of the signals using sensors to interpret characteristics of traffic approaching an intersection, and using mathematical and predictive algorithms, adapts the signal timings accordingly, optimizing their performance.</p>	(SU)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>The impact would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of this mitigation measure due to the need for coordination with the City of Redwood City.</p> <p>B) <i>Bayfront Expressway/University Avenue</i>. For this intersection, there is no feasible mitigation within the current right-of-way that would significantly reduce delay. An option that is currently being implemented at other busy intersections in Menlo Park would be the implementation of adaptive signal timing. Any potential mitigation measure would require coordination with and approval by Caltrans.</p> <p>C) <i>Marsh Road/US 101 NB Off-Ramp</i>. For this intersection, there is no feasible mitigation within the current right-of-way that would significantly reduce delay. This freeway interchange was recently modified and additional widening or construction is not envisioned at this time. Even with signal timing improvements, potential impacts at this intersection would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Any potential mitigation measure would require coordination with Caltrans.</p>	<p>(SU)</p> <p>(SU)</p>

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		D) <i>Marsh Road/Middlefield Road (Atherton)</i> . In order to improve the operating condition for the PM peak hour to an acceptable level, a potential mitigation measure would involve adding a second southbound left-turn only lane. On Middlefield Road, this measure would also require widening Middlefield Road on either side of Marsh Road. This measure would also require widening the east leg of Marsh Road to provide two receiving lanes, in order to accept the two southbound left-turn lanes from Middlefield Road. This measure may require obtaining additional right-of way and coordination with and approval by the Town of Atherton. The mitigation measure described would improve average delays and reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, the implementation of this mitigation measure is under the jurisdiction of the City of Atherton.	(D)
<u>Impact TR-2CM</u> Increase in traffic associated with the proposed project under Cumulative plus Project Conditions would result in a significant cumulative impact on roadway segments in the project area.	(S)	None feasible.	(SU)
<u>Impact TR-3CM</u> Increase in traffic associated with the proposed project under Cumulative plus Project Conditions would result in a significant impact on Routes of Regional Significance in the project area.	(S)	None feasible.	(SU)
<u>Impact TR-4CM</u> Under Cumulative plus Project conditions the project would not result in any impacts to the local pedestrian, bicycle, or transit system.	(LTS)	None required.	—

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
3.12 Utilities			
Would the project have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<u>Impact UT-1</u> The proposed project could exceed water supplies available under normal conditions to serve the project from existing entitlements.	(S)	<u>Mitigation Measure UT-1.1</u> <i>Water Conservation Methods.</i> The project sponsor shall implement the following water conservation methods. These methods could include, but not be limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site rain gardens, cisterns, stormwater collection systems and other low impact development (LID) practices shall be installed. • A dual recycled water system shall be installed, in consultation with the SFPUC, as part of project design, and to be used for toilets, irrigation of outdoor landscaping and other non-potable water supply requirements. 	(SU)
Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Impact Criterion #2)			
<u>Impact UT-2</u> The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB? (Impact Criterion #3)			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Impact Criterion #4)			
<u>Impact UT-3</u> The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, nor result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves the project area that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's expected demand in addition to the provider's existing entitlements.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Impact Criterion #5)			
Would the project fail to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Impact Criterion #6)			
The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal. The proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Impact Criterion #7)			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Would the project result in a determination by the gas and electric provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments, and would result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy? (Impact Criterion #8)			
The proposed project would not exceed existing gas and electric supply.	(LTS)	None required.	—
Cumulative Development <u>Impact UT-1CM</u> The proposed project, in combination with other development within the City of Menlo Park, could have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements under normal, dry and multiple dry years.			
The following mitigation measure identifies a number of water conservation measures, programs or projects that could reduce water demand and begin to correct the supply and demand imbalance. In compliance with its Individual Contact with SFPUC and under BAWSCA’s conservation provisions, MPWMD in its efforts to reduce its contribution to regional demands has implemented the BMPs listed below with the exception of the “Potential BMPs.” Figure 3.12-2 demonstrates the levels of conservation at 10 and 20 percent that would be necessary to reduce the cumulative impact to less-than-significant levels. However, in order to reduce water demand within MPMWD service area, some of the BMPs involve other entities. While these BMPs would potentially reduce citywide demands and reduce the water supply shortfall; consequently, due to the extent of regional supply cutbacks and since all BMPs are not under the City’s jurisdiction it cannot be guaranteed that each BMP would be implemented; therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. (SU)			
<u>Impact UT-1CM:</u> The proposed project, in combination with other development within the City of Menlo Park, could have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements under normal, dry and multiple dry years. Therefore, this is a significant cumulative impact.	(S)	<u>Mitigation Measure UT-1CM.1</u> <i>Conservation Measures.</i> The UWMP lists BMPs outlined by the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) and other demand management programs that are currently in effect to reduce demand in the event of supply cutbacks.	(SU)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>Residential plumbing retrofit. Between 1985 and 1993, MPMWD distributed over 5,000 water conservation kits (showerheads, aerators, toilet dams and leak pills). MPMWD plans to continue this program in the future, but market penetration of lowflow devices (showerheads) is nearly saturated and expected additional savings very modest.</p> <p>Leak reductions through constant maintenance, system repair audits, leak detection, and repair. Conducted on an as needed basis. Unaccounted for water is historically low (3 to 4%) relative to other utilities.</p> <p>Metering with commodity rates for all new connections and retrofit of existing connections. MPMWD meters water use for all of its customers and uses a conservation promoting multi-block tiered rate structure in order to encourage water conservation.</p> <p>Large landscape conservation programs and incentives. Enforce water efficient landscape ordinance (UWMP Appendix D). Plans to distribute water use reports to large landscape users. Plans to facilitate Xeriscape education and staff training at retail garden/irrigation supply centers.</p> <p>High-efficiency washing machine rebate programs. Currently participating in residential and commercial programs. For the residential program, achieved 66 rebates for FY 2003/04 and 84 rebates for FY 2004/05.</p> <p>School education programs and public outreach, includes water efficient landscaping demonstrations. Multiple level programs: Slogan contests, giveaways of water savings kits (showerheads and other fixtures); advertizing campaigns; Bay Area landscape seminars and classes.</p>	

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>Conservation programs for commercial, industrial, and institutional accounts. Participating in a pre-rinse spray nozzle replacement program for restaurants and food service facilities. Enforce water efficient landscape ordinance (UWMP Appendix D). Achieve water reduction goals in the form of employee education and audits. In the future, BAWSCA may offer a regional program.</p> <p>Conservation pricing. Uses an increasing block-rate tiered structure where the per unit price of water increases with increasing increments of water use.</p> <p>Water conservation coordinator. Shared position among staff.</p> <p>Water waste prohibition. Comply with Ordinance No. 849</p> <p>Residential ultra-low-flush toilet replacement programs.</p> <p>System Pressure Control Program.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure UT-1CM.2</u></p> <p><i>Alternative Supplies and Demand Offsets.</i> Listed below are projects or programs that MPMWD is currently investigating or considering as methods to reduce citywide demands or improve local supplies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of groundwater wells to serve irrigation needs; Implementation of this mitigation measure could require project-specific environmental analysis to assess if the construction or operation of new wells would have any adverse environmental consequences and would require environmental evaluation. • Use of dual plumbing systems utilizing groundwater or “gray water” for irrigation and other non-potable needs; and 	

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water use offsets, such as removal and replacement of existing turf with artificial turf at sports fields. <p><u>Mitigation Measure UT-1CM.3</u> <i>Capital Improvement Projects.</i> MPMWD through implementation of its Capital Improvement Program is taking steps to address dry year deficiencies as well to provide continued reliable water service through the year 2030. One of MPMWD’s guiding principles regarding water service is to repair, replace, and upgrade the water distribution infrastructure to ensure the system’s long-term integrity. Money is appropriated to the Capital Improvement Program to accomplish this objective as illustrated in Table 3.12-10. The amount varies widely year to year depending on the particular projects.</p>	
<p>Impact UT-2CM: The proposed project, in combination with other development within the City of Menlo Park, would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. (LTS)</p> <p>Impact UT-3CM: The proposed project, in combination with other development within the service area, would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, nor result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project area that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s expected demand in addition to the provider’s existing entitlements. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be less than significant. (LTS)</p> <p>Impact UT-4CM: The proposed project, combined with other development within the service area, would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate its solid waste disposal needs, and the proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (LTS)</p> <p>Impact UT-5CM: The proposed project alone would not require the construction or expansion of the stormwater facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impact on the existing storm drainage system’s ability to collect and convey stormwater runoff. (NI)</p> <p>Impact UT-6CM: The proposed project, in combination with other development served by PG&E, would not exceed existing gas and electric supply capacity. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be less than significant. (LTS)</p>			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
3.13 Climate Change			
Would the project fail to implement all emission-reduction strategies deemed to be feasible by the City? (Impact Criterion #1)			
<u>Impact CC-1</u> Future development under the proposed project would result in a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	(PS)	<u>Mitigation Measure CC-1.1</u> To the extent feasible and to the satisfaction of the City, the project sponsor shall incorporate the following measures into the design, construction and operation of the project, in addition to other applicable measures identified in the City of Menlo Park Climate Action Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an On-Site Renewable Energy System that consists of solar, wind, geothermal, biomass and/or bio-gas strategies. This system shall reduce grid-based energy purchases and provide at least 2.5 percent of the project energy cost from renewable energy. Such a strategy could include installation of photovoltaic panels and solar and tankless hot water heaters; • Install light colored “cool” roofs and cool pavements; • Install energy efficient heating and cooling systems, appliances and equipment, and control systems; • Install light emitting diodes (LEDs) for outdoor lighting; • Install the infrastructure to deliver and use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation; • Install charging stations for election vehicles for employee and visitors; and • Implement a recycled content purchasing policy (e.g., prohibiting use of plastic water bottles). 	(LTS)

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 1-1
Menlo Gateway Project
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
Cumulative Development			
<p>The analysis of the proposed project’s climate change impact is essentially an analysis of the project’s contribution to a cumulatively significant global impact through its emission of greenhouse gases. The cumulative impacts of the proposed project, with respect to the issue of climate change, are therefore addressed above.</p>			

Legend: (S) Significant Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Impact (NI) No Impact
