

### 3. Infill Environmental Checklist

## Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The infill project could potentially result in one or more of the following environmental effects.

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forestry                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality       | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings |  |

## Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed infill project WOULD NOT have any significant effects on the environment that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed, or that uniformly applicable development policies would not substantially mitigate. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21094.5, CEQA does not apply to such effects. A Notice of Determination (Section 15094) will be filed.
- I find that the proposed infill project will have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. With respect to those effects that are subject to CEQA, I find that such effects WOULD NOT be significant and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION, or if the project is a Transit Priority Project a SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed infill project will have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. I find that although those effects could be significant, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the infill project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, or if the project is a Transit Priority Project a SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed infill project would have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. I find that those effects WOULD be significant, and an infill ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required to analyze those effects that are subject to CEQA.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Thomas Rogers, Senior Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

July 10, 2014

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
For

## Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. For the purposes of this checklist, “prior EIR” means the environmental impact report certified for a planning level decision, as supplemented by any subsequent or supplemental environmental impact reports, negative declarations, or addenda to those documents. “Planning level decision” means the enactment or amendment of a general plan, community plan, specific plan, or zoning code. (Section 15183.3(e).)
4. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur as a result of an infill project, then the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact has already been analyzed in a prior EIR. If the effect of the infill project is not more significant than what has already been analyzed, that effect of the infill project is not subject to CEQA. The brief explanation accompanying this determination should include page and section references to the portions of the prior EIR containing the analysis of that effect. The brief explanation shall also indicate whether the prior EIR included any mitigation measures to substantially lessen that effect and whether those measures have been incorporated into the infill project.<sup>1</sup>

If the infill project would cause a significant adverse effect that either is specific to the project or project site and was not analyzed in a prior EIR, or is more significant than what was analyzed in a prior EIR, the lead agency must determine whether uniformly applicable development policies or standards that have been adopted by the lead agency, or city or county, would substantially mitigate that effect. If so, the checklist shall explain how the infill project’s implementation of the uniformly applicable development policies will substantially mitigate that effect. That effect of the infill project is not subject to CEQA if the lead agency makes a finding, based upon substantial evidence, that the development policies or standards will substantially mitigate that effect.

5. If all effects of an infill project were either analyzed in a prior EIR or are substantially mitigated by uniformly applicable development policies or standards, CEQA does not apply to the project, and the lead agency shall file a Notice of Determination.
6. Effects of an infill project that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or that uniformly applicable development policies or standards do not substantially mitigate, are subject to CEQA. With respect to those effects of the infill project that are subject to CEQA, the checklist shall indicate whether those effects are significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. If there are one or more “Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an infill EIR is

---

<sup>1</sup> The mitigation measures from the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR that apply to the Project are included in Attachment A.

required. The infill EIR should be limited to analysis of those effects determined to be significant. (Sections 15128, 15183.3(d).)

7. “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures will reduce an effect of an infill project that is subject to CEQA from “Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how those measures reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. If the effects of an infill project that are subject to CEQA are less than significant with mitigation incorporated, the lead agency may prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration. If all of the effects of the infill project that are subject to CEQA are less than significant, the lead agency may prepare a Negative Declaration.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question.
  - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

<b>I. Agricultural and Forestry Resources</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
---	---	---	-----------	-----------------------	--

In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts on forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the Project:

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

## Setting

There are approximately 5,483 acres of farmland in San Mateo County. However, the Project site is not on or adjacent to any farmland and is considered *Urban and Built-Up Land* and *Other Land*. Urban and Built-Up Land is land occupied by structures with a building density of at least one unit to 1.5 acres. *Other Land* is land not included in any other mapping category, but does not include farmland.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the Project site is not currently protected under the Williamson Act or zoned for agricultural uses.<sup>3</sup> The Project site is zoned SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan), which does not allow for agricultural uses.

There are currently about 37 Heritage Trees at the Project site; however, these are not considered to be forestry resources per the definitions of Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 12220(g), timberland as defined by PRC Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production per Government Code Section 51104(g). According to the Open Space/Conservation Element of the City's General Plan, Menlo Park includes several natural community types, including oak woodlands. However, per the Existing Vegetation map in the General Plan, the Project site is located in an *Urban* area.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

- a. *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?***

### Effects of the Project

According to the 2010 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) from the State Department of Conservation, the Project site is in an area that is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land and Other Land. Other Land is not considered farmland; therefore, the Project would have ***no impact*** on farmlands.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 6-4) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were recommended. The physical conditions, as they relate to farmland, have not changed in the Specific Plan area. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- b. *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?***

### Effects of the Project

The Project site is not zoned for agricultural use or under a Williamson Act contract. The Project involves the construction of non-medical offices and residential units on land within an already developed area for similar uses. The construction of the Project would not result in the conversion

<sup>2</sup> State Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. 2011. *San Mateo County Important Farmland 2010*. October. Available: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/smt10.pdf.> Accessed: December 30, 2013.

<sup>3</sup> State Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. 2012. *San Mateo County Williamson Act FY 2006/2007*. Available: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/sanmateo\_06\_07\_WA.pdf.> Accessed: March 12, 2013.

of farmland to a nonagricultural use. As such, Project would have ***no impact*** on agricultural resources.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 6-4) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to agricultural resources, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by PRC Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?***

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project site is not used for growing a crop of trees for commercial lumber or other forest products; therefore, the Project site is not considered timberland. Per PRC Section 12220(g), forested land is defined as land that can support 10 percent native tree cover of any species. As such, the Project site is not considered forest land. In addition, the Project site has previously been developed with several different uses, none of which include forestry resources. As discussed above, the Project site is zoned SP-ECR/D and within the El Camino Real Mixed Use – Residential General Plan land use designation, which supports a variety of retail uses, personal services, business and professional offices, and residential uses. The land uses would continue with implementation of the Project. As such, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland and ***no impact*** would occur.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 6-4) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to forestry resources, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to nonforest use?***

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project would result in the removal of 37 existing trees; however, the Project Sponsor would be required to adhere to the Municipal Code, Chapter 13.24, which protects the health and maintenance of Heritage Trees. Per Chapter 13.24 of the Municipal Code, prior to tree removal, the Project Sponsor would be required to submit a tree protection plan for review and approval by the director of community development. The tree protection plan would address issues related to protective techniques to minimize impacts associated with grading, excavation, demolition, and construction. In addition, the conceptual landscape plan shows a minimum replacement of a two-to-one ratio for

the 37 Heritage Trees that would be removed from the site. As such, the Project would have **no impact** on the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to nonforest use.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 6-4) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to forest land, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- e. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to nonforest use?*

### **Effects of the Project**

As discussed above, the Project would not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use or the conversion of forest land to nonforest use. The Project site does not contain agricultural resources and none are proposed under the Project. Although some trees exist at the project site, these are not considered forestry resources. As such, the Project would have **no impact** on the conversion of agricultural and forest land.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 6-4) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to conversion of farmland or forest land, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

<b>II. Air Quality</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

### Air Quality Background

The Project is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), an area surrounded by mountains that confine the movement of air and the pollutants it contains. This area includes all of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, the western half of Solano, and the southern half of Sonoma Counties. The regional climate within the SFBAAB is considered semi-arid and is characterized by warm summers, mild winters, infrequent seasonal rainfall, moderate daytime on-shore breezes, and moderate humidity. A wide range of meteorology and emissions sources—such as dense population centers, heavy vehicular traffic, and industrial activity—primarily influence the air quality within the SFBAAB.

Air pollutant emissions within the SFBAAB are generated from stationary, area-wide, mobile, and natural sources. Stationary sources can be divided into two major subcategories: point and area sources. *Point sources* occur at an identified location and are usually associated with manufacturing and industry.

Examples are boilers and combustion equipment that produce electricity or generate heat. *Area sources* consist of many smaller point sources that are widely distributed. Examples of area sources include residential and commercial water heaters, painting operations, portable generators, lawn mowers, agricultural fields, landfills, and consumer products, such as barbeque lighter fluid and hair spray. Construction activities that create fugitive dust, through activities such as excavation and grading, also contribute to area source emissions. Mobile sources refer to emissions from motor vehicles, including tailpipe and evaporative emissions, and are classified as either on-road or off-road. On-road sources may be legally operated on roadways and highways. Off-road sources include aircraft, ships, trains, and self-propelled construction equipment. Air pollutants can also be generated by the natural environment, such as when fine dust particles are pulled off the ground surface and suspended in the air during high winds.

Both the federal and state governments have established ambient air quality standards for outdoor concentrations of various pollutants in order to protect public health. The National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) / California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) have been set at levels above which concentrations could be generally harmful to human health and welfare and that would protect the most sensitive persons from illness or discomfort with a margin of safety.

The air pollutants for which NAAQS/CAAQS have been promulgated and that are most relevant to air quality planning and regulation in the SFBAAB include ozone ( $O_3$ ), carbon monoxide (CO), respirable particulate matter (PM10), fine particulate matter (PM2.5), nitrogen dioxide ( $NO_2$ ), sulfur dioxide ( $SO_2$ ), and lead (Pb). In addition, toxic air contaminants (TACs) are of concern in the SFBAAB. Each of these is briefly described below.

- **Ozone ( $O_3$ )** is a gas that is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs), which can also be referred to as reactive organic gases (ROG), and nitrogen oxides ( $NO_x$ ), both byproducts of internal combustion engine exhaust, undergo slow photochemical reactions in the presence of sunlight. Meteorological conditions that are needed to produce high concentrations of ozone are direct sunshine, early morning stagnation in source areas, high ground surface temperatures, strong and low morning inversions, greatly restricted vertical mixing during the day, and daytime subsidence that strengthens the inversion layer. Ozone concentrations are generally highest during the summer months when direct sunlight, light wind, and warm temperature conditions are favorable.
- **Nitrogen Dioxide ( $NO_2$ )** a reddish-brown reactive, oxidizing gas capable of damaging cells lining the respiratory tract and is an essential ingredient in the formation of ozone. Like  $O_3$ ,  $NO_2$  is not directly emitted but is formed through a reaction between nitric oxide (NO) and atmospheric oxygen. NO and  $NO_2$  are collectively referred to as  $NO_x$  and are major contributors to  $O_3$  formation.  $NO_2$  also contributes to the formation of PM10 and is emitted as a by-product of fuel combustion.
- **Carbon Monoxide (CO)** a colorless, odorless gas produced by the incomplete combustion of fuels. CO concentrations tend to be the highest in the winter mornings when surface-based inversions trap the pollutant at ground level. Because CO is emitted directly from internal combustion engines, unlike ozone, and motor vehicles operating at slow speeds are the primary source of CO in the SFBAAB, the highest ambient CO concentrations are generally found near congested transportation corridors and intersections.
- **Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10) and Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)** consist of extremely small, suspended particles or droplets 10 microns and 2.5 microns, respectively, or smaller, in diameter. Some sources of particulate matter, like pollen and windstorms, are naturally occurring.

However, in populated areas, most particulate matter is caused by road dust, diesel soot, combustion products, abrasion of tires and brakes, and construction activities.

- **Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)** is a general term for a diverse group of air pollutants that can adversely affect human health, but have not had ambient air quality standards established for them. They are not fundamentally different from the pollutants discussed above, but lack ambient air quality standards for a variety of reasons (e.g., insufficient data on toxicity, association with particular workplace exposures rather than general environmental exposure, etc.). TACs effects tend to be local rather than regional. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) has designated nearly 200 compounds as TACs. Additionally, ARB has implemented control measures for a number of compounds that pose high risks and show potential for effective control. The majority of the estimated health risks from TACs can be attributed to a relatively few compounds, the most important being particulate matter from diesel-fueled engines (DPM). The health effects of TACs can result from either acute or chronic exposure; many types of cancer are associated with chronic TAC exposures.
- **Sulfur Oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>)**, primarily SO<sub>2</sub>, is a product of high-sulfur fuel combustion and chemical processes occurring at chemical plants and refineries. It is a colorless, extremely irritating gas or liquid. Although sulfur dioxide concentrations have been reduced to levels well below state and national standards, further reductions are desirable to attain compliance with standards for PM<sub>10</sub>, of which SO<sub>2</sub> is a contributor.
- **Lead (Pb)** occurs in the atmosphere as particulate matter. The combustion of leaded gasoline is the primary source of airborne lead in the SFBAAB. The use of leaded gasoline is no longer permitted for on-road motor vehicles; therefore, most lead combustion emissions are associated with off-road vehicles such as racecars and some jet fuels. Other sources of lead occur in the manufacturing and recycling of batteries, paint, ink, ceramics, ammunition, and secondary lead smelters.

### Existing Regional Air Quality

The air quality on the San Francisco Bay Peninsula (Peninsula) has generally improved over the past 20 years, as motor vehicles have become cleaner, agricultural and residential burning has been curtailed, and as consumer products containing ROG<sub>s</sub> have been reformulated or replaced. The emissions inventory for the entire SFBAAB and San Mateo County is summarized in Table II-1. In the SFBAAB, motor vehicles generate the majority of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO. Stationary sources generate the most SO<sub>x</sub> and area-wise sources generate the most airborne particulates (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The primary pollutants of concern in the SFBAAB are ozone (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>), CO, and PM.

**Table II-1. SFBAAB and San Mateo County 2010 and 2015 Estimated Average Daily Emissions (tons per day)**

Year	Emissions Source	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
2010	San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin	359.2	414.2	1595.7	62.2	215.7	81.6
2015	San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin	330.6	334.6	1123.4	65.8	225.2	83.1
2010	San Mateo County	33.4	56.2	158.3	8.6	20.9	7.6
2015	San Mateo County	31.2	53.6	136.1	10.3	22.2	8.0

Source: California Air Resources Board. 2013. *Almanac Emission Projection Data*. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/app/emsmv/emssumcat.php>>. Published in 2009. Accessed: June 11, 2013.

## Existing Local Air Quality

BAAQMD monitors ambient air pollutant concentrations through a series of monitoring stations located throughout the SFBAAB. The closest monitoring station to the Project site is the Redwood City monitoring station, which is located approximately 2.0 miles to the northwest of the Project site. The Redwood City monitoring station currently measures concentrations of ozone, CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Data from the Cupertino monitoring station was also used to report PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations not available at the Redwood City monitoring station. The Cupertino monitoring station is located about 11.3 miles south of the Project site.

Table II-2 identifies the NAAQS and CAAQS for relevant air pollutants along with the ambient pollutant concentrations that have been measured at the Redwood City and Cupertino monitoring stations through the period of 2010 to 2012. Measurements from these years indicate that state standards for ozone were exceeded once in the past 3 years and have not been exceeded in the past 2 years. Particulate air quality is a moderate problem on the Peninsula. There were two exceedances of the national 24-hour standard in 2010 at the Redwood City monitoring station. CO, a product of incomplete combustion, was formerly a problem for the Peninsula, but with improved motor vehicles and fuels, air quality at Redwood City meets state and federal standards. Due to the Project's close proximity to the monitoring stations in Redwood City and Cupertino, it can be assumed that pollutant concentrations are similar at the Project site.

## Attainment Status

Measurements of local ambient concentrations of the criteria pollutants (CP) are used by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and ARB to assess and classify the air quality of each regional air basin, county, or, in some cases, a specific urbanized area. The classification is determined by comparing actual monitoring data with national and state standards. If a pollutant concentration in an area is lower than the standard, the area is classified as being in *attainment* for that pollutant. If the pollutant exceeds the standard, the area is in marginal, moderate, serious, severe, or extreme *nonattainment*, depending on the magnitude of the air quality standard exceedance. *Attainment* is assigned to areas where pollutant concentrations, used to exceed the standards, meet the standard over a designated period of time. If there are not enough data available to determine whether the standard is exceeded in an area, the area is designated *unclassified*.

EPA and ARB use different standards for determining whether the SFBAAB is an attainment area. Under NAAQS, the SFBAAB is currently classified as a nonattainment area for O<sub>3</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The SFBAAB is in attainment or designated as unclassified for all other pollutants under national standards. Under CAAQS, the SFBAAB is designated as a nonattainment area for O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and an attainment area for all other pollutants. Table II-3 summarizes the attainment status of San Mateo County with regard to the NAAQS and CAAQS.

**Table II-2. Summary of Ambient Air Quality in the Project Vicinity**

Pollutant Standards	2010	2011	2012
<b>Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) – Redwood City</b>			
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)	0.113	0.076	0.063
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the CAAQS 1-hour standard (>0.09 ppm)	2	0	0
Maximum 8-hour concentration (ppm)	0.077	0.062	0.055
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the CAAQS 8-hour (>0.070 ppm)	1	0	0
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the NAAQS 8-hour (>0.075 ppm)	1	0	0
<b>Carbon Monoxide (CO) – Redwood City</b>			
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)	3.3	3.8	4.0
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the NAAQS 1-hour (≥35 ppm)	0	0	0
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the CAAQS 1-hour (≥20 ppm)	0	0	0
Maximum 8-hour concentration (ppm)	1.72	1.67	1.81
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the NAAQS 8-hour (≥9 ppm)	0	0	0
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the CAAQS 8-hour (≥9.0 ppm)	0	0	0
<b>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) – Redwood City</b>			
State maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)	0.059	0.056	0.046
Annual average concentration (ppm)	0.012	0.012	-
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the CAAQS 1-hour (0.18 ppm)	0	0	0
<b>Particulate Matter (PM10)<sup>c</sup> – Cupertino</b>			
National <sup>b</sup> maximum 24-hour concentration (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	27.9	28.36	39.1
State <sup>c</sup> maximum 24-hour concentration (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	27.4	28.9	41.5
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the NAAQS 24-hour (>150 µg/m <sup>3</sup> ) <sup>§</sup>	0	0	0
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the CAAQS 24-hour (>50 µg/m <sup>3</sup> ) <sup>§</sup>	0	0	0
<b>Particulate Matter (PM2.5) – Redwood City</b>			
National <sup>b</sup> maximum 24-hour concentration (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	36.5	39.7	33.3
State <sup>c</sup> maximum 24-hour concentration (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	32.7	24.0	34.3
Days exceeding <sup>a</sup> the NAAQS 24-hour (>35 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	1	1	0

Source: California Air Resources Board. 2013. *Top 4 Summary Pollutant/Year Range Selection*. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/topfour/topfour1.php>>. Accessed: June 6, 2013; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2013. *Monitor Values Report| Air Data| US EPA*. Available: <[http://www.epa.gov/airdata/ad\\_rep\\_mon.html](http://www.epa.gov/airdata/ad_rep_mon.html)>. Last Updated: September 9, 2013. Accessed: October 2013.

## Notes:

- ppm = parts per million  
 NAAQS = National Ambient Air Quality Standards  
 CAAQS = California Ambient Air Quality Standards  
 µg/m<sup>3</sup> = micrograms per cubic meter  
 mg/m<sup>3</sup> = milligrams per cubic meter  
 - = data not available

- <sup>a</sup> An exceedance is not necessarily a violation. This is a mathematical estimate of how many days concentrations would have been measured as higher than the level of the standard had each day been monitored. Values have been rounded.  
<sup>b</sup> Measurements usually are collected every 6 days.  
<sup>c</sup> State criteria for ensuring that data are sufficiently complete for calculating valid annual averages are more stringent than the national criteria.

**Table II-3. Federal and State Attainment Status for San Mateo County**

Criteria Pollutant	Federal Designation	State Designation
O <sub>3</sub> (1-hour)	-- <sup>a</sup>	Serious Nonattainment
O <sub>3</sub> (8-hour)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
CO	Maintenance	Attainment
PM10	Attainment	Nonattainment
PM2.5	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
NO <sub>2</sub>	Attainment	Attainment
SO <sub>2</sub>	Attainment	Attainment
Lead	Attainment	Attainment
Sulfates	(No Federal Standard)	Attainment
Hydrogen Sulfide	(No Federal Standard)	Unclassified <sup>b</sup>
Visibility	(No Federal Standard)	Unclassified <sup>b</sup>

Source:

California Air Resources Board. 2013. *Top 4 Summary Pollutant/Year Range Selection*. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/topfour/topfour1.php>>. Accessed: June 6, 2013; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2013b. *The Green Book Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants*. Last revised: July 31, 2013. Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/oar/oaqps/greenbk/>>. Accessed: October 2013.

Notes:

- CO = carbon monoxide  
 PM10 = particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns  
 PM2.5 = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns  
 NO<sub>2</sub> = nitrogen dioxide  
 SO<sub>2</sub> = sulfur dioxide

<sup>a</sup>. The federal 1-hour standard of 12 parts per hundred million (pphm) was in effect from 1979 through June 15, 2005. The revoked standard is referenced here because it was employed for such a long period and because this benchmark is addressed in the state implementation plans.

<sup>b</sup>. *Unclassified* is assigned to areas where there are not enough data available to determine whether the pollutant concentrations are below or exceed the standard.

## Sensitive Receptors

Populations that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large are often referred to as *sensitive receptors*. While the ambient air quality standards are designed to protect public health and are generally regarded as conservative for healthy adults, there is greater concern to protect adults who are ill or have long-term respiratory problems and young children whose lungs are not fully developed. According to ARB, sensitive receptors include children less than 14 years of age, the elderly over 65 years of age, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. According to BAAQMD,

...examples of receptors include residences, schools and school yards, parks and play grounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, and medical facilities. Residences can include houses, apartments, and senior living complexes. Medical facilities can include hospitals, convalescent homes, and health clinics. Playgrounds could be play areas associated with parks or community centers.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2010. *Draft CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*. May. Available: <<http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES/Updated-CEQA-Guidelines.aspx>>. Accessed: October 2013.

Sensitive Receptors in the vicinity of the Project site include residences and schools, described below.

- Residential uses located northeast of the Project site, separated by train tracks, approximately 50 feet from the Project site boundary.
- Residential uses located southeast of the Project site, separated by Oak Grove Avenue.
- Residential uses located northwest of the Project site, separated by the intersection of El Camino Real and Glenwood Avenue.
- Language Pacifica School at 585 Glenwood Avenue, approximately 400 feet to the northwest.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

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

#### **Effects of the Project**

The applicable air quality plan in the region is the BAAQMD 2010 Clean Air Plan. According to BAAQMD methodology, a project is consistent with the plan if growth in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is less than population growth, and if the project is consistent with Transportation Control Measures contained in the Clean Air Plan. The Project was analyzed as part of the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR (Specific Plan EIR), which found that VMT associated with the Specific Plan would increase at a greater rate than population, and the Specific Plan would be consistent with the Transportation Control Measures in the Clean Air Plan. Because the Specific Plan would result in a VMT increase greater than population, it would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan. Consequently, the Project would also be inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan, and this impact would be **significant and unavoidable**. Implementation of the Specific Plan EIR's **Mitigation Measure TR-2** (page 4.13-53), related to TDM measures, would help to reduce VMT associated with the Project, but the impact would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Although significant and unavoidable impacts were identified, the Project would not result new specific effects or more significant effects. Consequently, this topic does not require further environmental review.

#### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.2-16 to 4.2-19) and was determined to be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-2. The physical conditions, as they relate to air quality plans, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would be required to incorporate Mitigation Measure TR-2, which requires Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies be implemented. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional feasible mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR are available that would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts to less than significant.

***b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

## **Effects of the Project**

### **Project Construction**

The Project was evaluated under the Specific Plan EIR, which found that overlapping construction of development projects could result in substantial pollutant emissions that would be significant and unavoidable. The Project would construct office space, residential space, retail space, and parking/garage areas, and it is possible that construction of these land uses could overlap, resulting in substantial pollutant emissions that would contribute to an air quality violation and exceed the BAAQMD's applicable significance thresholds. Because of the potential overlap of construction and emission of pollutants, construction emissions associated with the Project would cause a ***significant and unavoidable*** impact pertaining to the violation of an air quality standard or worsening of an existing violation. **Mitigation Measures AIR-1a and AIR-1b** (pages 4.2-15 to 4.2-16) would reduce the amount of criteria pollutant emissions associated with construction of the Project, but not to a less-than-significant level. However, because the proposed land uses were included in the Specific Plan development scenario, the Project would not result in any additional construction-related impacts beyond those disclosed in the Specific Plan EIR. Consequently, this topic does not require further environmental review.

### **Project Operations**

As discussed under III(a), the Project would not be consistent with the applicable air quality plan because it would result in VMT increases that would occur at a faster rate than population growth. Consequently, Project operations (namely, increased vehicle travel due to the Project) could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation. As a result, this impact would be ***significant and unavoidable***. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure TR-2** would help to reduce VMT associated with the Project, but the impact would not be reduced to a less-than-significant-level. However, because the proposed land uses were included in the Specific Plan development scenario, the Project would not result in any additional operations-related impacts beyond those disclosed in the Specific Plan EIR. Although significant and unavoidable impacts were identified, the Project would not result new specific effects or more significant effects. Consequently, this topic does not require further environmental review.

## **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.2-12 to 4.2-19) and was determined to be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of **Mitigation Measures AIR-1a, AIR-2b, and TR-2**. The physical conditions, as they relate to air quality standards, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate all applicable mitigation measures from the Specific Plan EIR regarding air quality. This includes implementation of a TDM plan (TR-2), implementation of BAAQMD basic and additional dust control measures (AIR-1a), and implementation of an Exhaust Emissions Control Plan (AIR-2a). No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional feasible mitigation measures beyond those in

the Specific Plan EIR are available that would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts to less than significant.

- c. ***Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

### **Effects of the Project**

The BAAQMD's guidance on cumulatively considerable emissions can be summarized from the following passage from their CEQA guidelines.

In developing thresholds of significance for air pollutants, BAAQMD considered the emission levels for which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. If a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air quality conditions. Therefore, additional analysis to assess cumulative impacts is unnecessary. The analysis to assess project-level air quality impacts should be as comprehensive and rigorous as possible.<sup>5</sup>

If the Project exceeds the significance thresholds identified by the BAAQMD, then it is considered cumulatively considerable. As discussed above for checklist question b., the Project would likely result in substantial pollutant emissions that could exceed the BAAQMD's significance thresholds due to the overlap of construction phases of the Project and increased Project-generated VMT. As a result, the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is a nonattainment area. This impact would be ***significant and unavoidable***. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure TR-2** would help to reduce VMT associated with the Project and **Mitigation Measures AIR-1a and AIR-1b** would reduce the amount of criteria pollutant emissions associated with construction of the Project. This impact would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level, however. Because the proposed land uses were included in the Specific Plan development scenario, the Project would not result in any additional impacts related to criteria pollutants beyond those disclosed in the Specific Plan EIR. Although significant and unavoidable impacts were identified, the Project would not result new specific effects or more significant effects. Consequently, this topic does not require further environmental review.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.2-12 to 4.2-19) and was determined to be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of **Mitigation Measures AIR-1a, AIR-2b, and TR-2**. The physical conditions, as they relate to criteria pollutants, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate **Mitigation Measures AIR-1a, AIR-2b, and TR-2**. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional feasible mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR are available that would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts to less than significant.

---

<sup>5</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District. *Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines*. Available: <[http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/Draft\\_BAAQMD\\_CEQA\\_Guidelines\\_May\\_2010\\_Final.ashx](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/Draft_BAAQMD_CEQA_Guidelines_May_2010_Final.ashx)>.

**d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

## Effects of the Project

### Project Construction

Construction of the Project could expose sensitive receptors to increased toxic air contaminants (TACs). However, due to lack of site specific construction information, the Specific Plan EIR did not conduct an analysis related to TAC exposure during construction. Therefore, the Infill EIR will quantify construction and demolition-related emissions and contain a health risk assessment (HRA) that evaluates potential health risks to existing sensitive receptors. Health risks to nearby receptors from exposure to construction-related diesel particulate matter and PM<sub>2.5</sub> exhaust emissions will be characterized. Health risks will be identified in the Infill EIR and pollutant concentrations will be compared to the BAAQMD's thresholds of significance to determine the Project-level and cumulative health impacts. This topic requires **further environmental review** in the Infill EIR. It is not anticipated that every future development project in the Specific Plan area would necessarily require the same analysis. Typically, an HRA would not be required if no sensitive receptors are present within 1,000 feet of construction activities or if the construction schedule is notably shorter than typical (e.g., six months). The need for detailed construction analysis will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for other projects proposed in the Specific Plan area in the future.

### Project Operations

The Project is within the development projections evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR. As discussed in the Specific Plan EIR, roadway volumes would increase along El Camino Real. The increase in roadway volumes would lead to an increase in cancer risk of 1.64, which is below the BAAQMD significance criterion of 10 in 1 million. In addition, non-cancer adverse health risks would be 0.011, which is below the significance threshold of 1.0. Consequently, TAC-related health risks posed by the Project from Project-generated traffic would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

Similarly, PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations from traffic generated by the Specific Plan were found to be 0.023 micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ), which is below the BAAQMD draft threshold of 0.3  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . Traffic increases generated by the Project, and the associated PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration increases, would be even less than those of the Downtown Specific Plan and also below the BAAQMD draft threshold. Consequently, PM<sub>2.5</sub>-related health risks posed by the Project from Project-generated traffic would be **less than significant**.

### Roadway Traffic

The Project would locate sensitive receptors near El Camino Real, an area of elevated concentrations of TACs and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The Specific Plan EIR evaluated health risks posed to sensitive receptors near El Camino Real, and found that residences within 200 feet of the roadway could be exposed to increased cancer risk, while non-cancer health risks were found to be below the BAAQMD significance threshold. Implementing certain components of **Mitigation Measure AIR-5** (page 4.2-21) would reduce cancer risk to a **less-than-significant** level. Namely, the requirement to equip sensitive land uses within 100 feet of the edge of the roadway with filtration systems with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) rating of 14 or higher and a control efficiency of 85 percent or greater would reduce cancer risk to less than 10 in 1 million. The MERV-rating filtration requirement would be included in the list of mitigations for the Project, because it can be stated with confidence that the elevated cancer risks for sensitive receptors within 100 feet of El Camino Real

would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the aforementioned filtration equipment. No mitigation is required for non-cancer health risks, as concentrations would be below the applicable thresholds.

Similarly, the Specific Plan EIR found that sensitive receptors within 100 feet from El Camino Real would result in significant PM2.5 exposure impacts. However, implementing the MERV-rating requirement of **Mitigation Measure AIR-5**, discussed above, would also reduce PM2.5 exposure impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

### **Caltrain Operations**

New sensitive receptors would be exposed to elevated TACs and PM2.5 concentrations associated with Caltrain operations, as the Project would locate sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the Caltrain right-of-way. Health risks were evaluated using standard dispersion models and calculations in the Specific Plan EIR. Cancer risk and non-cancer health risks associated with the pollutants were found to be above and below, respectively, the applicable significance criterion thresholds. Implementing certain components of **Mitigation Measure AIR-7** (pages 4.2-23 to 4.2-25) would reduce the cancer risk impact to a *less-than-significant* level. Namely, the requirement to equip sensitive land uses within 300 meters from the track centerline with filtration systems with a MERV rating of 14 or higher and a control efficiency of 85 percent or greater would reduce cancer risk to less than 10 in 1 million. The MERV-rating filtration requirement would be included in the list of mitigations for the Project, because it can be stated with confidence that the elevated cancer risks for sensitive receptors within 300 meters of the track centerline would be mitigated with the aforementioned filtration equipment to a less-than-significant level. No mitigation is required for non-cancer health risk impacts, including health risks posed by PM2.5 concentrations, as concentrations would be below the applicable threshold.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item, with regard to operation, was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.2-20 to 4.2-25) and was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measures AIR-5 and AIR-7**. The physical conditions, as they relate to exposure to sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. As discussed above, the Project would incorporate the MERV filters recommended in **Mitigation Measures AIR-5 and AIR-7**. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project during operation. No additional mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR are required as the impact is less than significant.

#### ***e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project would not include any typical odor sources of concern, which include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfills, transfer stations, composting facilities, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing facilities, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, auto body shops, rendering plants, and coffee roasting facilities. Although the Project could potentially include restaurant space, this use is anticipated to be typical and would include required ventilation. Therefore, a potential restaurant is not expected to create an objectionable odor. Further, no

sensitive receptors would be located within close proximity to any of these typical odor sources of concern as part of the Project. Thus, the Project would result in ***no impact*** under CEQA. No mitigation would be required.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.2-11) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to odors, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

III. Biological Resources	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

The Project site is fully developed and within a highly urbanized/landscaped area. The Project site provides little wildlife habitat and essentially no habitat for plants other than opportunistic ruderal species adapted to the built environment or horticultural plants used in landscaping. Landscaped areas and planted trees can typically provide cover, foraging, and nesting habitat for a variety of bird species, especially those that are tolerant of disturbance and human presence. Although there is potential for multiple special-status plant species to occur within the Project site and the surrounding Menlo Park El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Specific Plan) area, no special-status plant species are expected to occur because there is no suitable habitat present.

Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*) and other protected migratory birds have the potential to nest and hunt in urban settings, and have the potential to utilize trees located on the Project site. The pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*) and other protected common bat species have the potential to occur in the area on a transient basis during spring and summer seasonal movements. Pallid bats may roost in tree cavities or under bark and in structures, such as bridges and buildings.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

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

### Effects of the Project

The pallid bat is the only special-status bat species that has the potential to occur in the Specific Plan area. Within the Project site, bats have the potential to occur in human-made structures and trees, including the 37 Heritage Trees to be removed and the seven buildings to be demolished. Pallid bats could use these trees and structures for roosting, breeding, or hibernating. In addition to protections afforded special-status bat species by the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and California Endangered Species Act (CESA), other bats and non-game mammals are protected in California.

Maternity roosts are those that are occupied by pregnant females or females with non-flying young. Non-breeding roosts are day roosts without pregnant females or non-flying young. Destruction of an occupied, non-breeding, special-status bat roost, resulting in the death of bats; disturbance that causes the loss of a maternity colony of special-status bats (resulting in the death of young); or destruction of hibernacula (winter hibernation sites) would be considered a significant impact. This may occur due to direct or indirect disturbances. Direct disturbance includes tree removal, building removal, or nest destruction by any other means. Indirect disturbances include noise or increased human activity in the area. Hibernacula are generally not formed by bat species in the Bay Area due to sufficiently high temperatures year round.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-5a**, **Mitigation Measure BIO-5b**, and **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c** (pages 4.3-29 to 4.3-31), as presented in the Specific Plan EIR, would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.3-29 to 4.3-31) and was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-5a, BIO-5b, and BIO-5c**. The Project would incorporate all applicable mitigation measures from the Specific Plan EIR regarding special-status species. The physical conditions, as they relate to biological resources, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR or are required as the impact is less than significant.

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

#### Effects of the Project

No riparian habitat or natural plant communities are present within the boundaries of the Project site. Project activities would occur within the boundaries of an existing urban/landscaped developed area. No wetlands or other waters of the United States are present on or adjacent to the site. The Project site is not near San Francisquito Creek and its associated riparian zones, which are on the edge of the Specific Plan EIR study area. Since there is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community located within or adjacent to the Project site, there would be a ***less-than-significant*** impact under CEQA. No mitigation would be required.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.3-34 to 4.3-35) and was also determined to be less than significant. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

#### Effects of the Project

Project activities at the Project site occur within the boundaries of an existing developed area. No wetlands or other waters of the United States are present within the Specific Plan area, and, therefore are not present at the Project site. Since there are no federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act located within or adjacent to the Project site, the Project will result in ***no impact*** under CEQA. No mitigation would be required.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was not analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. However, since the Project site does not include federally protected wetlands, no new specific effects would occur.

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

### Effects of the Project

The loss of active nests, eggs, or young of any special-status species would be considered a significant impact. Although this is a highly urbanized, developed area, there is the possibility that Cooper's hawk may occur at the Project site. If active nest sites occur in or adjacent to the Project site, noise and visual disturbance associated with construction activities occurring during the nesting season may lead to nest abandonment and/or nest failure. The removal of large trees has potential to destroy active nest sites. Destruction of Cooper's hawk nests, or nest of any other raptor or other special-status bird species, would be considered a significant impact.

In addition to CEQA impacts, any removal or destruction of active nests and any killing of migratory birds would violate the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code, Sections 3500-3516. Common bird species may use vegetation in the Project site for nesting. With the exception of English sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), and rock dove (pigeon, *Columba livia*), the nests, eggs, and nestlings of all birds are protected under the California Fish and Game Code.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1a** and **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b** (pages 4.3-24 to 4.3-27), as presented in the Specific Plan EIR, would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level.

Additionally, the Project may result in impacts on common birds through increased building collisions both at night and during the day. However, because Cooper's hawk is the only special-status bird species identified as having a moderate potential to be present in the Project site, and because hawks are known to forage in relatively open areas, the potential for a Cooper's hawk to strike a building is deemed low. Therefore, there would be a **less-than-significant** impact.

Nevertheless, implementing **Bird-Safe Building Guidelines** into the Project design could minimize bird mortality. These measures are based on the Bird-Safe Building Guidelines developed by the New York Audubon Society and the Bird Friendly Building Program developed by the Fatal Light Awareness Program ([www.flap.org](http://www.flap.org)), and could be considered and incorporated, to the extent feasible, during building design and operations of the Project. These measures, as outlined in the Specific Plan EIR would help to minimize the potential impacts on migrating birds in the Project site and surrounding area.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.3-24 to 4.3-27) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b**. In addition, as with the Specific Plan, the Project would incorporate the Bird-Safe Building Guidelines into the Project design. The physical conditions, as they relate to biological resources, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan

EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR are required as the impact is less than significant.

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

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project site and surrounding areas are urban and almost completely developed. As a result, mature trees are primarily located within the public right-of-ways, including streets, sidewalks, and other public areas, or private properties. The Specific Plan includes numerous guidelines calling for the retention of existing mature trees to the extent possible (Standard D.2.01, and Design Guidelines D.2.30, D.2.45, D.3.22 and D.5.17). With implementation of the Project, all of the existing street trees along Oak Grove Avenue and El Camino Real would be retained. Additionally, a “green and shaded Downtown and Station Area” is a key unifying concept (Standard D.1), with numerous design guidelines providing for more trees and landscaping along sidewalks, in plazas and other public spaces (Design Guidelines D.2.04, D.2.21, D.2.27, D.2.40, D.2.49, D.2.54, D.3.06, D.3.09, D.3.16, D.3.25, D.4.05, D.4.11, D.4.14, D.5.03, D.5.04, D.5.18, and D.6.06). Therefore, consistent with the Specific Plan design guidelines, the Project would include the planting of new trees within Garwood Way Public Park and the onsite plazas.

Heritage trees are protected by Menlo Park Municipal Code Chapter 13.24 Heritage Trees. A total of 37 Heritage Trees were identified within the footprint of the Project site and are proposed for removal. The loss of a Heritage Tree without prior approval by the City would be a violation that can be remedied by fine, stop-work order, and development moratorium. City code requires submittal of a removal permit, subject to the approval of the Director of Public Works. Approvals/denials can be appealed to the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) and again to the City Council. For larger projects that require City Council approval, the EQC is consulted in advance, and the City Council incorporates actions on the Heritage Tree removal permits concurrent with the rest of the project actions. Associated guidelines (*Heritage Tree Replacement Procedures*) require the planting of replacement trees at a 1:1 basis for residential projects and 2:1 for commercial projects to mitigate the impact of heritage tree removal. The Municipal Code and guidelines apply to both private and public projects.

Additionally, the City’s Building Division provides “Tree Protection Specification” measures to further ensure the protection of heritage trees during construction activities. These measures include, but are not limited to, fencing protected trees and providing a “tree protection zone” during building/development, or using a tree wrap where appropriate and prohibiting spillage of materials below the tree canopy, damaging trunks, roots, or branches of trees without prior authorization.

The City’s procedures and the Specific Plan guidelines would ensure the protection of Heritage Trees and would limit impacts to a ***less-than-significant*** level. No mitigation would be required.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.3-33 to 4.3-34) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation Specific Plan standards and design guidelines, as listed above. Therefore, these uniformly applicable development policies would

substantially mitigate the impacts of the Project. No additional mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to biological resources, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

***f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

**Effects of the Project**

The entire Project site is developed, with approximately 76.4 percent covered in impervious surfaces including streets, buildings, and pavement. The entire site is zoned SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) in the El Camino Real Mixed Use – Residential General Plan land use designation. This zoning and land use is not conducive to natural features and is not part of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the Project would result in ***no impact***.

**Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.3-24) and was also determined to result in no impact. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

<b>IV. Cultural Resources</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting<sup>6</sup>

### Historic Setting

The Project site includes seven buildings along Oak Grove Avenue, Derry Lane, and El Camino Real. These buildings have been modified externally and internally to accommodate changing uses during their histories. In general, the buildings are nondescript, functional, mid-twentieth-century buildings that have housed a variety of small business and do not display unusual or distinctive design or construction features. The buildings present in the subject area are not architecturally distinctive and have had significant alterations, remodels, and additions. As such, there does not appear to be potential for a historic district and none of the buildings at the Project site appear to be eligible as a contributor to a potential historic district. Table IV-1 summarizes the historic and current uses of the buildings and their construction dates.

<sup>6</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all information in this section is from: LSA Associates, Inc. 2005. *A Cultural and Paleontological Resources Study for the Derry Lane Mixed-Use Development Project*. Appendix E Cultural Resources Technical Report to the Derry Lane Mixed-Use Development Project EIR.

**Table IV-1. Historic and Current Uses of Buildings at Project Site**

Address	Historic Uses	Current Use	Construction Date
550 Oak Grove Avenue	Car wash	Car wash	1967
558/560 Oak Grove Avenue	Post office, laundry/cleaners	Vacant	1948
562/564 Oak Grove Avenue	Feed and pet supplies	Dance Studio	1950
580 Oak Grove Avenue	Foster's Freeze	Foster's Freeze	1949
540/560 Derry Lane	Post office, car repair, laundry/cleaners	Hardware Storage	1949
570 Derry Lane	Laundry/cleaners	Vacant	1948
1258 El Camino Real	Veterinary hospital, chiropractic office, hair salon	Vacant	1958

Source: LSA Associates, Inc. 2006. *Derry Lane Mixed-Use Development EIR*. Section J, Cultural and Paleontological Resources.

The current evaluation concurs with the 2006 findings by LSA Associates for the six properties on Derry Lane and Oak Grove Avenue; these properties do not appear to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Places (California Register). The previous analysis is summarized below. However, the building at 1258 El Camino Real, which is part of the Project site, was not previously evaluated. Therefore, a description and evaluation are provided below.

**550 Oak Grove Avenue.** The current building on the property is a car wash structure built in 1967. The property was formerly the site of the Menlo Park Hotel constructed in the 1860s and destroyed by a fire in 1899, after which it was rebuilt. The site continued as a hotel until the 1930s when it was demolished. This property was field checked on January 22, 2014 by an ICF architectural historian. The existing car wash building is an open-sided structure with a central hexagonal-shaped pavilion with rectangular shaped flat roof wings. The walls are buff brick and a flush metal door is at the central pavilion. The building lacks architectural distinction and does not appear eligible for listing on the California Register.

**558/560 Oak Grove Avenue.** The previous study indicates the building was originally built in 1948 or 1949 for post office use. Historic aerials show the building appears in 1948.<sup>7</sup> The building is concrete with red brick façade detailing. A concrete molding of an eagle above the left side of the door is the only remaining symbol from when the building was occupied by the post office. The interior has been completely renovated to accommodate prior uses and no signs of the original use as a post office in the building interior remain. Aside from the small concrete molding, this building lacks architectural distinction and, therefore, does not appear eligible for listing on the California Register. This property was field checked on January 22, 2014 by an ICF architectural historian and the building appears unaltered since its last recordation in 2006 by LSA. However, the building no longer houses the Peninou French Laundry and is currently vacant. Additional architectural details on this Modern commercial building include the original curvilinear overhang, and a façade consisting mainly of bands of fixed metal-frame windows.

**562/564 Oak Grove Avenue.** This building was constructed in 1950 and is a nondescript concrete building with brown and tan sandstone façade detailing. It is a utilitarian building that lacks architectural distinction and does not appear eligible for listing on the California Register. This building

<sup>7</sup> Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC 2009. Available: <<http://hisdtoricaerials.com>>.

is currently used as a dance studio. This property was field checked on January 22, 2014 by an ICF architectural historian and the building appears unaltered since its last recordation in 2006 by LSA.

**580 Oak Grove Avenue.** A Foster's Freeze fast food walk-up restaurant was built on this property in 1949. The building has been remodeled twice, once in 1965 and once in 1987, which resulted in the removal of most of its original architectural details. The building has been extended to the rear and its façade appears to have been renovated in 1987. Although some examples of this style of fast food restaurants have been listed in the California Register in recent years, this building is a poor example of the type and lacks historic integrity. It does not appear eligible for listing on the California Register. This property was field checked on January 22, 2014 by an ICF architectural historian and the building appears unaltered since its last recordation in 2006.

**540/560 Derry Lane.** The previous study indicates the building was likely constructed in 1948 or 1949 as a maintenance area/garage for postal trucks used by the post office at 558/560 Oak Grove Avenue. The building does not appear on the 1948 historic aerials.<sup>8</sup> The building is a utilitarian industrial building that lacks architectural features or distinction and is currently used for hardware storage. It does not appear eligible for listing on the California Register. This property was field checked on January 22, 2014 by an ICF architectural historian and the building appears unaltered since its last recordation in 2006.

**570 Derry Lane.** This building, constructed in September of 1948 as the Berges Steel Erector,<sup>9</sup> is a utilitarian false-front industrial building with additions. It lacks architectural distinction and does not appear eligible for listing on the California Register. The building has been previously evaluated for eligibility. In 1990, the San Mateo County Historical Association completed the Menlo Park Historical Building Survey to catalog Menlo Park's architectural cultural resources. The building at 570 Derry Lane was included in the survey as representative of Menlo Park's twentieth century downtown business district. However, it was determined that the building is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register, or a local register. The property was given due diligence and an adequate consideration during the 2006 evaluation by LSA and was recommended for no further study or protection. The current evaluation concurs with the 2006 findings.

This property was field checked on January 22, 2014 by an ICF architectural historian and the building appears unaltered since its last recordation in 2006 by LSA. Additional architectural details on this false-front commercial building include the original storefront fenestration of fixed wood-frame double bands of windows with wood kick panels and a double entry door in the center. The building is currently vacant.

**1258 El Camino Real.** The one-story building is set back from El Camino Real by a paved driveway, a surface parking lot, and mature trees. The building is centered with a projecting gable pavilion supported on Doric order columns and containing double-entry metal-frame glass doors with sidelights and the side bays consist of plate glass windows. The 1888 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps shows a vacant small one-story building with a stove pipe fronting the street level. The 1925 and 1944 Sanborn Maps show a one-story single family dwelling with a porch and a private garage in the rear where the current building is located.

The current building on the property was constructed in May 1958 as the Eastep Pet Hospital. The building plans indicate that it was constructed in the Modern style of architecture. The building was a

---

<sup>8</sup> Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC 2009. Available at <http://hisdtoricaerials.com>.

<sup>9</sup> Permit and plans A-1723, Sec. 7, 1948. Available at the Menlo City Building Division.

concrete-block-wall framing that featured exposed concrete block side walls and the main façade was centered with a scored stucco plaster wall projecting from the building containing the main entrance hidden from view. The main façade also featured exposed roof beams, plate glass windows at the north bay and an elaborate clerestory windows at the south bay.<sup>10</sup> Dr. W. W. Eastep, a veterinarian, was the owner of the establishment until approximately the 1970s. The next available permit was issued on December 27, 1978 to a Dr. Erickson for the Erickson Pet Hospital to re-roof the building.<sup>11</sup> In March of 1982, Erickson constructed a new fence on the property.<sup>12</sup> Bill Tarr, a chiropractor, retained the property in 1997 and completely remodeled the front façade as it appears today and added a 536-sf addition to the rear.<sup>13</sup> The last available permit for the property was issued in August 2005 to Sammy Zelcher to remodel the interior of the building for a conversion from retail building to a hair salon.<sup>14</sup> The exterior of the building as of the current study remains unchanged since its façade alterations in 1997.

Due to the extensive alterations to the main façade in 1997 and a general lack of historic significance, the building at 1258 El Camino Real does not appear to be eligible for listing individually on the California Register. The property is not associated with any significant events in California or Menlo Park history, and does not appear eligible for listing on the California Register under Criteria 1. Research did not indicate that the original owners of the current building or subsequent owners made any significant contributions to the history of California or Menlo Park, nor is the property associated with any other significant historic persons, and, therefore, does not appear to be eligible for listing on the California Register under Criteria 2. The current building lacks architectural distinction as well as historic integrity and, therefore, does not appear to be eligible for listing on the California Register under Criteria 3. The property is not a likely source of information pertinent to history or prehistory and does not appear eligible for listing on the California Register under Criteria 4. This resource has been evaluated in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)(2)-(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, using the criteria outlined in Section 5024.1 of the California PRC and it is also not an historical resource for the purposes of the CEQA.

**Remainder of Project Site.** The vacant northern portion of the Project site formerly featured five buildings constructed in 1967 and associated parking areas used for a Cadillac dealership. However, these buildings were demolished in April 2010 in anticipation of the mixed-use 1300 El Camino Real Project. The building foundations and paved surfaces were not demolished or removed and are currently visible from surrounding areas. Therefore, the existing northern portion of the Project site is vacant of buildings and consists of impervious surfaces and ruderal vegetation.

## Archaeological Sensitivity

The Project site's high archaeological sensitivity is indicated by the numerous buildings depicted on historical Sanborn maps. The Project site was the location of a diverse array of commercial and residential buildings and structures. Background research identified numerous buildings that once occupied the lots containing the existing buildings at the Project site. Additionally, several now vacant portions of the Project site once contained nineteenth century businesses. It is likely that the historical activity resulted in unidentified, potentially significant archaeological deposits that could be encountered during construction. In May 2004, Menlo Park public works crews repairing a sinkhole on

---

<sup>10</sup> Permit and plans A-58845, January 1, 1958.

<sup>11</sup> Permit A-16314, December 27, 1978.

<sup>12</sup> Permit A-18423, March 24, 1982.

<sup>13</sup> Permit A-33141, June 23, 1997.

<sup>14</sup> Permit 05-1045, August 17, 2005.

Derry Lane encountered a subsurface deposit of historical archaeological materials. Materials included bottles, ceramic fragments, and animal bones. Such materials are consistent with debris associated with refuse pits or backfilled wells that may have resulted from the Project site's previous occupants. In addition, historical bottle glass was identified adjacent to the Project site in the Caltrain right-of-way. For these reasons, the Project site could contain undisturbed archaeological deposits.

## Paleontological Sensitivity

The Project site is located just north of San Francisquito Creek on an alluvial plain off the southwestern end of the San Francisco Bay. Geologically, the sediments of the Project site are Pleistocene alluvial fan deposits (1.8 million–10 thousand years old), which include the Santa Clara Formation. The alluvium is generally brown, dense, gravelly, and clayey sand or clayey gravel. The alluvium extends beyond the depth of available bore data (50 feet) to an approximate depth of 500 feet. These Pleistocene sediments are known to contain fossils, as are the Miocene Briones Formation sediments (5–24 million years old) located southwest of the Project site.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

### *a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?*

#### Effects of the Project

All seven buildings proposed for demolition are over 50 years old. However, these buildings are not contributors to a distinctive cultural landscape or land use pattern. They are nondescript, functional buildings that do not display unusual or distinctive design or construction features. Information identified during background research indicates that the buildings (1) are not associated with significant events in California history; (2) are not associated with persons important in California history; (3) do not represent distinctive architectural styles, methods of construction, or the work of an important creative individual; and (4) have not yielded, nor are likely to yield, information important in history. Therefore, none of these buildings are listed on, or appear to be eligible for listing on the California Register or local registers. In addition, none of the buildings meet the definition of a historical resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Specific Plan) did not identify buildings at the Project site as historical resources. Therefore, removal of these buildings would result in a *less-than-significant* impact under CEQA. Since a site-specific evaluation of the existing buildings at the Project site was conducted by ICF on January 22, 2014, the Project has complied with **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** (page 4.4-17) of the Specific Plan EIR and no additional mitigation is required.

#### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.4-14 to 4.4-17) and was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1**. This mitigation measure requires site-specific historic evaluations and treatment in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. In accordance with this mitigation measure, ICF completed site-specific evaluations of the existing buildings at the Project site on January 22, 2014, as discussed above, fulfilling the first part of the **Mitigation Measure CUL-1**. The evaluations determined that none of the buildings would meet the definition of a historical resource. Therefore, the Project Sponsor is not required to further implement **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** by adhering to treatment

in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. In addition, no substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

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

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project site is highly sensitive for archeological deposits. This sensitivity is indicated by: (1) historical archaeological materials identified in and adjacent to the Project site; (2) documented historical activity in and adjacent to the Project site; and (3) the lack of evidence to indicate substantial historical subsurface disturbance of the Project area. Because the Project site is in the location of several nineteenth century businesses and contains identified subsurface archaeological materials, the Project site is highly sensitive for historical archaeological deposits that may meet the definition of historical resources under CEQA. Subsurface Project construction may result in damage to such deposits, which may result in a significant impact on cultural resources. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-2** (page 4.4-18), as presented in the Specific Plan EIR, would reduce this impact to a ***less-than-significant*** level. Full compliance with this mitigation measure will be verified before the proposal is considered for final discretionary approvals.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.4-17 to 4.4-18) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-2**. The physical conditions, as they relate to archeological resources, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate **Mitigation Measure CUL-2**. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR are required as the impact is less than significant with mitigation.

- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project site is considered highly sensitive for paleontological resources. Four fossil localities have been identified within 5 miles of the Project site. In addition, other locations with geological formations similar to those in the vicinity of the Project site have produced significant vertebrate fossil deposits. For these reasons, Project construction may encounter paleontological resources. Because there is a high potential that ground-disturbing construction could encounter paleontological resources, the Project would result in potentially significant impacts on paleontological resources. However, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-3** (pages 4.4-18 to 4.4-19), as included in the Specific Plan EIR, would reduce this impact to a ***less than significant*** level.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.4-18) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-3**. The physical conditions, as they relate to paleontological resources, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate **Mitigation Measure CUL-3**. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR are required as the impact is less than significant with mitigation.

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

#### **Effects of the Project**

Construction of the Project would require soil excavation and grading for building foundations and utilities. This Project activity has the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, resulting in potentially significant impacts. However, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-4** (pages 4.4-19 to 4.4-20), which is required in the Specific Plan EIR, would reduce impacts on human remains to a *less than significant* level.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.4-19 to 4.4-20) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-4**. The physical conditions, as they relate to human remains, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate **Mitigation Measure CUL-4**. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR or uniform development policies are required as the impact is less than significant with mitigation.

<b>V. Geology and Soils</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

The Project site is located along the eastern alluvial plains of the Santa Cruz Mountains, which run northwest along the spine of the San Francisco Peninsula. East of the Santa Cruz Mountains, numerous drainages have carried alluvial deposits toward the bay for thousands of years. Thick alluvial deposits of clays, silts, sands, and gravels generally make up the underlying materials with bedrock found at depths of up to approximately one thousand feet.

## Soils

Surface pavements generally consist of 0.5–3.5 inches of asphalt concrete over 2–7 inches of aggregate base. Below the surface pavements, there is generally between 2.5 and 7 feet of undocumented fill, usually found as lean clay with some sand. Below the fill is stiff to hard lean clays with varying amounts of sand interbedded with loose to medium dense sands to the terminal depth of 75 feet. Sand layers generally range from 3 to 10 feet in thickness with greatly varying fine contents.<sup>15</sup>

## Seismicity and Seismic Hazards

The Project site lies within an area that contains many active and potentially active faults and is considered to be an area of high seismic activity.<sup>16</sup> The San Andreas fault is the closest fault to the Project site and poses a substantial threat of damage in the Project site. Located approximately 7 miles west of the Project site, the San Andreas fault caused considerable damage in 1906 and 1989. The San Andreas, Hayward, and Calaveras faults pose the greatest threat of earthquake-related damage in the Bay Area according to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Working Group.<sup>17</sup>

**Ground Shaking.** Strong ground shaking from a major earthquake could affect the Project site during the next 30 years. An earthquake on any one of the active faults mentioned above could potentially produce a range of ground shaking intensities at the Project site. Ground shaking may affect areas hundreds of miles distant from the earthquake's epicenter.

**Surface Fault Rupture.** Seismically induced ground rupture is defined as the physical displacement of surface deposits in response to an earthquake's seismic waves. The magnitude, sense, and nature of fault rupture can vary for different faults or even along different strands of the same fault. Ground rupture is considered more likely along active faults. The Project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Rupture Hazard Zone, as designated through the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and no mapped active faults are known to pass through the immediate project region. Therefore, the risk of ground rupture within the Project site is very low.

---

<sup>15</sup> Cornerstone Earth Group. 2013. *Geotechnical Investigation - El Camino Real Complex*. Prepared for the Greenheart Land Company. October 1, 2013.

<sup>16</sup> An *active* fault is defined by the State of California as a fault that has had surface displacement within Holocene time (approximately the last 11,000 years). A *potentially active* fault is defined as a fault that has shown evidence of surface displacement during the Quaternary (last 1.6 million years), unless direct geologic evidence demonstrates inactivity for all of the Holocene or longer. This definition does not, of course, mean that faults lacking evidence of surface displacement are necessarily inactive. *Sufficiently active* is also used to describe a fault if there is some evidence that Holocene displacement occurred on one or more of its segments or branches (Hart 1997).

<sup>17</sup> United States Geological Survey Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WG07), Fact Sheet 2008-3027, Forecasting California's Earthquakes - What Can We Expect in the Next 30 Years? Available: <<http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2008/3027/fs2008-3027.pdf>>. Accessed on January 17, 2014.

**Liquefaction.** Liquefaction is a transformation of soil from a solid to a liquefied state during which saturated soil temporarily loses strength resulting from the buildup of excess pore water pressure, especially during earthquake-induced cyclic loading. Soils susceptible to liquefaction include saturated loose to medium dense sands and gravels, low-plasticity silts, and some low-plasticity clay deposits. Liquefaction and associated failures could damage foundations, disrupt utility service, and can cause damage to roadways. The California Geological Survey has prepared Seismic Hazard maps for liquefaction potential in many areas located around the Bay. According to the map that covers the Project site; the Project site is outside of the liquefaction zone.<sup>18</sup>

**Landslides.** Slope failures, commonly referred to as landslides, include many phenomena that involve the downslope displacement and movement of material. Landslides may occur on slopes of 15 percent or less; however, the probability is greater on steeper slopes. The Project site generally consists of relatively gently sloping developed topography that has a low likelihood of landslides or debris flows. The Project site is outside of the impacted zones for earthquake-induced landslides or rainfall-induced landslides.<sup>19</sup>

## Geologic Hazards

**Expansive Soils.** Expansive soils are characterized by their potential *shrink-swell* behavior. Shrink-swell is the cyclic change in volume (expansion and contraction) that occurs in certain fine-grained clay sediments from the process of wetting and drying. Clay minerals such as smectite, bentonite, montmorillonite, beidellite, vermiculite and others are known to expand with changes in moisture content. The higher the percentage of expansive minerals present in near surface soils, the higher the potential for substantial expansion. The greatest effects occur when there are large or repeated moisture content changes. Expansions of 10 percent or more in volume are not uncommon. This change in volume can exert enough force on a building or other structure to cause cracked foundations, floors and basement walls. Damage to the upper floors of the building can also occur when movement in the foundation is extensive. Structural damage typically occurs over a long period of time, usually the result of inadequate soil and foundation engineering or the placement of structures directly on expansive soils.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

- a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*
- 1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*

## Effects of the Project

The Project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Rupture Hazard Zone, as designated through the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and no mapped active faults are known to pass through the immediate project region. Therefore, the Project would result in **no impact**.

---

<sup>18</sup> Cornerstone Earth Group. 2013. *Geotechnical Investigation – El Camino Real Complex*. Prepared for the Greenheart Land Company. October 1, 2013.

<sup>19</sup> Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2014. Earthquake and Hazards Program. *Landslide Maps and Information*. Available: <<http://quake.abag.ca.gov/landslides/>>. Accessed: June 27, 2014.

## Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.5-12 to 4.5-13) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to exposure of people to an earthquake fault rupture, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

### 2. *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

#### Effects of the Project

According to modeling conducted by USGS in conjunction with the California Geological Survey, the Bay Area would likely experience at least one major earthquake (greater than moment magnitude 6.7) within the next 30 years. The intensity of such an event would depend on the causative fault and the distance to the epicenter, the magnitude, the duration of shaking, and the characteristics of the underlying geologic materials. There are no active faults that run through or adjacent to the Project site. The nearest active fault to the Project site is the San Andreas fault, which is located approximately 7 miles away.

In general, ground shaking tends to be more severe in softer sediments such as alluvial deposits where surface waves can be amplified causing a longer duration of ground shaking compared to bedrock materials. Areas where bedrock is exposed or located relatively shallow tends to experience surface waves from an earthquake as more of a sharp jolt. At the Project site, underlying deposits generally consist of alluvial deposits of varying thicknesses with no near surface occurrences of bedrock. Therefore, there is potential for improvements to experience substantial ground shaking throughout the Project site.

For newly constructed structures, all of the aforementioned seismic hazards can generally be mitigated through the application of current industry standard geotechnical practices and seismic structural design according to the requirements found in the most recent version of the California Building Code and Special Publication 117, where applicable. Moreover, major development is typically subject to site-specific analysis of seismic and other geologic risk. After decades of study of past earthquakes and the performance of structures and other improvements, building codes have incorporated measures to reduce the potential for catastrophic damage to occur in buildings, roadways, and utility connections. Although damage and injury cannot be completely avoided during a major seismic event, adherence to building code requirements would reduce the potential damage and personal injury to what is generally recognized to be an acceptable level. Therefore this would be a ***less-than-significant*** impact. No mitigation would be required.

## Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.5-12 to 4.5-13) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to exposure of people to strong seismic ground-shaking, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

### 3. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

#### Effects of the Project

Liquefaction typically occurs in areas underlain with loose saturated cohesionless soils within the upper 50 feet of subsurface materials. These soils, when subjected to ground shaking, can lose their strength resulting from the buildup of excess pore water pressure causing them to behave closer to a liquidified state. The site is not located within a State-designated Liquefaction Hazard Zone.<sup>20</sup> Unreinforced masonry buildings and other buildings constructed prior to the 1930s that have not undergone seismic upgrades would be expected to incur the greatest structural damage. Damage from earthquake-induced ground failure could be high in buildings constructed on improperly engineered fills or saturated alluvial sediments that have not received adequate compaction or treatment. However, adherence to building code requirements would reduce the potential damage and personal injury to what is generally recognized to be an acceptable level. Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant* impact. No mitigation would be required.

#### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.5-12 to 4.5-13) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to exposure of people to seismic-related ground failures, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

### 4. *Landslides?*

#### Effects of the Project

Earthquake-induced landslides could occur in unstable upland areas to the west and southwest of the Project site. Landslides may occur on slopes of 15 percent or less; however, the probability is greater on steeper slopes that exhibit old landslide features such as scarps, slanted vegetation, and transverse ridges. The Project site is relatively flat and has a low potential for earthquake-induced or rainfall-induced landslides.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant* impact. No mitigation would be required.

#### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.5-12 to 4.5-13) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to exposure of people to landslides, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

---

<sup>20</sup> California Geological Survey. 2007 and 2009. *California Geological Survey Seismic Hazard Zones of Required Investigation*. Available: <<http://quake.abag.ca.gov/>>. Accessed: January 27, 2014.

<sup>21</sup> Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2014. Earthquake and Hazards Program. *Landslide Maps and Information*. Available: <<http://quake.abag.ca.gov/landslides/>>. Accessed: June 27, 2014.

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

The Project site is currently developed with a majority of the land area covered by impervious surface such as asphalt, buildings, and concrete. The impervious areas are generally landscaped and vegetated. However, the Project would require removing the existing cover and thereby exposing underlying soils to the effects of wind and water. The relatively flat topography of the Project site generally reduces the potential for erosion and loss of topsoil during construction activities. Nonetheless, areas of the Project site subject to concentrated runoff, and areas of unprotected slopes or piles of bare soil would still pose erosion hazards if left unmitigated. Once covered by an impermeable surface such as asphalt or a new structure or, if vegetated with landscaping and trees, the resulting potential for erosion would then be substantially reduced.

Protection of soils during construction can generally be mitigated through well-established erosion control measures. Every construction project in the State of California that causes a disturbance of 1 acre or more of soil through grading, clearing, and or excavation is subject to the Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009 DWQ (Construction General Permit), also referred to as the General Permit, adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board). In order to complete the General Permit application, the Project Sponsor must first submit a Notice of Intent to obtain coverage under the General Permit. This General Permit requires dischargers to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which specifies the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would prevent construction pollutants from contacting storm drains, with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving offsite into receiving waters. Furthermore, the SWPPP would also include BMPs to control erosion associated with grading, trenching, and other ground surface-disturbing activities (see also discussion of SWPPP in Section VIII, *Hydrology and Water Quality*). With adherence to the requirements of the General Permit, impacts related to soil erosion from construction would be **less than significant**. No mitigation would be required.

**Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.5-13 to 4.5-14) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to soil erosion or loss of top soil, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

**c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?****Effects of the Project**

The Project site is largely developed and most of the near surface soils have likely been reworked to some degree as part of construction. Generally, prior to laying a foundation or roadway, the site soils are prepared or compacted in accordance with the building code requirements. Older structures were, in general, built to less stringent codes when compared to recent standards so conditions

would likely vary throughout the Project site. However, site preparation conducted according to current standards would likely improve the stability of soils throughout the Project site.

Standard geotechnical practices include an evaluation of subsurface soils and identifying engineering properties as well as providing appropriate mitigations to prepare underlying soils for a stable foundation of a planned improvement. These geotechnical investigations routinely evaluate the potential for landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, and collapse. The Project site is generally flat and there is little likelihood for landslides to affect any proposed development. Lateral spreading is related to liquefaction which is discussed above. Lateral spreading can occur on gentle slopes and is dependent on site-specific conditions. Placement of compacted fills or design of foundation systems to mitigate the effects of subsidence is within current standard practices. Soils that are susceptible to collapse are typically found in regions outside of the Project site. Collapsible soils are most often encountered in arid climates, where wind and intermittent streams deposit loose low-density materials.

For all the potential geologic hazards mentioned here, the use of standard geotechnical practices through a required geotechnical investigation and implementation of building code requirements are proven means of mitigation. The Project Sponsor would implement these requirements; therefore, the impacts from unstable soils, landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, and collapse would be *less than significant*. No mitigation would be required.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.5-14 to 4.5-15) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to unstable geologic units or soil, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

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

#### **Effects of the Project**

The preliminary geotechnical investigation<sup>22</sup> for the Project site indicates that soils had low expansion potential. Structural damage, warping, and cracking of roads, driveways, parking areas, and sidewalks, and rupture of utility lines may occur if the potential for expansive soils and the nature of the imported fill are not considered during design and construction of improvements. However, standard engineering practices could be used to reduce potential hazards associated with soils at the Project site.

As part of the construction permitting process, the City would require completed reports of soil conditions to identify potentially unsuitable soil conditions. The evaluations must be conducted by registered soil professionals. The reports must (a) identify potentially unsuitable soil conditions and (b) contain appropriate recommendations for foundation type and design criteria that conform to the analysis and implementation criteria described in the City Building Code, Chapters 16, 18, and A33, to eliminate inappropriate soil conditions.

---

<sup>22</sup> Cornerstone Earth Group. 2013. *Geotechnical Investigation – El Camino Real Complex*. Prepared for the Greenheart Land Company. October 1, 2013.

Adherence to the soil and foundation support parameters of the City Building Code, as required by City and state law, ensures the maximum practicable protection available from soil failures under static or dynamic conditions for structures and their associated trenches and foundations. The Project Sponsor would be required to incorporate these recommendations into Project design. In view of these circumstances, hazards related to expansive soil units at the Project site are considered *less than significant*.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.5-15) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to expansive soils, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

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

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project would not include any septic tanks or leach field systems. Wastewater generated at the Project site would be disposed through the existing sanitary sewer system. Existing sanitary sewer service for the Project site is provided via a 6-inch sewer main that runs under the Project site. Because the Project does not require soils capable of supporting septic systems, there would be *no impact*.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.5-12) and was also determined to be result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to septic tanks, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

<b>VI. Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

### Overview of Climate Change

Global climate change refers to changes in the normal<sup>23</sup> weather of the earth measured by alterations in wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature relative to historical averages. Such changes vary considerably by geographic location. Over time, the earth's climate has undergone periodic ice ages and warming periods, as observed in fossil isotopes, ice core samples, and through other measurement techniques. Recent climate change studies use the historical record to predict future climate variations and the level of fluctuation that might be considered statistically normal given historical trends.

Temperature records from the Industrial Age (ranging from the late eighteenth century to the present) deviate from normal predictions in both rate and magnitude. Most modern climatologists predict an unprecedented warming period during the next century and beyond, a trend that is increasingly attributed to human-generated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions resulting from the industrial processes, transportation, solid waste generation, and land use patterns of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), GHG emissions associated with human activities have grown since pre-industrial times, increasing by 70 percent between 1970 and 2004.<sup>24</sup> Increased GHG emissions are largely the result of increasing fuel consumption, particularly the incineration of fossil fuels.

The IPCC modeled several possible emissions trajectories to determine what level of reductions would be needed worldwide to stabilize global temperatures and minimize climate change impacts. Regardless of the analytic methodology used, global average temperature and sea level were predicted to rise under

<sup>23</sup> "Normal" weather patterns include statistically normal variations within a specified range.

<sup>24</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Summary for Policy Makers. In B. Metz, O.R. Davidson, P.R. Bosch, R. Dave, L.A. Meyer, (eds.), *Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press. Page 3. Available: <<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg3/ar4-wg3-spm.pdf>>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

all scenarios.<sup>25</sup> In other words, there is evidence that emissions reductions can minimize climate change effects but cannot reverse them entirely. However, emissions reductions can reduce the severity of impacts. For example, the IPCC predicted that the range of global mean temperature change from year 1990 to 2100, given different emissions-reduction scenarios, could range from 1.1°C to 6.4°C.

## Principal Greenhouse Gases

The primary GHGs generated by the Project would be carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>). Note that perfluorocarbons (PFCs) and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) are not discussed as these gases are primarily generated by industrial processes, which are not anticipated as part of the Project.

To simplify reporting and analysis, methods have been set forth to describe emissions of GHGs in terms of a single gas. The most commonly accepted method to compare GHG emissions is the global warming potential (GWP) methodology defined in the IPCC reference documents.<sup>26</sup> The IPCC defines the GWP of various GHG emissions on a normalized scale that recasts all GHG emissions in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e), which compares the gas in question to that of the same mass of CO<sub>2</sub> (by definition, CO<sub>2</sub> has a global warming potential of 1).

Table VI-1 lists the global warming potential of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and SF<sub>6</sub>, their lifetimes, and their concentrations in the atmosphere. Each of these gases is briefly described below.

**Table VI-1. Lifetimes and Global Warming Potentials of Principal Greenhouse Gases**

Greenhouse Gases	Global Warming Potential (over 100 years)	Lifetime (years)	Recent Atmospheric Concentration
CO <sub>2</sub>	1	50–200	393 ppm
CH <sub>4</sub>	21	9–15	1,874 ppb
N <sub>2</sub> O	310	120	324 ppb
SF <sub>6</sub>	23,900	3,200	7.5 ppt

Source: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 1996. *1995: Science of Climate Change*. (Second Assessment Report). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 2001:388–390. Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center 2013.<sup>27</sup>

Notes:

- ppb = parts per billion by volume.
- ppm = parts per million by volume.
- ppt = parts per trillion by volume.

**Carbon Dioxide.** CO<sub>2</sub> is the most important anthropogenic GHG and accounts for more than 75 percent of all GHG emissions caused by humans. Its atmospheric lifetime of 50 to 200 years ensures that

<sup>25</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Summary for Policy Makers. In Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H. L. Miller (eds.). *Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Page 13. Available: <[http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/planning/climate\\_change/maps/16\\_55/cbay\\_south.pdf](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/planning/climate_change/maps/16_55/cbay_south.pdf)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>26</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 1996. *1995: Science of Climate Change*. (Second Assessment Report). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 2001:241–280.

<sup>27</sup> Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center. 2013. *Recent Greenhouse Gas Concentrations*. Last Revised: February 2013. Available: <[http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current\\_ghg.html](http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current_ghg.html)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

atmospheric concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> will remain elevated for decades even after mitigation efforts to reduce GHG concentrations are promulgated.<sup>28</sup> The primary sources of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere include the burning of fossil fuels (including motor vehicles), gas flaring, cement production, and land use changes (e.g., deforestation, oxidation of elemental carbon). CO<sub>2</sub> can also be removed from the atmosphere by photosynthetic organisms. Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> has increased from a pre-industrial concentration of 280 parts per million (ppm) to 393 ppm.<sup>29,30</sup>

**Methane.** CH<sub>4</sub>, the main component of natural gas, is the second most abundant GHG and has a GWP of 21.<sup>31</sup> Sources of anthropogenic emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> include growing rice, raising cattle, using natural gas, landfill outgassing, and mining coal. Certain land uses also function as both a source and sink for CH<sub>4</sub>. For example, wetlands are a terrestrial source of CH<sub>4</sub>, whereas undisturbed, aerobic soils act as a CH<sub>4</sub> sink (i.e., they remove CH<sub>4</sub> from the atmosphere).

Atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> has increased from a pre-industrial concentration of 715 parts per billion (ppb) to 1,874 ppb.<sup>32,33</sup>

**Nitrous Oxide.** N<sub>2</sub>O is a powerful GHG, with a GWP of 310.<sup>34</sup> Anthropogenic sources of N<sub>2</sub>O include agricultural processes (e.g., fertilizer application), nylon production, fuel-fired power plants, nitric acid production, and vehicle emissions. N<sub>2</sub>O also is used in rocket engines, racecars, and as an aerosol spray propellant. Natural processes, such as nitrification and denitrification, can also produce N<sub>2</sub>O, which can be released to the atmosphere by diffusion. In the United States, more than 70 percent of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are related to agricultural soil management practices, particularly fertilizer application.

N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations in the atmosphere have increased 18 percent from pre-industrial levels of 270 ppb to 324 ppb.<sup>35,36</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Introduction. In B. Metz, O.R. Davidson, P.R. Bosch, R. Dave, L.A. Meyer, (eds.), *Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press. Available: <<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg3/ar4-wg3-chapter1.pdf>>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>29</sup> Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center. 2013. *Recent Greenhouse Gas Concentrations*. Last Revised: February 2013. Available: <[http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current\\_ghg.html](http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current_ghg.html)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>30</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. In Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.), *Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Available: <[http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/ar4/wg1/en/contents.html](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/contents.html)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>31</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 1996. *1995: Science of Climate Change*. (Second Assessment Report). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>32</sup> Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center. 2013. *Recent Greenhouse Gas Concentrations*. Last Revised: February 2013. Available: <[http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current\\_ghg.html](http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current_ghg.html)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>33</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. In Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.), *Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Available: <[http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/ar4/wg1/en/contents.html](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/contents.html)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>34</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 1996. *1995: Science of Climate Change*. (Second Assessment Report). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>35</sup> Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center. 2013. *Recent Greenhouse Gas Concentrations*. Last Revised: February 2013. Available: <[http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current\\_ghg.html](http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current_ghg.html)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>36</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. In Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.), *Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Available: <<http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/ar4-wg1.htm>>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

**Sulfur Hexafluoride.** SF<sub>6</sub>, a human-made chemical used as an electrical insulating fluid for power distribution equipment, in the magnesium casting, in semiconductor manufacturing, and also as a tracer chemical for the study of oceanic and atmospheric processes.<sup>37</sup> SF<sub>6</sub> is the most powerful of all GHGs listed in IPCC studies, with a GWP of 23,900.<sup>38</sup> SF<sub>6</sub> concentrations in the atmosphere have risen from 0 to more than 7.5 parts per trillion (ppt) since pre-industrial times.<sup>39</sup>

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventories

A GHG inventory is an accounting of the amount of GHGs emitted to or removed from the atmosphere over a specified period of time attributed to activities by a particular entity (e.g., annual emissions and reductions attributed to the state of California). A GHG inventory also provides information on the activities that cause emissions and removals, as well as the methods used to make the calculations. Table VI-2 outlines the most recent global, national, state, and local GHG inventories available to help contextualize the magnitude of potential Project-related emissions.

**Table VI-2. Global, National, State, and Local Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventories**

Emissions Inventory	CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)
2004 IPCC Global GHG Emissions Inventory	49,000,000,000
2011 EPA National GHG Emissions Inventory	6,708,300,000
2010 ARB State GHG Emissions Inventory	451,600,000
2007 SFBAAB GHG Emissions Inventory	95,800,000

### Sources:

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2010. *Source Inventory of Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Available: <[http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/Emission%20Inventory/regionalinventory2007\\_2\\_10.ashx](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/Emission%20Inventory/regionalinventory2007_2_10.ashx)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Introduction. In B. Metz, O. R. Davidson, P.R. Bosch, R. Dave, L. A. Meyer, (eds.), *Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press. Available: <<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg3/ar4-wg3-chapter1.pdf>>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.
- California Air Resources Board. 2013. *California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2010 – by Category as Defined in the Scoping Plan*. Last Reviewed: October 2, 2013. Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm>>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2013. *Draft Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2011: Executive Summary*. Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/ghgemissions/US-GHG-Inventory-2011-ES-Executive-Summary.pdf>>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

CO<sub>2</sub>e = carbon dioxide equivalent

<sup>37</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2013. *F-Gases Emissions/ Climate Change/ US EPA*. Available: <<http://epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/fgases.html#Trends>>. Last revised: September 9, 2013. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>38</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 1996. *1995: Science of Climate Change*. (Second Assessment Report). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>39</sup> Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center. 2013. *Recent Greenhouse Gas Concentrations*. Last Revised: February 2013. Available: <[http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current\\_ghg.html](http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/current_ghg.html)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

## Predicted Effects of Climate Change

Climate change could have a number of adverse effects. Although these effects would have global consequences, in most cases they would not disproportionately affect any one site or activity. In other words, many of the effects of climate change are not site-specific. Emission of GHGs would contribute to the changes in the global climate, which would in turn, have a number of physical and environmental effects. A number of general effects are discussed below.

**Sea Level Rise and Flooding.** Measurements taken in the San Francisco Bay (Bay) indicate that the current rate of sea level rise is about 3.5 inches per century at Alameda and 8.4 inches per century at San Francisco.<sup>40</sup> Climate change effects on sea levels could lead to even higher rates of sea level rise (accelerated sea level rise).

Different scenarios and models used to predict sea level rise result in different estimates of the magnitude of sea level rise. For example, the California Climate Change Center predicts that accelerated sea level rise could result in a sea level rise in California of 4.3–28.2 inches above the existing mean sea level (msl) by 2099.<sup>41</sup> The California Climate Action Team (CAT) projects that sea levels could rise as much as 35 inches by the year 2100.<sup>42</sup>

In October 2011, the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) adopted the latest amendment to the Bay Plan. The Bay Plan states that the Bay will rise 10–17 inches by 2050, 17–32 inches by 2070, and 55–69 inches by the end of the century if current trends continue.<sup>43</sup>

In the future, precipitation events are predicted to vary in terms of timing, intensity, and volume according to many climate change models. Extreme storm events may occur with greater frequency.<sup>44</sup> Alterations in the flow regime and subsequent flood potential could also occur from effects of climate change on local and regional precipitation patterns.

**Water Supply.** California Health and Safety Code Section 38501(a) recognizes that climate change “poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California,” and notes, “the potential adverse impacts of [climate change] include...reduction in the quality and supply of water to the State from the Sierra snowpack.” As most of the state, including the Bay Area, depends on surface water supplies originating in the Sierra Nevada, this water supply reduction is a concern.

---

<sup>40</sup> California Department of Water Resources. 2006. Progress on Incorporating Climate Change into Planning and Management of California’s Water Resources Technical Memorandum Report. Table 2-6. Available: <<http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/docs/DWRClimateChangeJuly06.pdf>>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>41</sup> Cayan, D. P. Bromirski, K. Hayhoe, M. Tyree, M. Dettinger, and R. Flick. 2006. *Projecting Future Sea Level*. California Energy Commission. Table 3. July 2006. Available: <<http://www.energy.ca.gov/2005publications/CEC-500-2005-202/CEC-500-2005-202-SF.PDF>>. Last Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>42</sup> California Climate Action Team. 2006. *Executive Summary, 2006 Final Climate Action Team Report to the Governor and Legislature*. April. Available: <<http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/docs/DWRClimateChangeJuly06.pdf>>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>43</sup> San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. 2011. Resolution No. 11-08: Adoption of Bay Plan Amendment No. 1-08 Adding New Climate Change Findings and Policies to the Bay Plan; And Revising the Bay Plan Tidal Marsh and Tidal Flats; Safety of Fills; Protection of the Shoreline; and Public Access Findings and Policies. Page 11. Adopted October 2011. Available: <[http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/proposed\\_bay\\_plan/10-01Resolution.pdf](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/proposed_bay_plan/10-01Resolution.pdf)>. Last Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>44</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2013. *Climate Change Indicators in the United States/ Weather and Climate*. Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/science/indicators/weather-climate/index.html>>. Last updated: April 22, 2013. Last Accessed: January 29, 2014.

Most of the scientific models addressing climate change show that the primary effect on California's climate would be a reduced snow pack and a shift in stream-flow seasonality. A higher percentage of the winter precipitation in the mountains would likely fall as rain rather than as snow in some locations, thereby reducing the overall snowpack. Further, as temperatures rise, snowmelt is expected to occur earlier in the year resulting in peak runoff that would likely come a month or so earlier. The end result of this would be that the state may not have sufficient surface storage to capture the resulting early runoff. As a result of absent construction of additional water storage projects, a portion of the current supplies would be lost to the oceans rather than be available for use in the state's water delivery systems.

**Water Quality.** Climate change could have adverse effects on water quality, which would, in turn, affect the beneficial uses (habitat, water supply, etc.) of surface water bodies and groundwater. The changes in precipitation discussed above could result in increased sedimentation, higher concentration of pollutants, higher dissolved oxygen levels, increased temperatures, and an increase in the amount of runoff constituents reaching surface water bodies. Sea level rise, discussed above, could result in the encroachment of saline water into freshwater bodies.<sup>45</sup>

**Ecosystems and Biodiversity.** Climate change is expected to have effects on diverse types of ecosystems, from alpine to deep sea habitat. As temperatures and precipitation change, seasonal shifts in vegetation would occur; this could affect the distribution of associated flora and fauna species. As the range of species shifts, habitat fragmentation could occur, with acute impacts on the distribution of certain sensitive species. The IPCC states that "[a]pproximately 20-30 percent of plant and animal species assessed so far are likely to be at increased risk of extinction if increases in global average temperature exceed 1.5–2.5°C" relative to pre-industrial levels.<sup>46</sup> Shifts in existing biomes could also make ecosystems vulnerable to encroachment of foreign species. These disruptions can cause ripple effects in food webs for a wide range of organisms. In general terms, climate change is expected to put a number of stressors on ecosystems, with potentially catastrophic effects on biodiversity.<sup>47</sup>

**Human Health Impacts.** Climate change may also increase the risk of vector-borne infectious diseases, particularly those found in tropical areas and spread by insects, such as Lyme disease and West Nile Virus. The presence of harmful bacteria and *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia*, water-borne parasites, could also increase in the event of heavy rainfall or flooding and contaminate drinking water. While these health impacts would largely affect tropical areas in other parts of the world, effects would also be felt in California. Warming of the atmosphere would be expected to increase ground-level ozone, which could adversely affect individuals with heart and respiratory problems, such as asthma. Extreme heat events would also be expected to occur with more frequency and could adversely affect sensitive populations,

---

<sup>45</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Summary for Policy makers. In *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. In Parry, Martin L., Canziani, Osvaldo F., Palutikof, Jean P., van der Linden, Paul J., and Hanson, Clair E. (eds.), *Contribution of Working Group II to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 1000 pp. Available: < <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg2/ar4-wg2-spm.pdf> >. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>46</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Summary for Policy makers. In *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. In Parry, Martin L., Canziani, Osvaldo F., Palutikof, Jean P., van der Linden, Paul J., and Hanson, Clair E. (eds.), *Contribution of Working Group II to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 1000 pp. Available: < <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg2/ar4-wg2-spm.pdf> >. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

<sup>47</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2013. *Ecosystems Impacts & Adaptation*. Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/impacts-adaptation/ecosystems.html>>. Last Updated: September 9, 2013. Accessed January 29, 2014.

such as the elderly and children. Finally, the water supply impacts and seasonal temperature variations expected as a result of climate change could affect the viability of existing agricultural operations, making the food supply more vulnerable.<sup>48</sup>

**Heat Island Effect.** Although not a direct cause by climate change, the impact of the heat island effect may be exacerbated by the increase frequency of heating days due to climate change. The heat island effect is created by paved urban areas that tend to absorb rather than reflect solar radiation due to dark asphalt surfaces, resulting in greater temperatures above and surrounding these areas than nearby rural areas. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), this effect can result in greater energy demands for air conditioning, increased air pollution and GHG emissions due to these increased energy demands, heat-related illness and mortality, and effects on water quality.<sup>49</sup>

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

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

#### Effects of the Project

The Project is within the land use projections analyzed as part of the Specific Plan EIR, which found that emissions associated with the buildout of the Specific Plan Area would result in substantial GHG emissions from vehicle trips, natural gas and electricity consumption, solid waste generation, water and wastewater conveyance and treatment, and landscape maintenance. The emissions per service population for the Specific Plan were found to be greater than the applicable Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) per capita threshold. The Specific Plan EIR concluded that emissions would result in substantial GHG emissions that could have a significant impact on the environment. This impact is **significant and unavoidable**. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GHG-1** (pages 4.6-19 to 4.6-23) would help reduce GHG emissions associated with the Project but not to a less-than-significant level. Although significant and unavoidable impacts were identified, the Project would not result in new specific effects or more significant effects. Consequently, this topic does not require further environmental review.

In addition, the Project Sponsor would comply with guidelines and standards in the Specific Plan aimed at reducing GHG emissions. Specifically, Section C.5 of the Specific Plan is a section devoted entirely to addressing sustainability. Guidelines implementing the LEED for Neighborhood Development 2009 rating systems credits are located in Section D.6 of the Specific Plan, as well as a number of other areas including: Specific Plan Guidelines D.2.47, D.4.09, D.5.20, E.3.6.07, E.3.14, Standards E.3.8.01 through E.3.8.03, E.3.8.17 and E.3.8.18, and Guidelines E.3.8.04 through E.3.8.16 and E.3.8.19 through E.3.8.26. These measures would contribute to lessening GHG impacts in the Specific Plan area. The Project Sponsor would also implement BAAQMD-identified GHG mitigation measures and proposed CALGreen amendments as required by **Mitigation Measure GHG-1**.

---

<sup>48</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2013. *Human Health Impacts & Adaptation*. Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/impacts-adaptation/health.html#impactsdiseases>>. Last Updated: May 14, 2013. Last Accessed: June 12, 2013.

<sup>49</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2013. *Heat Island Effect*. Available: <<http://www.epa.gov/hiri/>>. Last updated: September 9, 2013. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

In accordance with Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, the Infill EIR will discuss whether the Project would result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy. This discussion will be in the "Other CEQA" chapter of the Infill EIR.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.6-17 to 4.6-23) and was determined to be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of **Mitigation Measure GHG-1** and uniform development policies in the Specific Plan, as listed above. The physical conditions, as they relate to greenhouse gas emissions, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate all applicable mitigation measures from the Specific Plan EIR regarding GHG emissions. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR are available that would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts to less than significant.

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

### **Effects of the Project**

As discussed above, the Project is within the land use projections analyzed as part of the Specific Plan EIR, which found that the Specific Plan emissions would exceed the applicable BAAQMD per capita threshold. In addition, the Specific Plan EIR determined that the BAAQMD thresholds were derived using AB 32 attainment goals, and that an exceedance of the per capita threshold would indicate that the Project conflicts with Assembly Bill (AB) 32. The Specific Plan EIR concluded that this impact is **significant and unavoidable**. Implementation of **Mitigation Measures GHG-2a** and **GHG-2b** (pages 4.6-24 to 4.6-25) would help reduce GHG emissions associated with the Project but not to a less-than-significant level. The Project would not result in impacts more severe than what has been disclosed in the Specific Plan EIR. However, the Project Sponsor would comply with guidelines and standards in the Specific Plan aimed at reducing GHG emissions, as listed above. In addition, the Project Sponsor would obtain and install electric vehicle/plug-in hybrid electric vehicle recharging stations and participate in a commercial recycling program as required by the City, outlined in **Mitigation Measures GHG-2a** and **GHG-2b**, respectively. Although significant and unavoidable impacts were identified, the Project would not result new specific effects or more significant effects. This topic does not require further environmental review.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.2-24 to 4.2-27) and was determined to be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-2a and GHG-2b and uniform development policies. The physical conditions, as they relate to plans and policies regarding GHG emissions, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate all applicable mitigation measures from the Specific Plan EIR regarding GHG emissions. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional feasible mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific EIR or uniform development policies are available that would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts to less than significant.

<b>VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Hazardous materials information in this section is based primarily on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (Phase I ESAs) for 1258 El Camino Real and 1300 El Camino Real prepared by Green Environment, Inc. in April and March 2012, respectively and the High-Vacuum, Dual-Phase Extraction Pilot Test Workplan Derry Lane Site prepared by Green Environment, Inc. in September 2013.

### Setting

The Project site is in the City of Menlo Park (City) and is bound by residential and commercial development to the north along Glenwood Avenue, to the east by both Caltrain and Garwood Way rights-of-way, to the south by Oak Grove Avenue, and El Camino Real to the west.

Adjacent land uses include an assisted living facility to the north; single- and multi-family residential units to the east of the Caltrain right-of-way; the Menlo Park Caltrain Station and mixed-use development to the south of Oak Grove Avenue; and the El Camino Real commercial corridor to the west. The northeast corner of El Camino Real/Oak Grove Avenue (immediately adjacent to the Project site), includes a Chevron gas station and a restaurant. As mentioned in the *Project Description*, the existing Project site is divided into three areas: the 1258 El Camino Real Site, the 1300 El Camino Real Site, and the Derry Lane Site. Although these areas are currently on separate parcels, the entire Project site is owned by the Project Sponsor.

The 1258 El Camino Real site includes a 3,500-square-foot (sf) building. The one-story building was constructed in 1958 and was occupied by a veterinary hospital from 1958 to 1991, followed by a chiropractic office until 2002 and a hair salon from 2005 to 2010. The building is currently vacant. 1258 El Camino Real is listed as a former state voluntary cleanup program site with a voluntary cleanup agreement termination date of June 2011, and as a past hazardous waste generation site (asbestos waste, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), other organic solids).

The 1300 El Camino Real site includes two parcels that formerly featured five buildings constructed in 1967. These buildings were demolished in April 2010 in anticipation of a previous mixed-use project that was not completed. Building foundations, paved surfaces, and subsurface utilities were not demolished or removed at that time. The existing site is vacant of buildings and consists of impervious surfaces and ruderal vegetation. During the environmental records search, the site was listed as Roger Penske Cadillac in the California Facility Inventory Database (FID) underground storage tank (UST) site and Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System (SWEEPS) UST site. The property was

also listed as Sandhill Property Co. and Anderson Cadillac & Oldsmobile, and was listed under the Haznet database. Stanford Cadillac was listed as a historic Cortese and leaking underground storage tank (LUST) site. Anderson Cadillac & Oldsmobile is listed as a closed LUST site (as of August 1984), a historic UST site, an Air Pollutant Emission site, and as a hazardous waste generator from 1993 (waste consisting of PCBs, oxygenated solvents, unspecified organic liquid mixture, unspecified solvent mixture, aqueous solution with total organic residues less than 10 percent, and waste oil and mixed oil).

The Derry Lane Site occupies approximately 3.5 acres of contiguous parcels. In May 2011, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) issued an Imminent and Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order to the Derry Family Partnership, LP and several individuals in response to the discovery of perchloroethylene (PCE) and the PCE-degradation products trichloroethene (TCE), dichloroethene (DCE), and vinyl chloride in site soil, soil vapor, and groundwater at concentrations posing a risk to human health and the environment. The presence of these contaminants was due to a release of PCE from a former dry cleaning business (Wo Sing Cleaners) that operated at 570 Derry Lane from 1981 to 2011.

The closest existing school to the Project site is the Language Pacifica School at 585 Glenwood Avenue, approximately 400 feet to the northwest. Other schools in the vicinity include Menlo School at 50 Valparaiso Avenue, and Nativity Elementary School at 1250 Laurel Street, both schools are located approximately 0.3 miles to the southwest and to the northeast of the Project site, respectively.

The Project site is not within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The airport closest to the Project site is the Palo Alto Airport of Santa Clara County, approximately 4 miles to the east. San Carlos Airport is approximately 5.4 miles to the northwest and the Moffett Federal Airfield is approximately 7.8 miles to the southeast. Furthermore, there are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project site.

In September 2011, the City adopted the Annex to 2010 Association of Bay Area Governments Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (Hazard Mitigation Plan) and an update to the City's Emergency Operation Plan (EOP).<sup>50</sup> The Hazard Mitigation Plan assesses a full range of natural disasters and the City's response through disaster planning. The City developed the EOP to better prepare for responses to emergency situations that could result from natural disasters and technological incidents. Fire response to the Project site is provided by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District (MPFPD) via Fire Station 6, located at 700 Oak Grove Avenue. The Menlo Park Police Department (MPPD) is at 701 Laurel Street.

According to the figure depicting the local responsibility area (LRA) for San Mateo County, *Fire Hazards Severity Zones in LRA-San Mateo County* of the Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), the Project is not located within a Very High Fire Risk Area.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> City of Menlo Park. 2013. *City of Menlo Park General Plan—Open Space/Conservation, Noise and Safety Elements*. Adopted May 21. Page 88. Available: <[http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/he/20130530/MP\\_Final\\_Adopted\\_OSCNS\\_5\\_21\\_13.pdf](http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/he/20130530/MP_Final_Adopted_OSCNS_5_21_13.pdf)>. Accessed: January 29, 2013.

<sup>51</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2008. *Fire and Resource Assessment Program: Fire Hazards Severity Zones in LRA-San Mateo County map*. November. Available: <[http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san\\_mateo/fhszl\\_map.41.pdf](http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san_mateo/fhszl_map.41.pdf)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

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

### Effects of the Project

#### Project Construction

Based on historical data obtained during the completion of the Phase I ESAs for the 1258 El Camino Real and 1300 El Camino Real Sites, and the current remediation status of the Derry Lane Site, it is likely that contamination exists in the Project site footprint. In addition, it is possible that the existing building components contain quantities of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) or lead-based paints. These contaminated soils and building materials would be hauled offsite during construction for disposal. Therefore, the Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction. This topic requires *further environmental review* in the Infill EIR.

#### Project Operation

It is anticipated that the Project would use hazardous materials typical of non-medical office, retail and residential uses (e.g., solvents, cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, petroleum fuels, propane, aerosol cans). These hazardous material products are generally used in small, localized amounts, and any spills that may occur would be cleaned up immediately. Although implementation of the Project might account for an increase in amounts of common types of hazardous materials, normal routine use of these products would not result in a significant hazard to residents or workers in the vicinity. In addition, the Project would not handle acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Moreover, any applicant handling hazardous materials would be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) for review and approval by the San Mateo County Environmental Health (SMCEH). The City has a policy for reviewing the use of hazardous materials that it coordinates with the county and the MPFPD. The purpose of the Hazardous Materials Business Plan is to ensure that employees are adequately trained to handle the materials and provides information to the MPFPD should emergency response be required. Proper handling and disposal of contaminated building materials would reduce unforeseen risks to the environment and prevent potential future adverse health, safety, or environmental effects. As a result, the Project would have *less-than-significant* impacts related to transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. The Project would not result in impacts beyond what was discussed in the Specific Plan EIR.

#### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.7-14 to 4.7-19) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to the transport and use of hazardous materials, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. However, due to the extent of the identified hazardous materials at the Project site, it has been determined that this topic, as it relates to construction, requires further environmental review in the Infill EIR.

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

### Effects of the Project

As discussed under Section VII(a), above, construction activities related to the Project may encounter contaminated media during grading, excavation, and the installation of the support structures for new buildings. Disturbance of these subsurface soils and groundwater at locations that may have been previously contaminated by prior uses could further extend contamination into the environment and expose construction workers or the public to contaminants. In addition, existing building materials could contain quantities of ACMs or lead-based paints. Although the Project would be required to comply with DTSC mandates during remedial activities, and would implement recommendations found in the Phase I ESAs and **Mitigation Measure HAZ-3** (pages 4.7-17 to 4.17-18), as presented in the Specific Plan EIR, this topic requires **further environmental review** in the Infill EIR.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.7-14 to 4.7-17) and was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure HAZ-3**. The Project is within the development scenario considered in the Specific Plan EIR and presence of hazardous materials at the Derry Lane Site and 1300 El Camino Real Site are both summarized in the Specific Plan EIR. However, due to the extent of the identified hazardous materials at the Project site, it has been determined that this topic requires further environmental review in the Infill EIR.

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

### Effects of the Project

#### Project Construction

The closest existing school is the Language Pacifica School located at 585 Glenwood Avenue, approximately 400 feet from the Project site. All other schools in the vicinity are located at distances greater than one-quarter mile. As discussed above, under Sections VII(a) and VII(b), it is possible that contamination may exist at the Project site in the form of PCE releases in soil and groundwater, hydraulic fluid impacted soil and PCB-affected soil. As such, construction activities related to the Project may encounter contamination during grading, excavation, and the installation of support structures for new buildings and could, therefore, result in a potentially significant impact. This topic requires **further environmental review** in the Infill EIR.

#### Project Operation

It is anticipated that the Project would use hazardous materials typical of non-medical office, retail and residential uses. These hazardous materials would generally be used in small, localized amounts, and any spills that may occur would be cleaned up immediately. In addition, the Project would not handle acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, operation of the Project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts on nearby schools.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This impact was not discussed in the Specific Plan EIR; therefore, this topic will be analyzed in the Infill EIR as it relates to construction impacts.

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

### Effects of the Project

As discussed in the Setting above, the Project site was found in several environmental databases during completion of the Phase I ESAs. The 1258 El Camino Real Site was listed as a former state voluntary cleanup program site with termination having been granted in June 2011. The 1300 El Camino Real Site was included and granted closure in August of 1984 for a LUST violation. The Derry Lane Site is currently participating in an Imminent and Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order requested by the DTSC. Therefore, this topic requires *further environmental review* in the Infill EIR.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This impact was not discussed in the Specific Plan EIR; therefore, this topic will be analyzed in the Infill EIR.

- e. Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

### Effects of the Project

The Project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. As such, the Project will result in *no impact*. No mitigation would be required.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.7-14) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to safety hazards in the vicinity of an airport land use plan area, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- f. Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

### Effects of the Project

The Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the Project will result in *no impact*. No mitigation would be required.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.7-14) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to safety hazards in the vicinity of a private airstrip, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

### Effects of the Project

The Project site is located in an area where existing emergency response times for fire protection, emergency medical services, and police protection meet adopted standards. In addition, the Project does not include any characteristics (e.g., permanent road closures or roadway modifications) that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency response or evacuation in the Project vicinity. Emergency vehicle access would be permitted from El Camino Real and Garwood Way through the middle of the Project site between the two proposed office buildings. Another access point could potentially be added off of Oak Grove Avenue. Due to the new driveway at Garwood Way, emergency access to the Project site would improve over existing conditions. Hydrants and other fire connections would be available as per MPFPD requirements. Adherence to the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City's EOP and the requirements of the MPFPD would ensure adequate response to emergencies and evacuation plans as growth occurs, and reduce the potential for interfering with emergency plans. As such, the Project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts. No mitigation would be required.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was not analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. However, since the Project would adhere to the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City's EOP, and the requirements of the MPFPD, no new specific effects would occur. Therefore, no further analysis is required.

- h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

### Effects of the Project

As mentioned, the Project site is not located within a Very High Fire Risk Area. Furthermore, the Project site is located in a completely developed portion of San Mateo County and is neither adjacent to nor intermixed with wildlands. As such, the Project will result in **no impact**. No mitigation would be required.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was not analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. However, since the Project site is not subject to wildland fires, no new specific effects would occur. Therefore, no further analysis is required.

<b>VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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 or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting**

**Drainage Patterns.** The Project site lies within the San Francisco Bay (Bay) hydrologic region. This region extends from southern Santa Clara County north to Tomales Bay in Marin County, and inland to the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. Creeks and streams in the region flow to the Bay estuary or directly into the Pacific Ocean. The Project site is located on the San Mateo Plain, an alluvial plain just north of the Santa Clara Valley. In this area, surface drainage generally flows from southwest to northeast, conveying water from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the southern Bay.

Atherton Channel and San Francisquito Creek run perpendicular to El Camino Real and are approximately 0.5 mile north and 1 mile south, respectively, of the Project site. Both creeks drain into the southern Bay. A drainage divide runs parallel between the two creeks, leading the stormwater from the Project site north to Atherton Channel. There are no creeks or streams crossing the Project site. The site, which is in an urbanized area, is relatively flat and largely covered with impervious surfaces (pavement, building roofs, compacted soil, and gravel). The existing Project site is comprised of approximately 214,400 sf of impervious surfaces (76.4 percent).

A 12-inch stormwater main is located under Garwood Way, which leads north into the stormwater system under Glenwood Avenue, and from there to the receiving waters of the Atherton Channel. A stormwater main is also located under El Camino Real, which fronts the Project site. This main is approximately 30 inches in diameter west of the Project site, increasing in stages to 42 inches in diameter to the northwest of the Project site, prior to the main’s confluence with Atherton Creek. El Camino Real and its associated drainage conveyances are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, while the Garwood Way/Glenwood Avenue system is maintained by the City. The City published a citywide storm

drainage study in May 2003 that identified existing deficiencies within the existing stormwater collection system.

**Water Quality.** The quality of surface water and groundwater in the vicinity of the Project site is affected by past and current land uses at the site; water quality within the watershed is also affected by the composition of local geologic materials. Water quality in surface and groundwater bodies is regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards). The Project site is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board, which is responsible for implementation of State and federal water quality protection guidelines in the vicinity of the Project site. The State Water Board implements the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan), a master policy document for managing water quality in the region. The Basin Plan establishes beneficial water uses for waterways and water bodies within the region.

Existing sources of pollutants discharging into surface waters in the Project area may include both point and nonpoint discharges. A point source is any discernible, confined, and discrete conveyance (e.g., a pipe discharge) of pollutants to a water body from such sources as industrial facilities or wastewater treatment plants. These discharges are subject to prohibitions by regulatory agencies, water quality requirements, periodic monitoring, annual reporting, and other requirements designed to protect the overall water quality of the creeks and eventually the Bay. Nonpoint pollutant sources are sources that do not have a single, identifiable discharge point but are rather a combination of many sources. A nonpoint source can be stormwater runoff from land that contains, for example, petroleum from parking lots, pesticides from farming operations, or sediment from soil erosion. Nonpoint pollutant sources could include microbial contaminants, inorganic contaminants, pesticides and herbicides, organic chemical contaminants, and radioactive contaminants.

Runoff water quality is regulated by the federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Nonpoint Source Program (established through the Clean Water Act); the NPDES program objective is to control and reduce pollutants to water bodies from nonpoint discharges. The City is a participant in the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPPP). The STOPPPP maintains compliance with the NPDES Stormwater Discharge Permit and promotes stormwater pollution prevention within that context. Compliance with the NPDES Permit is mandated by State and federal statutes and regulations.

**Groundwater.** The Project site is within the Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin. The basin is composed primarily of geologically young fluvial, alluvial fan, and basin deposits of clay, silt, sand, and gravel. Groundwater along El Camino Real in Menlo Park is likely to be shallowest closer to Atherton Channel and San Francisquito Creek, and deepest along the drainage divide. Groundwater flow is primarily in the direction of the Bay, but may be locally influenced by the creeks or groundwater wells.

Groundwater was encountered at the Project site in some exploration borings, and is estimated to be at depths ranging from 38 to 40 feet below current grades. Historic high groundwater is mapped in the area at depths at approximately 30 feet below site grade. Fluctuations in groundwater levels occur due to many factors including seasonal fluctuation, underground drainage patterns, regional fluctuations, and other factors.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Cornerstone Earth Group. *Geotechnical Investigation – El Camino Real Complex*. Prepared for the Greenheart Land Company. October 1, 2013.

**Flooding.** The Project site is located within Zone X of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood map public database. This area is determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain. In addition, the Project site is not located within a mapped dam failure inundation area.<sup>53</sup>

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

### a. *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

#### Effects of the Project

**Construction.** Construction of the Project would include excavation grading of existing surfaces, and demolition of approximately 25,800 sf of existing buildings. These activities would result in short-term disturbance and exposure of surface soils that could cause erosion and increase sediment and pollutant loading in stormwater runoff. To regulate construction-related stormwater discharges, the Regional Water Board requires compliance with the Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009 DWQ (Construction General Permit or General Permit) for projects that disturb more than 1 acre of land. Compliance with the Construction General Permit requires development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevent Plan (SWPPP). Because the Project would disturb more than 1 acre, the Project Sponsor would be required to implement a SWPPP.

During construction activities, demolition, clearing and grubbing, cut/fill, grading, materials/waste management, and other associated activities could contribute to additional pollutants in stormwater runoff. However, the approved SWPPP, required for coverage under the Construction General Permit, would include stormwater quality best management practices (BMPs) to prevent erosion and transport of polluted runoff and sediment during construction. The Construction General Permit is considered protective of water quality during construction activities. The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board inspects construction sites to ensure that construction projects are in compliance with their approved SWPPP. If substantial dewatering is required during construction, the Project Sponsor would have to apply for an individual waste discharge requirements (WDR)/NPDES permit. If an individual WDR/NPDES permit is required, it would include quantity and effluent discharge limitations, along with monitoring and reporting. The individual WDR/NPDES permit limitations would be imposed to be protective of water quality.

In addition, the City Engineering Division requires a Grading and Drainage (G&D) Permit and preparation of a construction plan for any construction project disturbing 500 sf or more. The G&D Permit requirements specify that the Project Sponsor's construction plan must demonstrate that sediment-laden water shall not leave the site. The Project Sponsor may comply with these requirements by such means as completing grading activities during dry months, providing temporary sediment basins and traps, and/or utilizing temporary silt fences or straw rolls. Compliance with the G&D Permit plans during construction is assured through the building permit inspection process. Therefore, there would be no violation of WDRs during construction activities and the Project contributions to violation of water quality standards, polluted runoff, or erosion and sedimentation during construction activities would be *less than significant*.

**Operation.** Project site improvements would include the construction of approximately 130,000 sf of new building footprints. Implementation of the Project would increase impervious surfaces to 233,800 sf (approximately 83.3 percent), compared to 214,400 sf of existing impervious surfaces, a

---

<sup>53</sup> City of Menlo Park. *City of Menlo Park General Plan*. Open Space, Conservation, Noise, and Safety Elements. Adopted May 21, 2013.

difference of 19,400 sf. Approximately 46,800 sf of pervious landscaped areas would be provided throughout the site. Up to 10 stormwater treatment areas with about 11,500 sf in total would be located throughout the Project site in order to limit stormwater runoff. These biotreatment areas would be open, level, vegetated areas that would allow runoff to be distributed evenly across the area and would comply with the San Mateo County NPDES C.3 requirements for bioswales stormwater infiltration/ treatment.

Increasing the total area of impervious surfaces can result in a number of potential impacts associated with increased volume of runoff and a greater potential to introduce pollutants to receiving waters. Urban runoff can carry a variety of pollutants, such as oil and grease, metals, sediment, and pesticide residues from roadways, parking lots, rooftops, landscaped areas, and other surfaces, and deposit them in adjacent waterways. However, water quality in stormwater runoff is regulated locally by the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP), the municipal stormwater requirements set by the Regional Water Board, which includes the C.3 provisions. Adherence to these updated requirements causes new development and redevelopment projects to incorporate treatment measures and other appropriate source control and site design features that reduce pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practical. Many of these requirements result in the construction of Low Impact Development techniques such as use of onsite infiltration through landscaping or vegetated swales that reduce pollutant loading in offsite discharges. Incorporation of these types of source control design measures can even potentially improve upon existing conditions.

The El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Specific Plan) further recommends that new buildings incorporate green roofs (Specific Plan Guideline E.3.8.12) that harvest rain water that can reduce peak stormwater volumes and/or flow rates to relieve both existing and future system capacity limitations. The Specific Plan also recommends the use of porous paving material on driveways and parking areas (Specific Plan Guidelines D.2.47, D.4.09, D.5.20, D.6.03, D.6.04 and E.3.8.13) to minimize stormwater runoff from paved surfaces, as well as stormwater management techniques such as the use of bioswales on surface parking lots.

Compliance with applicable stormwater management requirements and Specific Plan guidelines, and implementation of a landscaping plan designed to provide stormwater treatment areas, would ensure that the Project has a *less-than-significant* impact on water quality standards and WDRs during construction and operation.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.8-16 to 4.8-20) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of Specific Plan standards and design guidelines, as listed above. Therefore, these uniformly applicable development policies would also substantially mitigate the impacts of the Project. No additional mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

### **Effects of the Project**

As stated above, the Project site is already developed and covered by impervious surfaces. The underlying shallow aquifer is not currently used for groundwater supply; however, it is considered by the Regional Water Board as a potential source for groundwater. A net increase in impervious surfaces might affect the amount of precipitation that is recharged to the shallow aquifer. However, drainage control design features required by SMCWPPP and the City of Menlo Park require that all stormwater from disturbed sites be treated and that project runoff not exceed pre-project levels. Therefore, implementation of the Project would result in a ***less-than-significant*** impact on groundwater supplies.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.8-19) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to depletion of groundwater supplies, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- c. 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?***

### **Effects of the Project**

As described under Section VIII(a), above, the Project would develop and implement a SWPPP during the construction phase and would incorporate NPDES C.3 requirements and Specific Plan guidelines into the final design. Adherence to these stormwater management requirements would ensure that construction and operation of the Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation. The Project would not have a direct effect on the course of a stream or river as there are no streams or rivers present at the Project site. Therefore, the Project would have a ***less-than-significant*** impact on erosion or siltation on- or offsite.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.8-16 to 4.8-20) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of Specific Plan standards and design guidelines, as listed above in Section VIII(a). Therefore, these uniformly applicable development policies would also substantially mitigate the impacts of the Project. No additional mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to existing drainage patterns and erosion, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- d. 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 or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?***

### **Effects of the Project**

As described under Sections VIII(a) and VIII(c), construction and operation of the Project would not alter the course of a stream or river or increase the amount of stormwater runoff generated at the Project site. The Project would likely increase onsite stormwater infiltration and would comply with all applicable stormwater management regulations including the NPDES Construction General Permit and NPDES C.3 requirements, thereby reducing construction- and operation-related stormwater runoff to the extent feasible. Therefore, the Project would have a ***less-than-significant*** impact related to onsite or offsite flooding.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.8-16 to 4.8-20) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of Specific Plan standards and design guidelines, as listed above in Section VIII(a). Therefore, these uniformly applicable development policies would also substantially mitigate the impacts of the Project. No additional mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to existing drainage patterns and runoff, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project would be served by the City's stormwater drainage system. As described under Sections VIII(a), VIII(c), and VIII(d), above, the Project would not result in an increase in stormwater runoff from the Project site. The Project would increase onsite stormwater infiltration by providing biotreatment areas and implementing the Specific Plan guidelines, thereby reducing stormwater loads to the City's drainage system. As such, the Project would not exceed the capacity of the City's stormwater system and would not contribute substantial new sources of polluted runoff, resulting in a ***less-than-significant*** impact.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.8-16 to 4.8-20) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of Specific Plan standards and design guidelines, as listed above in Section VIII(a). Therefore, these uniformly applicable development policies would also substantially mitigate the impacts of the Project. No additional mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to runoff and existing stormwater drainage systems, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

***f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

**Effects of the Project**

Aside from potential water quality impacts associated with stormwater runoff, as described above in Section VIII(a), the Project would not otherwise degrade water quality. Compliance with federal, state, and local standards would ensure that the Project would result in ***less-than-significant*** impacts on existing water quality.

**Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.8-16 to 4.8-20) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of Specific Plan standards and design guidelines, as listed above in Section VIII(a). Therefore, these uniformly applicable development policies would also substantially mitigate the impacts of the Project. No additional mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to degradation of water quality, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

***g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

**Effects of the Project**

The Project site is not within a FEMA-designated flood zone; therefore, the Project site is not subject to 100-year flood hazards. As such, the Project would have ***no impact*** with regard to the placement of housing in a 100-year flood zone.

**Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.8-20 to 4.8-21) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to flood hazard areas, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

***h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?***

**Effects of the Project**

As described under Section VIII(g), above, the Project site is not located within a designated 100-year flood hazard zone as shown in the City's General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not place a new structure within the 100-year flood zone that could impede or redirect flows. Therefore, there would be ***no impact***.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.8-20 to 4.8-21) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to flood hazards and floodflows, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

#### **Effects of the Project**

According to the City's General Plan, areas of the City are located within the potential dam inundation area for the Searsville dam. However, the Project site is not within this dam inundation area. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, resulting in **no impact**.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.8-21) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to levee or dam flooding, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

#### **Effects of the Project**

The Project site is situated approximately 65–70 feet above mean sea level (msl) and approximately 2.4 miles southwest of the Bay. The Project site's inland position on the southwest portion of the Bay, at a higher elevation and distance, effectively shields the area from tsunami waves. Menlo Park could be at risk for seiches, which are waves generated in a bay or lake and caused by winds, changes in atmospheric pressure, underwater earthquakes, or landslides into the water. Per the City's General Plan, the Project site is not within an area susceptible to tsunamis. The Project site is mainly flat with little potential to create future mudflow or landslides. Therefore, there would be **no impact** related to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.8-16) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

<b>IX. Land Use and Planning</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant Impact or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Polices
Would the Project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

### Existing Land Uses

**Project Site Vicinity.** The area surrounding the Project site is characterized by a mix of land uses. The Project site is generally bound by residential and commercial development along Glenwood Avenue to the north, the Caltrain and Garwood Way rights-of-way to the east, Oak Grove Avenue to the south, and El Camino Real to the west. The site is bordered to the north by commercial buildings, a gas station, a vacant multi-story former assisted living facility (a proposed hotel), and associated surface parking lots along Glenwood Avenue. The neighborhood to the north of Glenwood Avenue consists mainly of single-family dwellings. Directly to the east of the Project site is the Caltrain corridor, with the Menlo Park Caltrain station located to the south. In addition, a portion of downtown Menlo Park, including a multi-family residential building, is located immediately south of the Project site, across Oak Grove Avenue. In general, this area comprises a more urban environment than is found in surrounding neighborhoods. El Camino Real, which is dominated by car-oriented businesses and retail and mixed-use buildings, is west of the Project site. The northeast corner of El Camino Real and Oak Grove Avenue, directly adjacent to the Project site, features a gas station and a restaurant/café.

**Project Site.** As explained in the *Project Description*, the Project site is currently divided into three properties: Derry Lane Site, 1300 El Camino Real Site, and 1258 El Camino Real Site. Derry Lane bisects the southern portion of the Project site and features six outdated commercial buildings and associated parking lots. The rest of the Project site is surrounded by chainlink fencing and is inaccessible to the public.

*Derry Lane Site.* The 3.5-acre Derry Lane Site is in the southern portion of the Project site. This area includes eight individual parcels, one public street (Derry Lane), a utility right-of-way, six buildings, and associated parking areas. The six buildings total approximately 22,300 sf and 2 buildings are currently unoccupied. The buildings located along Oak Grove Avenue are the most prominent uses on the site, since they are immediately adjacent to the street, are visible from commercial areas to the south, and are in the vicinity of the Caltrain Station. The buildings at the Derry Lane Site current operate as a car wash, a dance studio, a Foster's Freeze, and a hardware storage area.

*1300 El Camino Real Site.* The 3.4-acre 1300 El Camino Real Site is in the northern portion of the Project site. This area formerly featured five buildings constructed in 1967 and associated parking areas used for a Cadillac dealership. However, these buildings were demolished in April 2010 in anticipation of the mixed-use 1300 El Camino Real Project and the site is currently vacant.

*1258 El Camino Real Site.* The 0.3-acre 1258 El Camino Real Site is located toward the center of the Project site, north of the Derry Lane Site and south of the 1300 El Camino Real Site. This site includes a 3,500-sf, one-story unoccupied building that previously housed a variety of uses including a veterinary hospital, chiropractic office, and hair salon.

### **Existing Land Use Designations and Zoning**

The entire Project site is located in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Specific Plan) area and within the El Camino Real Northeast-Residential (ECR NE-R) District. The Project site is zoned SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan). The ECR NE-R District is located on the east side of El Camino Real between Oak Grove and Glenwood Avenues and is currently characterized by a mix of retail, personal service, office, and residential uses. The area is bordered by the railroad tracks to the east and medium-density residential uses beyond the railroad tracks.

The Project site is within the El Camino Real Mixed Use/Residential land use designation. This designation emphasizes residential use in close proximity (approximately 0.5 mile) to the station area and downtown, in order to support area businesses, transit use, and overall downtown vibrancy. This designation also allows for a variety of retail uses, personal services, business and professional offices, residential uses, and public and semipublic uses. The district provides for higher intensities with a focus on residential development given its location near the train station area and downtown.

The Specific Plan outlines the maximum amount of building intensity permitted in the ECR NE-R District. However, these maximums may be increased with a Public Benefit Bonus, which allows additional development beyond the base intensity and height in exchange for extra public benefits. The Public Benefit Bonus would be expected to increase profits from development in exchange for providing additional benefits to the public. Examples of public benefits could include, but are not limited to, publicly accessible open space, senior housing, affordable residential units, hotel facilities, Platinum Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) Certified Buildings, preservation/reuse of historic resources, public parks/plazas, shuttle services, and a public amenity fund. With a Public Benefit Bonus, the Project site can be development with a floor area ratio (FAR) of up to 1.5, a height of up to 48 feet (with a maximum façade height of 38 feet), and up to 50 dwelling units per acre.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

### *a. Physically divide an established community?*

#### Effects of the Project

The Project site is located between two existing physical barriers that limit east-west connectivity: the Caltrain corridor and El Camino Real. The Project would not include changes to these barriers and would not alter the existing street grid. A public plaza would be located at the southeastern portion of the Project site and Garwood Way would be extended through the Project site, connecting Oak Grove Avenue with Glenwood Avenue to the east of El Camino Real. Therefore, implementation of the Project would promote additional connectivity in the area and would not further exacerbate existing barriers or create a new physical barrier that would divide the community.

The Project would include taller buildings at the Project site than currently exist. The Project site is comprised of 1–1.5 stories in height with heights of up to 21 feet. The Project would include three buildings up to 48 feet in height. However, the heights are moderated by the Specific Plan with the inclusion of 45-degree building profiles above façade heights of 38 feet for 48-foot heights (Standard E.3.4.3.01). Massing controls restrict building facades facing public rights-of-way from exceeding 100 feet in length without a major building modulation (Standard E.3.4.2.02). With these massing controls, the visual perception from the ground level would be reduced and façade heights would be similar to existing two- and three-story buildings in the vicinity of the Project site. Because the proposed building heights and massing controls would result in buildings relatively compatible with the surrounding existing buildings, the Project would not create physical or visual barriers, resulting in *less-than-significant* impacts.

#### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.9-10 to 4.9-12) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of Specific Plan standards and design guidelines, as listed above. Therefore, these uniformly applicable development policies would also substantially mitigate the impacts of the Project. No additional mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to the division of an established community, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

### *b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

#### Effects of the Project

##### Consistency with the Specific Plan

The adoption of the Specific Plan was accompanied by a General Plan amendment that replaced General Plan land use designations, goals, and polices with those in the Specific Plan. Because the Project site is within the Specific Plan area, the City's General Plan is superseded with the Specific

Plan and is not discussed here. In addition, the current Zoning Ordinance refers to the Specific Plan as the guiding document.

The Specific Plan establishes an approach to land use that is based on the plan's overall objective of preserving and enhancing community life, character, and vitality through public space improvements, mixed-use infill projects sensitive to the small town character of Menlo Park, and improved connections across El Camino Real. The five guiding principles of the Specific Plan are: (1) enhance public space; (2) generate vibrancy; (3) sustain Menlo Park's village character; (4) enhance connectivity; and (5) promote healthy living and sustainability. The Project would help to support these guiding principles, as follows.

- **Enhance Public Space.** The Project would include the development of a 10,000-sf public park located adjacent to Garwood Way. The park would be accessible to Menlo Park residents and would contain up to two bocce courts, seating, tables, and table game play (chess and checkers). In addition, the Project would provide public plazas at the southeastern corner of the Project site and between the two proposed commercial buildings. Therefore, the Project would support a more active, vibrant downtown and healthier living by encouraging social gathering.
- **Generate Vibrancy.** The Project would develop the currently vacant and underutilized Project site into a mixed-use development with up to 210,000 sf of non-medical office space, up to 220 housing units, and up to 22,000 sf of retail/restaurant space. This would bring vitality to the downtown and station areas and increased retail sales. The Project site would be a new location of activity and social life that would enhance the community and contribute to a vibrant downtown.
- **Sustain Menlo Park's Village Character.** The Project would recognize the unique qualities of downtown and El Camino Real by adhering to the Specific Plan standards and guidelines to help control building height, massing, and appearance. The Project may also include retail uses along the Oak Grove Avenue and El Camino Real frontages to promote a small-town character.
- **Enhance Connectivity.** The Project would construct a public plaza would be located at the southeastern portion of the Project site, promoting east/west connectivity from east of the Caltrain corridor to El Camino Real and downtown. In addition, the extension of Garwood Way would link Oak Grove Avenue with Glenwood Avenue to the east of El Camino Real, promoting additional north-south connectivity.
- **Promote Healthy Living and Sustainability.** The Project would recognize and promote healthy living and activity by encouraging access to public transit as an alternative to vehicular use. The Project site is adjacent to the Menlo Park Caltrain station to the south and a SamTrans bus corridor along El Camino Real to the west. The proposed residential and employee density at the Project site within close proximity to local and regional public transportation hubs would promote carbon emissions reductions and sustainable living in the downtown area.

In addition to the above guiding principles, the Specific Plan includes standards and guidelines to help control development. Standards are the rules that new development are required to follow while guidelines encourage features of good design. Together they are intended to encourage infill development while respecting the smaller scale, fine-grain character of downtown and the nearby single-family residential neighborhoods. Because the Project site is located in the Specific Plan area, it will be required to adhere to the applicable standards, while consistency with the applicable guidelines will be a key component of the discretionary review process for the Project.

Key standards used to achieve compatibility between new buildings and the existing built character are based on massing controls and include limits on setbacks, façade heights and lengths, upper level building profiles, and façade modulation. Other controls, such as allowed building projections for canopies, awnings and similar features, building breaks, and required minimum open space further support existing patterns in the built environment. The Project is eligible for a Public Benefit Bonus. Therefore, as summarized in Table IX-1, with implementation of public benefits, the Project would be consistent with the FAR, height, and densities permitted at the Project site.

**Table IX-1. Allowed and Proposed Development at the Project Site**

	Allowed Development (ECR NE-R)	Proposed Development
Floor Area Ratio	1.10 [1.50] <sup>a</sup>	1.50
Dwelling Units/Acre	32 [50] <sup>a</sup>	34.4
Max. Building Heights <sup>b</sup>	38' [48'] <sup>c</sup>	48'

Sources: City of Menlo Park 2013; Greenheart Land Company 2013.

a. [ ] denotes the maximum allowable with the public benefit bonus.

b. According to Section E.3.2.01 of the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan, roof-mounted mechanical equipment, solar panels, and similar equipment may exceed the maximum building height, but shall be screened from view from publicly-accessible spaces.

c. Even with the public benefit bonus, building façade heights cannot exceed 38 feet.

### Compatibility with Existing Land Uses

As described above, the Project site is located in the ECR NE-R District. The concept for El Camino Real north of Oak Grove Avenue allows for high development intensities to support viable investment opportunities while keeping development character compatible with adjacent areas on both sides of the corridor. Although the Project would introduce more residential uses to the immediate area than currently exist, the residential use would complement existing retail, restaurant, cinema, and service uses by creating a stronger customer base for these uses. Multifamily residential uses are also already located in the larger area, along Mills Street and other nearby R-3 (Apartment) district parcels.

Overall, the land uses proposed at the Project site are consistent with existing land uses. The emphasis on residential use is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and the increased FAR and residential densities support the community's objectives to encourage the development of underutilized parcels, generate vibrancy in the downtown and station areas, and increase the use of transit. The included standards and guidelines in the Specific Plan help to integrate new development into the existing environment and, therefore, the change in intensities and densities would not, in itself, result in sustainable adverse effects on the compatibility of surrounding land uses. Other physical effects of increased FAR and density, such as traffic impacts and associated air quality emissions, are analyzed in the applicable checklist discussions.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.9-12 to 4.9-29) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of Specific Plan standards and design guidelines, as listed above. Therefore, these uniformly applicable development policies would also substantially mitigate the impacts of the Project. No additional mitigation measures were required.

The physical conditions, as they relate to land use plans and policies, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

***c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

**Effects of the Project**

The entire Project site is developed, with approximately 76.4 percent of covered in impervious surfaces including streets, buildings, and pavement. The entire site is zoned SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) in the El Camino Real Mixed Use – Residential General Plan land use designation. This zoning and land use is not conducive to natural features and is not part of an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, the Project would result in ***no impact***.

**Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.3-24 and 4.9-9) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

<b>X. Mineral Resources</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 is the state legislation that protects mineral resource zones (MRZs). Part of the purpose of the act is to classify mineral resources in the state and to transmit the information to local governments which regulate land use in each region of the state. Local governments are responsible for designating lands that contain regionally significant mineral resources in local general plans to assure resource conservation in areas of intensive competing land uses. The law has resulted in the preparation of Mineral Land Classification Maps delineating MRZs 1 through 4 for aggregate resources (sand, gravel, and stone).

The Project site is not delineated as a locally important mineral resource by the California Geological Survey (CGS) or on any County or City land use plan. The San Mateo County General Plan Mineral Resources Map does not specify that the Project site contains any significant mineral resources.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

- a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

### Effects of the Project

There are no known mineral resources at the Project site, as indicated by the San Mateo County General Plan map. The Project site is not delineated as a locally important mineral resource by the CGS or on any County or City land use plan. Although there is limited information about the mineral resource potential of the Project site, the site and its vicinity have been previously developed with a variety of commercial and retail uses, which are uses that are incompatible with mineral extraction activities. Consequently, there is almost no probability that mining or quarrying would be permitted in the area. Therefore, the Project would have **no impact** on known mineral resources.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 6-4) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to mineral resources, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?***

### **Effects of the Project**

As stated above, the Project site is not delineated as a locally important mineral resource site by the County or City. As such, the Project would result in ***no impact***.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 6-4) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to mineral resources, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

<b>XI. Noise</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

### Fundamentals of Environmental Noise and Vibration

#### Terminology

A brief description of noise and vibration concepts and terminology used in this assessment is provided below.

- **Sound.** A vibratory disturbance transmitted by pressure waves through a medium such as air or water and capable of being detected by a receiving mechanism, such as the human ear or a microphone.
- **Noise.** Sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or otherwise undesirable.
- **Decibel (dB).** A unitless measure of sound on a logarithmic scale that indicates the squared ratio of sound pressure amplitude to a reference sound pressure amplitude. The reference pressure is 20 micro-pascals.
- **A-Weighted Decibel (dBA).** An overall frequency-weighted sound level in decibels that approximates the frequency response of the human ear. The dBA scale is the most widely used for environmental noise assessments.
- **Maximum Sound Levels ( $L_{max}$ ).** The maximum sound level measured during the measurement period.
- **Equivalent Sound Level ( $L_{eq}$ ).** The equivalent steady state sound level that in a stated period of time would contain the same acoustical energy. The 1-hour A-weighted equivalent sound level ( $L_{eq}$  1h) is the energy average of A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 1-hour period.
- **Day-Night Level ( $L_{dn}$ ).** The energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period, with a 10-dB penalty added to sound levels between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.
- **Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL).** The energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period, with 5 dB added to the sound levels occurring during the period from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 10 dB added to the sound levels occurring during the period from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.  $L_{dn}$  and CNEL are typically within 1 dBA of each other and, for all intents and purposes, are interchangeable.
- **Vibration Velocity Level (or Vibration Decibel Level, VdB).** The root mean square velocity amplitude for measured ground motion expressed in dB.
- **Peak Particle Velocity (PPV).** A measurement of ground vibration defined as the maximum speed at which a particle in the ground is moving, expressed in inches per second (in/sec).

### Overview of Noise and Sound

*Noise* is commonly defined as unwanted sound that annoys or disturbs people and potentially causes an adverse psychological or physiological effect on human health. Because noise is an environmental pollutant that can interfere with human activities, evaluation of noise is necessary when considering the environmental impacts of a proposed project.

*Sound* is characterized by various parameters that include the rate of oscillation of sound waves (frequency), the speed of propagation, and the pressure level or energy content (amplitude). In particular, the sound pressure level is the most common descriptor used to characterize the loudness of an ambient (existing) sound level. Although the dB scale, a logarithmic scale, is used to quantify sound intensity, it does not accurately describe how sound intensity is perceived by human hearing. The human ear is not equally sensitive to all frequencies in the entire spectrum, so noise measurements are weighted more heavily for frequencies to which humans are sensitive in a process referred to as *A-weighted decibels* (dBA). Table XI-1 summarizes typical A-weighted sound levels for different noise sources.

**Table XI-1. Typical A-Weighted Sound Levels**

Common Outdoor Activities	Sound Level (dBA)	Common Indoor Activities
Jet flyover at 1,000 feet	110	Rock band
Gas lawnmower at 3 feet	100	
Diesel truck at 50 mph at 50 feet	90	Food blender at 3 feet
Noisy urban area, daytime	80	Garbage disposal at 3 feet
Gas lawnmower at 100 feet	70	Vacuum cleaner at 3 feet
Commercial area		Normal speech at 3 feet
Heavy traffic at 300 feet	60	Large business office
Quiet urban area, daytime	50	Dishwasher in next room
Quiet urban area, nighttime	40	Theater, large conference room (background)
Quiet suburban area, nighttime	30	Library
Quiet rural area, nighttime		Bedroom at night, concert hall (background)
Rustling of leaves	20	Broadcast/recording studio
	10	
Lowest threshold of human hearing	0	Lowest threshold of human hearing

Source: California Department of Transportation 2009.

Human sound perception, in general, is such that a change in sound level of 1 dB cannot typically be perceived by the human ear; a change in sound level of 3 dB is just noticeable; a change of 5 dB is clearly noticeable; and a change of 10 dB is perceived as doubling or halving the sound level. A doubling of actual sound energy is required to result in a 3 dB (i.e., barely noticeable) increase in noise; in practice, for example, this means that the volume of traffic on a roadway would typically need to double to result in a noticeable increase in noise.

The decibel level of a sound decreases (or attenuates) exponentially as the distance from the source of that sound increases. For a point source such as a stationary compressor or construction equipment, sound attenuates at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance. For a line source such as free flowing traffic on a freeway, sound attenuates at a rate of 3 dB per doubling of distance.<sup>54</sup> Atmospheric conditions including wind, temperature gradients, and humidity can change how sound propagates over distance and can affect the level of sound received at a given location. The degree to which the ground surface

<sup>54</sup> California Department of Transportation 2009. *Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement*. November. Available: <<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/>>. Accessed: August 14, 2012.

absorbs acoustical energy also affects sound propagation. Sound that travels over an acoustically absorptive surface such as grass attenuates at a greater rate than sound that travels over a hard surface such as pavement. The increased attenuation is typically in the range of 1 to 2 dB per doubling of distance. Barriers such as buildings and topography that block the line of sight between a source and receiver also increase the attenuation of sound over distance.

Community noise environments are generally perceived as *quiet* when the 24-hour average noise level is below 45 dBA, *moderate* in the 45 to 60 dBA range, and *loud* above 60 dBA. Very noisy urban residential areas are usually around 70 dBA CNEL. Along major thoroughfares, roadside noise levels are typically between 65 and 75 dBA CNEL. Increments of 3 to 5 dB to existing 1-hour  $L_{eq}$ , or to the CNEL, are commonly used as thresholds for an adverse community reaction to a noise increase. However, there is evidence that incremental thresholds in this range may not be sufficiently protective in areas where noise-sensitive uses are located and CNEL is already high (i.e., above 60 dBA). In these areas, limiting noise increases to 3 dB or less is recommended.<sup>55</sup> Noise intrusions that cause short-term interior levels to rise above 45 dBA at night can disrupt sleep. Exposures to noise levels greater than 85 dBA of 8-hours or longer can cause permanent hearing damage.

### Overview of Ground-borne Vibration

Ground-borne vibration is an oscillatory motion of the soil with respect to the equilibrium position and can be quantified in terms of velocity or acceleration. Ground-borne vibration can be a serious concern for nearby neighbors of a transit system route or maintenance facility, as it can cause buildings to shake and generate rumbling sounds. It is unusual for vibration from sources such as buses and trucks to be perceptible, even in locations close to major roads. Some common sources of ground-borne vibration are trains, buses on rough roads, and construction activities such as blasting, pile driving, and operating heavy earth-moving equipment.

Ground-borne vibration can be quantified by its peak or root-mean-square (RMS) velocity amplitudes. The RMS amplitude is useful for assessing human annoyance; the RMS amplitude is expressed in terms of the velocity level in decibel units (VdB). The peak amplitude is most often used for assessing the potential for damage to building structures; the peak amplitude is typically assessed in terms of peak particle velocity (PPV), measured in inches/second.

In extreme cases, ground-borne vibrations can cause damage to buildings. Building damage is not a factor for normal transportation projects, with the occasional exception of blasting and pile driving during construction. Annoyance from vibration often occurs when the vibration exceeds the threshold of perception by only a small margin. A vibration level that causes annoyance is well below the damage threshold for normal buildings.

Table XI-2 summarizes the typical ground-borne vibration velocity levels and average human response to vibration that may be anticipated when a person is at rest in quiet surroundings. If the person is engaged in any type of physical activity, vibration tolerance increases considerably. The duration of the event has an effect on human response, as does its daily frequency of occurrence. Generally, as the duration and frequency of occurrence increase, the potential for adverse human response increases.

---

<sup>55</sup> Federal Transit Administration. 2006. *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. FTA-VA-90-1003-06. Office of Planning and Environment.

**Table XI-2. Typical Levels of Ground-Borne Vibration**

Human or Structural Response	Vibration Velocity Level (VdB)	Typical Sources (50 feet from source)
Threshold for minor cosmetic damage to fragile buildings	100	Blasting from construction project
Difficulty in reading computer screen	90	Bulldozer or heavy tracked construction equipment
Threshold for residential annoyance for occasional events (e.g., commuter rail)	80	Upper range of commuter rail
Threshold for residential annoyance for frequent events (e.g., rapid transit)	70	Upper range of rapid transit
Approximate threshold for human perception of vibration	70	Typical commuter rail. Bus or truck over bump
Limit for vibration sensitive equipment	60	Typical rapid transit Typical bus or truck on public road
	50	Typical background vibration

Source: Federal Transit Administration 2006.

The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is usually around 50 VdB or lower. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by sources within buildings, such as the operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible ground-borne vibration are heavy construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the ground-borne vibration from traffic is rarely perceptible.

Ground-borne noise is a secondary phenomenon of ground-borne vibration. When a building structure vibrates, noise is radiated into the interior of the building. Typically, this is a low frequency sound that would be perceived as a low rumble. The magnitude of the sound depends on the frequency characteristic of the vibration and the manner in which the room surfaces in the building radiate sound. Ground-borne noise is quantified by the A-weighted sound level inside the building. The sound level accompanying vibration is generally 25–40 dBA lower than the vibration velocity level in VdB. Ground-borne vibration levels of 65 VdB can result in ground-borne noise levels up to 40 dBA, which can disturb sleep. Ground-borne vibration levels of 85 VdB can result in ground-borne noise levels up to 60 dBA, which can be annoying to daytime noise-sensitive land uses such as schools.<sup>56</sup>

### Existing Ambient Noise

Ambient noise levels in the Project area were measured for several sites for the Specific Plan EIR. The site closest to the Project site is the Willow Road site, which has a measured  $L_{eq}$  value of 57.6 dBA.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>56</sup> Federal Transit Administration. 2006. *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. FTA-VA-90-1003-06. Office of Planning and Environment.

<sup>57</sup> El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR Table 4.10-5.

Onsite noise sources are primarily associated with railroad operations on the Caltrain tracks and traffic surrounding the Project site. Existing noise levels from these sources are discussed below.

### Existing Vehicular Traffic

Vehicular traffic is an existing noise source associated with vehicles traveling on roads and driveways near the Project site. Traffic noise was modeled in the Specific Plan EIR at numerous roadway segments in the City. The three roadway segments nearest to the Project site are Oak Grove Avenue (between Laurel and El Camino), Ravenswood Avenue (between Alma and El Camino), and El Camino Real (between Menlo College and Valparaiso), and the existing (2010) traffic noise levels for these segments are 66.2 dBA, 69.8 dBA, and 71.0 dBA, respectively.<sup>58</sup>

Existing ground-borne vibration is mostly associated with passenger vehicles and heavy-duty trucks in the Project area. Vibration associated with rail operations is discussed below. Because the rubber tires and suspension systems of passenger vehicles and heavy-duty vehicles provide vibration isolation, it is unusual for passenger vehicles or heavy-duty trucks to cause ground-borne noise or vibration problems. Passenger vehicles and heavy-duty trucks cause effects such as rattling of windows; however, the source is almost always airborne noise and not vibration. Most causes of passenger vehicle and heavy-duty truck-related vibration can be directly related to a pothole, bump, expansion joint, or other discontinuity in the road surface. Smoothing the bump or filling the pothole will usually solve the problem.

### Existing Rail Operations

The Project site is adjacent to a functioning rail line that produces noise and ground-borne vibration. The existing rail line is located immediately adjacent to the north side of the Project site. Activity on the Caltrain rail lines and freight operations represent significant sources of noise and ground-borne vibration for the Project site. Based on the Caltrain schedule in place as of January 2014, the railroad tracks currently carry 92 Caltrain passenger trains (46 northbound and 46 southbound, of which 11 trains in each direction are *baby bullet* trains with limited stops along the railroad corridor) and one to four unscheduled freight trains per day.

The current Caltrain train schedule indicates that the baby bullet train has six stops per day in Menlo Park. Noise  $L_{eq}$  values from Caltrain operations were modeled at 50 feet from the tracks for the Specific Plan EIR and were found to be between 65–69 dBA during the daytime and 60–64 dBA during the nighttime.<sup>59</sup>

According to the Federal Transit Authority's (FTA's) ground-borne vibration and noise impact criteria, the existing railroad operation is considered frequent because there are more than 70 train events per day. The ground-borne vibration standard for commercial uses subject to frequent train events is 75 VdB.<sup>60</sup> Because of the proximity of the railroad tracks and rail operations—both Caltrain and freight train operations—to the Project site, noise and vibration impacts could be significant.

---

<sup>58</sup> *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR* Table 4.10-4.

<sup>59</sup> *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR* Table 4.10-5.

<sup>60</sup> Federal Transit Administration. 2006. *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. May.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

- a. *Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?*

### Effects of the Project

#### Construction

The Project is within the development projections envisioned in the Specific Plan EIR. Construction related noise impacts could result from the operation of heavy duty construction equipment, including graders, scrapers, loaders and other equipment. Noise impacts could also occur due to on-road vehicles associated with the Project, including construction worker commute vehicles, delivery trucks, and haul trucks. This impact was evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR and was found to be potentially significant as a result of the exposure of existing residences to construction noise. However, as discussed in the Specific Plan EIR, the Menlo Park noise ordinance does not specify quantitative noise limits for construction activity. Accordingly, the Specific Plan EIR assessed construction noise using the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) noise criteria and found that noise impacts could cause an adverse community reaction if construction were to occur at nighttime. The Menlo Park noise ordinance requires construction activities to occur during the daytime hours, however, so construction that occurs in the Specific Plan area would not exceed the DOT thresholds in the daytime construction scenario. Consequently, noise from the Project would also not exceed the thresholds. To further reduce impacts associated with construction noise, the Project would implement noise control measures as outlined in **Mitigation Measures NOI-1a, NOI-1b, and NOI-1c** (pages 4.10-11 to 4.10-12). Similar to the Specific Plan EIR, impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant with implementation of these mitigation measures. Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant* impact.

#### Operation

Operational noise from roadway traffic, Caltrain, and Union Pacific Railroad operations could result in impacts on residential uses at the Project site. Traffic increases as a result of the Project at certain intersections and roadway segments could result in a significant increase in noise. Train related noise could be potentially significant, as residences would be located near the train tracks as part of the Specific Plan. However, residences near the tracks would be subject to analyses by acoustical engineers to document the necessary design features to meet interior noise criteria, per mitigation in the Specific Plan EIR. **Mitigation Measure NOI-3** (pages 4.10-13 to 4.10-16), as included in the Specific Plan EIR, would mitigate potentially significant impacts. Nonetheless, this topic, with regard to the potential for increased traffic noise, requires *further environmental review* in the Infill EIR.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.10-13 to 4.10-16) and was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1a, NOI-1b, NOI-1c, and NOI-3**. The physical conditions, as they relate to noise levels, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate **Mitigation Measures NOI-1a, NOI-1b, NOI-1c, and NOI-3**. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. However, the Project could result in increased traffic noise at

certain intersections and roadway segments. Therefore, this topic requires further environmental review in the Infill EIR.

**b. *Expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?***

### **Effects of the Project**

This impact was evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR and was found to be potentially significant as a result of exposure of new noise sensitive uses to ground-borne vibration from Caltrain operations. This impact was found to be potentially significant in the Specific Plan EIR, as residences would be developed near the Caltrain station and tracks. The impact was determined to be less than significant, however, with the requirement that a vibration design study be conducted at developments within 200 feet of the tracks to ensure that proper design is implemented to reduce interior vibration. Consequently, this would be a ***less-than-significant*** impact for the Project with implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-4** (pages 4.10-16 to 4.10-17) as included in the Specific Plan EIR.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.10-16 to 4.10-17) and was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-4**. The physical conditions, as they relate to ground-borne vibration or noise levels, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate **Mitigation Measure NOI-4**. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR are required as the impact is less than significant with mitigation.

**c. *Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

### **Effects of the Project**

As discussed above under XI(a), construction noise from the Project would not result in significant noise impacts with implementation of mitigation measures from the Specific Plan EIR. Construction noise is considered temporary noise and is discussed below under XI(d). However, operational noise from increased traffic could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above existing levels. Therefore, this topic, with regard to traffic noise, requires ***further environmental review*** in the Infill EIR.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.10-12 to 4.10-13) and was determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to ambient noise levels, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. However, the Project could result in increased traffic noise at certain intersections and roadway segments. Therefore, this topic requires further environmental review in the Infill EIR.

- d. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

### Effects of the Project

As discussed under XI(a), construction and operation noise from the Project would not result in significant noise impacts with implementation of the mitigation measures. Construction noise is temporary but would remain below the applicable daytime thresholds with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise is considered permanent noise and is discussed under XI(c). Consequently, this would be a *less-than-significant* impact with mitigation. As discussed above, implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1a, NOI-1b, and NOI-1c**, would reduce construction-related noise to a *less-than-significant* level.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.10-9 to 4.10-12) and was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1a, NOI-1b, and NOI-1c**. The physical conditions, as they relate to ambient noise levels, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The Project would incorporate **Mitigation Measures NOI-1a, NOI-1b, and NOI-1c**. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. No additional mitigation measures beyond those in the Specific Plan EIR are required as the impact is less than significant with mitigation.

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

### Effects of the Project

The Project site is not within 2 miles of an airport, and is not under the jurisdiction of an airport land use plan. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.10-8) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to airport noise, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- f. Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

### Effects of the Project

The Project site is not within 2 miles of a private airstrip. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

**Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.10-8) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to private airstrip noise, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

<b>XII. Population and Housing</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Polices
Would the Project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

### Population

The City's jurisdictional population was estimated to be 32,679 as of January 1, 2013. The California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates that the City currently averages approximately 2.57 persons per household (pph).<sup>61</sup> Table XII-1 presents population estimates and projections for years 2010 through 2020 (build-out year of the Project) for Menlo Park (sphere of influence),<sup>62</sup> San Mateo County, and the Bay Area (Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Solano, Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo, and San Francisco Counties).

<sup>61</sup> California Department of Finance. State of California. 2013. *Table 2: E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates*. Available <<http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-5/2011-20/view.php>> Accessed on January 6, 2014.

<sup>62</sup> Several additional unincorporated areas adjoining the City are recognized as being within the City's sphere of influence and, therefore, are included in the City's General Plan. In California, *sphere of influence* has a legal meaning as a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency. Spheres of influence at California local agencies are regulated by Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCO) that recognize the unincorporated communities that would be best and most likely served by the city agencies. Hence, the spheres of influence represent areas with the greatest potential for annexation by the City. In most cases, ABAG provides more detailed demographic and employment projections for a city's sphere of influence than for small cities such as Menlo Park. Consequently, unless otherwise specifically noted, all City data represents the City sphere of influence since only limited demographic data is available for the City's incorporated area. The sphere of influence designation for the City includes unincorporated West Menlo Park, Week End Acres, Menlo Oaks, as well as the Stanford Linear Accelerator (SLAC). With the exception of SLAC, these areas are zoned residential and are substantially developed. All ABAG projections in this section for the City include the sphere of influence.

**Table XII-1. Population Trends in Menlo Park, San Mateo County, and the Bay Area, 2010–2020**

	2010	2015	2020	Growth 2010–2020
Menlo Park	36,820	37,700	38,700	1,880 (5.1%)
San Mateo County	718,450	745,400	775,100	56,650 (7.9%)
Bay Area	7,150,740	7,461,400	7,786,800	636,060 (8.9%)

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Projections 2013. December 2013.

The data indicate that the population growth from 2010 to 2020 in Menlo Park (5.1 percent) would be less than the population growth of the County and the Bay Area as a whole (about 7.9 percent and 8.9 percent, respectively). These projections suggest, in part, that the residential areas of the City are more built out than other communities in the County and Bay Area.<sup>63</sup>

## Housing

According to the California DOF, the estimated number of housing units in the City (jurisdictional boundary) as of January 1, 2013 was 13,124, with an average household size of 2.57 pph and a vacancy rate of 5.6 percent.<sup>64</sup> Table 3.11-3 presents ABAG projections for households in the Bay Area, the County, and the City (sphere of influence) for years 2010 through 2020. According to ABAG, the number of households in the County is projected to grow from approximately 257,840 units in 2010 to 277,200 in 2020, an increase of approximately 7.5 percent. The number of households in the City is projected to grow from approximately 14,130 units in 2010 to 14,870 in 2020, an increase of approximately 5.2 percent. Overall, the household growth rate in the City (5.2 percent) is expected to be below the household growth rate for the County (7.5 percent) and the Bay Area (8.8 percent).

**Table XII-2. Household Trends in Menlo Park, San Mateo County, and the Bay Area, 2012–2020**

	2010	2015	2020	Growth (2010–2020)
Menlo Park	14,130	14,490	14,870	740 (5.2%)
San Mateo County	257,840	267,150	277,200	19,360 (7.5%)
Bay Area	2,608,020	2,720,410	2,837,680	229,660 (8.8%)

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Projections 2013. December 2013.

## Employment

The employment profile for an area provides an indication of the composition of an area's economy and the present and future demand for employees. The County is a productive economic area led by technology-driven, bioscience, and service industries. Approximately 68 percent of Menlo Park residents age 16 and older were in the work force in 2010, which is nearly identical to the County rate and a few percentage points higher than the state rate. Most residents who are in the workforce (66 percent) are

<sup>63</sup> Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Projections 2013. December 2013.

<sup>64</sup> Department of Finance (DOF). State of California. 2013. "Table 2: E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates." Available <<http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-5/2011-20/view.php>> Accessed on February 20, 2014.

in management, business, science, and arts occupations, which is significantly more than the rate in the County or the state. According to the Census Bureau's employment industry analysis, many Menlo Park residents (28 percent) work in education, health care, or social assistance. The next most common category, with 23 percent of residents, is professional, scientific and management industries.<sup>65</sup>

As shown in Table XII-3, steady employment growth is expected between 2010 and 2020. More recent existing employment data are available from the U.S. Census that indicate there are currently 28,868 jobs in the City.<sup>66</sup> However, because the U.S. Census does not provide projections, Table XII-3 presents only ABAG employment projections for the City, the County, and the Bay Area.

**Table XII-3. Employment Trends in Menlo Park, San Mateo County, and the Bay Area, 2010–2020 (Total Number of Jobs)**

	2010	2015	2020	Growth (2010–2020)
Menlo Park	29,830	31,920	34,130	4,300 (14.4%)
San Mateo County	345,190	374,940	407,550	62,360 (18.1%)
Bay Area	3,385,300	3,669,990	3,987,150	601,850 (17.8%)

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Projections 2013. December 2013.

As indicated in Table XII-3, the ABAG projections from 2010 to 2020 show a steady increase in employment in the Bay Area (about 17.8 percent for the region). The County shows a slightly higher employment growth than the rest of the Bay Area (18.1 percent), and the City<sup>67</sup> shows lower rates of employment growth (14.4 percent) than the Bay Area average. The average number of workers per worker household in San Mateo County is 1.78 and approximately 7.8 percent of the people who currently work in the City also live in the City.<sup>68</sup>

### Menlo Park El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan

The Menlo Park El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Specific Plan) is intended to be implemented gradually over the next 30 years. The rate and type of development would be primarily determined by the private sector and would occur predominantly as market demand and individual property owners choose to sell or redevelop their properties. At full buildout, the Specific Plan was projected to include approximately 1,537 new residents (in 680 housing units) and 1,357 new employees. These projections were provided for context, and are not considered strict limits. Based on 30-year resident and employee projections, this would equate to approximately 28.5 percent of the expected future City population growth and approximately 17 percent of the projected job growth. Due to a lower average household size for multi-family units, as proposed under the Specific Plan, the Specific Plan analysis used a household generation rate of 2.38 persons per household.

<sup>65</sup> City of Menlo Park. 2013. *Housing Element*. May 21, 2013.

<sup>66</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, American Community Survey (ACS). 2013. *Sex of Workers by Means of Transportation to Work for Workplace Geography*. 2010–2012 ACS 3-Year Estimates, ID B08406. Geography: Menlo Park city, California. Available: <<http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t>>. Accessed January 6, 2013.

<sup>67</sup> As mentioned in this section, the most current employment data indicate that there are currently 28,868 jobs in the City.

<sup>68</sup> City of Menlo Park. 2013. *Housing Element*. May 21, 2013.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

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

### Effects of the Project

The Project includes the construction of approximately 220 new housing units and up to 217,000 sf of commercial uses, which would generate approximately 700 new employees. Construction of the Project, including the site preparation and building demolition phase, would temporarily increase construction employment. Given the relatively common nature and scale of the construction associated with the Project, the demand for construction employment would likely be met within the existing and future labor market in the City and the County. The size of the construction workforce would vary during the different stages of construction, but a substantial quality of workers from outside the City or County would not be expected to relocate permanently.

The units are expected to be utilized by singles and couples rather than large families. As such, the average household size would be more similar to that used in the Specific Plan rather than the current City average. Based on an average household size of 2.38 persons per household (per the Specific Plan), implementation of the Project would add approximately 524 people to the City's population. As noted in the Specific Plan EIR, this average household size is derived from all of Menlo Park, including single-family residential neighborhoods, and as such represents a relatively conservative projection for multi-family housing. The anticipated population growth from the proposed housing units proposed under the Project would represent less than 1 percent of the City's current population and would be approximately 28 percent of the City's population growth through 2020. Therefore, the Project would not directly result in substantial population growth beyond that expected for the City.

In addition, the Project would constitute infill development within an already developed neighborhood adjacent to downtown Menlo Park. The Project site is within walking distance of downtown's retail and service district, the Caltrain Station, and numerous transit routes. As such, the Project site is well-served by urban infrastructure, services, and transit. The development of higher density projects on infill sites near downtown areas is considered by most regional government planning agencies to be an environmentally sound way to add housing to growing metropolitan regions. In addition, because the Project site is located in an infill setting, no infrastructure would be extended to undeveloped areas; therefore, the Project would not result in substantial indirect population growth.

The Project would also result in the construction of approximately 217,000 sf of retail and non-medical office uses (commercial uses). Based on the average employee generation rate of 300 sf per office employee and 500 sf per retail employee, the project would generate up to 700 employees. This job growth represents 2.4 percent of the existing number of employed residents in Menlo Park and approximately 16 percent of the anticipated employment growth from 2010 to 2020.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> For comparison purposes, the 1300 El Camino Real Sand Hill Project was projected to result in the generation of approximately 299 jobs. Therefore, the net increase under the Project would be approximately 401 new jobs at the Project site. This job growth represents 1.3 percent of the existing number of employed residents in Menlo Park and 9.3 percent of the anticipated employment growth from 2010 to 2020.

Using the average number of workers per worker household for San Mateo County, the Project would generate approximately 393 new households. As discussed above, approximately 7.8 percent of all the City's residents would also work in the City. The existing 7.8 percent of the City's workforce that are also residents is used to estimate the number of new workers who would seek and find housing in the City as a result of the Project. Therefore, approximately 31<sup>70</sup> of the projected employees at the Project site would be expected to live in the City. Assuming each employee forms a household with the City average of 2.57 persons per household, the Project would result in an increase of approximately 79 new residents. The addition of 79 new residents would represent approximately 4.2 percent of the anticipated population growth in the City by 2020.<sup>71</sup>

As shown in Table XII-2, above, ABAG estimates that between 2010 and 2020, the number of households in the City would grow by approximately 740. The Project would generate a housing demand of 31 units in the City. Therefore, the Project-induced housing demand would equate to 4.2 percent of the projected housing demand by 2020. Because the Project would construct approximately 220 units, this demand for 31 units associated with the new onsite employees could be fulfilled by the Project. In addition, the current vacancy rate in the City is 5.6 percent, as noted above. This represents a total of 740 vacant units in the City. The 31 units needed to accommodate the estimated new households generated by the Project could be accommodated by vacant units. With the housing units proposed under the Project and the existing vacant units in the City, additional housing would not be induced by the Project. In addition, the City's 2013 Housing Element estimates that approximately 1,318 housing units will be constructed by 2035. As such, the Project's demand for housing also could be accommodated within the City's anticipated housing construction.

In total, the Project would generate approximately 603 new residents in the City and 251 new housing units.<sup>72</sup> The anticipated population growth from the proposed housing units and the employment growth as proposed under the Project would represent less than 1 percent of the City's current population and would be approximately 32 percent of the City's population growth through 2020. Therefore, the Project would not directly result in substantial population growth beyond that expected for the City. The demand for additional housing as a result of the Project would be *less than significant*.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.11-11 to 4.11-12) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. The Project would be within the limits of the Specific Plan. The Project would represent approximately 32.4 percent of the proposed residential

---

<sup>70</sup> (700 projected Project employees/1.78 workers per worker household) x 7.8 percent of Menlo Park employees who also live in the City = ~31 projected employees who live in the City.

<sup>71</sup> For comparison purposes, the 1300 El Camino Real Sand Hill Project was projected to result in the generation of approximately 299 jobs. Therefore, the net increase under the Project would be approximately 401 new jobs at the Project site and approximately 225 households would be generated. Assuming that 7.8 percent of Menlo Park residents also work in the City, approximately 18 new households would be created. Assuming each employee forms a household with the City average of 2.57 persons per household, the net difference between the two projects would result in an increase of approximately 46 new residents. The addition of 46 new residents would represent approximately 2.4 percent of the anticipated population growth in the City by 2020.

<sup>72</sup> For comparison purposes, the 1300 El Camino Real Sand Hill Project would generate approximately 46 new Menlo Park residents and the need for 18 housing units. Unlike the Project, the 1300 El Camino Real Sand Hill Project did not include housing units on the Project site.

units, 34.1 percent of the anticipated residents, and 51.6 percent of the anticipated employees analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. Including the Menlo Park residents induced by employment opportunities at the Project site (79 additional residents), the Project would result in approximately 39.2 percent of the residents anticipated under the Specific Plan. Since the impact would be less than significant, no mitigation measures were required in the Specific Plan EIR. The physical conditions, as they relate to population and housing, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

***b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**Effects of the Project**

The Project would demolish the seven existing onsite buildings, which are either vacant or include a car wash, dance studio, a restaurant, and a hardware storage area. None of the existing buildings proposed to be demolished include residences, and as a result no housing would be displaced as a result of the Project, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Project would result in ***no impact*** related to the displacement of housing and, therefore, this impact is not evaluated further.

**Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.11-10) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to displacement of housing units, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

***c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**Effects of the Project**

The Project site includes existing uses for a car wash, dance studio, Foster Freeze, and hardware storage. Therefore, there are some existing employees at the Project site. Although the exact number is unknown, it is assumed to be less than 15 employees. Although the Project would not accommodate the current uses and employees, there is available space in the City to accommodate the small amount of current tenants displaced by the Project. The Project would not displace a substantial number of people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing; therefore, this impact would be ***less than significant***.

**Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.11-10) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to displacement of people, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

<b>XIII. Public Services</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than- Significant or Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:					
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

### Fire Protection

Fire protection services in the Project area are provided by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District (MPFPD). The MPFPD service boundary includes the City, Atherton, and East Palo Alto, plus parts of unincorporated San Mateo County and federal facilities such as the Veterans Hospital, United States Geological Survey, and the Stanford Linear Accelerator. The MPFPD's seven fire stations, one administrative building, and one rescue warehouse serve a service population of over 99,050<sup>73</sup> and cover 30 square miles. In addition, the MPFPD is part of the greater San Mateo County boundary-drop plan whereby the closest apparatus responds to each call.<sup>74</sup>

Headed by the Fire Chief, the MPFPD is organized into the Administrative Services Division, the Fire Prevention Division, Operations Division, and the Training Division. Fully staffed, the MPFPD has 87 line safety employees/firefighters, 3 fire inspectors, 7 chief officers, and 13 staff personnel for a total of 110 employees. This equates to a ratio of 1.11 positions per 1,000 people. Each engine and truck is staffed by a minimum of 3 personnel.<sup>75</sup> Fire Station 6 at 700 Oak Grove Avenue is the closest station to the Project site. The MPFPD is in the initial planning states for reconstruction of Station 6 and facility modernizations are planned throughout the district to meet existing and future needs of the community. The Project site is also served by Fire Stations 1, 3, and 4.

<sup>73</sup> BAE Urban Economics. 2013. *Fiscal Impact Analysis Report for proposed Commonwealth Corporate Center*. Submitted to the City of Menlo Park, CA. October 25, 2013.

<sup>74</sup> Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. *Menlo Park Fire Protection District Information*. Available: <<http://www.menlofire.org/districtinfo.html>>. Accessed: January 22, 2014.

<sup>75</sup> Harold Schapelhouman, Fire Chief. 2013. Memorandum to Rachel Grossman, City of Menlo Park. April 11, 2013.

The MPFPD responded to approximately 8,500 emergencies or incident calls per year with about 60 percent of them being emergency medical incidents.<sup>76</sup> The response goals are less than 6.59 minutes for an emergency medical incident and under 8 minutes for all units to arrive for a structure fire. However, the actual response time may vary depending on whether the units are in quarters, in their response areas, responding to simultaneous incidents, or are out of their area for training.<sup>77</sup>

The MPFPD is currently studying a Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Program that would explore whether new development funds its fair share of the costs of needed capital facilities to serve growth within its boundaries. If approved by the City Menlo Park and other affected jurisdictions, the fee would be levied on new residential and non-residential development in the MPFPD's boundaries to offset the demand for capital facilities generated by new development.<sup>78</sup>

## Police Protection

Police services in the vicinity of the Project site are provided by the Menlo Park Police Department (MPPD), which serves the City, with mutual aid provided on an as-needed basis from neighboring law enforcement agencies.<sup>79</sup> The Project site is within MPPD's Beat 1. The MPPD is headquartered at the Menlo Park Civic Center at 701 Laurel Street, approximately 0.5 mile southeast of the Project site. This main station serves the Project site. The MPPD has recently opened a new site for a substation in Belle Haven, but it does not serve the Project site, and there are no other immediate or near-future plans for expansion MPPD's facilities, staff or equipment, aside from normal replacement schedules.

The MPPD is headed by the Chief of Police and consists of two divisions: Patrol Operations Division and Special Operations Division. The MPPD has a total of 47 sworn officers covering three beats, 5 community service officers (non-sworn), and 22 professional staff. The City is divided into three beat, with the Project site within Beat 1. The MPPD service population is 42,046 people, which includes the total resident population of the City and one-third of all employees (daytime residents) who work in the City. The current service ratio is 1.11 sworn officers per 1,000 residents, which meets the goals of the MPPD. From November 2011 to November 2012 (the most recent data available), the MPPD received a total of 10,322 emergency calls, 10,566 calls for services, and 22,043 officer-initiated contacts, for a total of 42,931 calls. The MPPD is committed to maintaining response times that are consistent with industry standards.

## Schools

The Project site is served by the Menlo Park City School District and the Sequoia Union High School District. Other elementary school districts serving portions of the City include Ravenswood Elementary School District, Las Lomas School District, and Redwood City School District. However, the Project site is outside the boundaries of the Ravenswood, Las Lomas, and Redwood City school districts' service areas. Therefore, it is not expected that students generated by development under the Project would attend schools in these districts.

---

<sup>76</sup> Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. *Menlo Park Fire Protection District Information*. Available: <<http://www.menlofire.org/districtinfo.html>>. Accessed: January 22, 2014.

<sup>77</sup> Harold Schapelhouman, Fire Chief. 2013. Memorandum to Rachel Grossman, City of Menlo Park. April 11, 2013.

<sup>78</sup> Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. *Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study – Administrative Draft*. Prepared by Seifel Consulting and Urban Economic. June 2013.

<sup>79</sup> Dave Bertini, Commander, Menlo Park Police Department, Memo to Rachel Grossman, City of Menlo Park, April 11, 2013.

**Menlo Park City School District.** The Menlo Park City School District (MPCSD) serves parts of the City, Atherton, and unincorporated San Mateo County. There are approximately 2,791 students, kindergarten through eighth grade, enrolled in the four schools of the district.<sup>80</sup> The MPCSD employed 167 full-time equivalent teachers during the 2012–2013 school year (the most recent data available) with an average student-to-teacher ratio of 16.7 students per teacher.<sup>81</sup> Pursuant to Education Code Section 52121–52128, the MPCSD strives to provide class sizes of 20 students for grades kindergarten through third and 24 students for grades fourth through eighth.<sup>82</sup> On average, the MPCSD exceeds this goal.

The Project site is within the attendance boundaries of the Encinal School and Hillview Middle School. Hillview Middle School has additional capacity available for new students; however, all three elementary schools are over capacity.<sup>83,84</sup> Nonetheless, if a school is at capacity, students have the potential to attend another elementary school in the district. The MPCSD is required to accommodate the students within its boundary. If all classes are at capacity, then the MPCSD may accommodate additional students by either increasing the class size or opening new classrooms. In addition, the MPCSD currently has plans to open a new elementary school at the O'Connor school site, which would help alleviate capacity issues.<sup>85</sup> The MPCSD currently uses student generation rates of 0.21 students per single-family dwelling; 0.26 students per townhouse dwelling; and 0.13 students per multifamily dwelling.<sup>86</sup>

**Sequoia Union High School District.** Sequoia Union High School District (SUHSD) is the only high school district within the City. The SUHSD serves approximately 9,247 students<sup>87</sup> from ninth grade to twelfth grade in the communities of Atherton, Belmont, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Portola Valley, Redwood City, Redwood Shores, San Carlos, and Woodside. The schools that serve the district include Carlmont High School, Redwood High School, Woodside High School, Sequoia High School, Menlo-Atherton High School, and Sequoia District Adult Education.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Menlo Park City School District, *About Us*. Available: <<http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=169038&sessionid=69d7bf3a3142231aa2155898b6f502d9>>. Accessed: January 22, 2014.

<sup>81</sup> California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office. 2013. *Certified Staff by Ethnicity for 2012-2013 - # of Staff by District by Ethnicity*. Staff Type: Teachers. 4168965 – Menlo Park City Elementary. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>>. Accessed: January 22, 2014.

<sup>82</sup> Menlo Park City School District. 2008. *Class Size and School Assignments*. Menlo Park Board Policies, Board Policy 5116.2. Class Size and School Assignments. Adopted June 2003, revised April 2008. Available: <<http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=171089#Philosophy>>. Accessed: October 22, 2013.

<sup>83</sup> Menlo Park School District. 2013. *Facility Master Planning Update*. Presentation at the Special Board Meeting May 29, 2013. Available: <<http://www.district.mpcsd.org/modules/groups/homepagefiles/cms/1602720/File/FINAL%20Board%20Meeting%20May%202029.pdf?sessionid=d71284ef773f18797e998c18007e01dd>>. Accessed: January 23, 2014.

<sup>84</sup> California Department of Education, Education Demographics Unit. 2013. *Enrollment by Grade for 2012-2013, District and School Enrollment by Grade*. 4168965 – Menlo Park City Elementary. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>>. Accessed: October 22, 2013.

<sup>85</sup> Menlo Park City School District. 2014. *Frequently Asked Questions*. Available: <<http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?&sessionid=&pageid=295681>>. Accessed June 27, 2014.

<sup>86</sup> Bay Area Urban Economics. 2013. *Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Housing Element Update*. April 1, 2013. Available: <[http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/fia/he\\_fia.pdf](http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/fia/he_fia.pdf)>. Accessed: October 22, 2013.

<sup>87</sup> California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. 2013. *Enrollment by Grade for 2012-2013, District and School Enrollment by Grade*. 4169062 – Sequoia Union High School. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>>. Accessed: January 22, 2014.

<sup>88</sup> Sequoia Union High School District. 2013. *Home Page*. Available: <<http://www.seq.org/>>. Accessed: October 22, 2013.

SUHSD currently employs 521 teachers with an average student-to-teacher ratio of 17.7 students per teacher.<sup>89</sup> SUHSD is projected to increase by over 1,000 students by 2020. The district is currently looking for potential sites for additional schools and is looking at expansion of its existing campuses. SUHSD has not established its own student generation rate and uses the statewide average of 0.2 students per dwelling unit.<sup>90</sup>

## Parks

The Menlo Park Community Services Department is responsible for providing recreational and cultural programs for the residents of the City. The Department's facilities include 221 acres of parkland distributed among 13 parks, 2 community centers, 2 public pools, 2 child care centers, and 2 gymnasiums. Included in the parks and recreational areas are tennis courts, softball diamonds, picnic areas, playgrounds, swimming pools, gymnastics centers, soccer fields, and open space.<sup>91</sup> The City has adopted a goal of maintaining a ratio of 5 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents.<sup>92</sup> Currently, the City provides a net of approximately 221 acres of parkland for its residents, which equates to a ratio of 6.76 acres per capita.<sup>93</sup> The City currently exceeds its goals.

## Libraries

The City has two libraries accessible to San Mateo County residents that are included as part of the Peninsula Library System. These libraries include the Main Menlo Park Library and the Belle Haven Elementary School Branch Library. In total, the two City libraries comprise approximately 37,846 sf and have staffs of approximately 53 people, including 7 librarians.<sup>94</sup> According to the General Plan, the Menlo Park Library has a goal to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and a ratio of 1.02 sf of library space per capita.<sup>95</sup> Currently, there are approximately 150,017 children's books, adult/juvenile books, and serial volumes and 37,846 sf of library space between the Main Menlo Park and Belle Haven branches. With a service population of approximately 32,679 residents, this equates to a ratio of 4.59 books per person and 1.16 sf of library space per person, exceeding the existing standard.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

***a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to***

---

<sup>89</sup> California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. 2013. *Certified Staff by Ethnicity for 2012-2013, # of Staff by District by Ethnicity*. Staff Type: Teachers. 4169062 – Sequoia Union High. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>>. Accessed: January 22, 2014.

<sup>90</sup> Bay Area Urban Economics. 2013. *Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Housing Element Update*. April 1, 2013. Available: <[http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/fia/he\\_fia.pdf](http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/fia/he_fia.pdf)>. Accessed: October 22, 2013.

<sup>91</sup> City of Menlo Park Community Services Department. 2013. *Community Services Department*. Available: <[http://www.menlopark.org/departments/dep\\_comservices.html](http://www.menlopark.org/departments/dep_comservices.html)>. Accessed: January 10, 2014.

<sup>92</sup> City of Menlo Park. 2013. *City of Menlo Park General Plan*. Open Space, Conservation, Noise, and Safety Elements. Adopted May 21, 2013.

<sup>93</sup>  $6.76 = (221/\text{January 1, 2013 population of } 32,679) \times 1,000 \text{ residents}$ .

<sup>94</sup> California State Library. 2011–2012. *Public Library Survey Data (2011–2012 Fiscal Year)*. Available: <<http://library.ca.gov/lids/librarystats.html>>. Accessed: January 22, 2014.

<sup>95</sup> City of Menlo Park. 1994. City of Menlo Park General Plan. *General Plan Background Report, Public Facilities and Services*. Page B-VI-8.

***maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:***

## **Fire Protection**

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project is anticipated to increase daytime population at the commercial buildings by approximately 700 people<sup>96</sup> and, based on MPFPD standards of each employee as the equivalent of 0.5 residents,<sup>97</sup> this equates to approximately 350 people added to the service population. In addition, the Project is anticipated to generate approximately 603 residents<sup>98</sup> who could live in the City and in the MPFPD's service area. In total, the Project could result in approximately 953 people added to the service population. If there were no increase in MPFPD staffing (110 fire safety personnel), then the ratio would decrease extremely slightly from 1.11 to 1.10 positions per 1,000 residents.<sup>99</sup> In order to maintain the current ratio, approximately one additional fire safety staff member would need to be hired. This one additional person could be accommodated within the existing and planned MPFP facilities.

The Project would be required to comply with all applicable MPFPD codes and regulations and would be required to meet MPFPD standards related to fire hydrants (e.g., water fire flow requirements, spacing of hydrants), design of driveway turnaround and access points to accommodate fire equipment, and other fire code requirements. Specifically, the Menlo Park Fire Protection District Fire Prevention Code Section 903.2 requires automatic fire sprinkler protection buildings for commercial occupancies over 5,000 sf if the building is 40 feet or taller.

At this time, the MPFPD is considering the adoption of an impact fee for fire protection services. If adopted prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project Sponsor would be required to pay applicable facilities fees, as would be outlined in the Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Program for the new construction at the Project site. Payment of this fee would ensure that the Project would fund its fair share of the costs of needed capital facilities to serve growth within the MPFPD boundaries. In addition, the Project is within the proposed growth of the Specific Plan. As such, the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire and emergency service facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Fire service impacts as a result of the Project would be ***less than significant***.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-26 to 4.12-28) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to fire services, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been

<sup>96</sup> Although there are currently 30 people employed at the Project site (the Jefferson Site), this number is insignificant, and 1,300 people is a conservative estimate that represents all new employees under the Project.

<sup>97</sup> Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. *Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study – Administrative Draft*. Prepared by Seifel Consulting and Urban Economic. June 2013.

<sup>98</sup> The 603 new residents include 524 residents induced by the residential portion of the Project and 79 residents induced by the commercial portion of the Project.

<sup>99</sup>  $1.10 = (110 \text{ fire safety personnel} / \text{new service population } [99,050+953=99,962]) * 1,000 \text{ residents}$

presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

## Police Protection

### Effects of the Project

The Project could affect the MPPD by intensifying site activity; adding new employees, visitors, and residents; increasing square footage; and increasing traffic incidents. In total, the Project would increase employees at the Project site to approximately 700. As mentioned above, when calculating the service population, the MPPD considers employees who work in Menlo Park as a one-third of a resident, resulting in approximately 233 additional daytime residents. In addition, the Project would add approximately 603 permanent residents to the City. As such, the MPPD's service population would increase by approximately 836 people for a total of 42,882 people. This would result in a nominal decrease of the officers per resident ratio, from 1.11 to 1.10 officers per 1,000 residents. In order to maintain the current ratio, approximately one additional officer would need to be hired. This one additional person could be accommodated within the existing MPPD facilities.

Police surveillance in the Project area would continue with routine patrols and responses to calls for assistance. The Project would not require the MPPD to expand its current service boundary to include the Project site because it is already included in Beat 1. Based on current service levels and service levels expected to occur under the Project, it is not expect that new police department facilities would need to be constructed. Therefore, the impacts on the MPPD would be *less than significant*.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-25 to 4.12-26) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to police services, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

## Schools

### Effects of the Project

The Project site is located within the MPCSD and the SUHSD. Development under the Project would result in the construction of up to 220 housing units in the Specific Plan area. In addition, approximately 31 people employed at the Project site are expected to move to Menlo Park (see Section XII, *Population and Housing*). The Project is within the parameters of the Specific Plan. Assuming that each employee would form a household, the Project could result in approximately 251 new households within the City.

**Menlo Park City School District.** The MPCSD would serve the new housing that induced by the Project. As stated above, the MPCSD currently uses student generation rates of 0.13 students per multifamily dwelling (as proposed under the Project) for kindergarten through eighth grade. Using this rate, the Project would generate approximately 33 elementary and middle school students per year at full buildout. The 33 students generated by the Project, if evenly distributed between the

brackets (elementary [kindergarten through fifth] and middle [sixth through eighth]), would result in approximately 22 new students at the elementary schools and 11 new students at the middle school.

As discussed above, the MPCSD elementary schools do not have capacity for additional students; however, the middle school could accommodate the 11 students generated by the Project.<sup>100</sup> Nonetheless, if a school is at capacity, students have the potential to attend another elementary school in the district. The MPCSD is required to accommodate the students within its boundary. If all classes are at capacity, then the MPCSD may accommodate additional students by either increasing the class size or opening new classrooms. In addition, the MPCSD currently has plans to open a new elementary school at the O'Connor School site on Elliot Drive in the Willows neighborhood, which is approximately 2 miles northeast of the Project site.<sup>101</sup> Once this school is operational, the MPCSD would be able to accommodate the students generated by the Project.

**High Schools.** Only one high school district, the SUHSD, serves the City. As such, it is assumed that all high school students generated by the Project would attend the SUHSD. While the SUHSD has not provided an equivalent breakdown of single- versus multi-family yields, a potential multi-family rate of 0.09 students per attached housing unit is used in the Specific Plan. Using this generation rate, the Project would result in approximately 23 new high school students. As explained above, the SUHSD is close to capacity and is looking for potential sites for additional schools and considering the expansion of its existing campuses. Adding 23 students to the school district could trigger the need for new or expanded facilities.

**Overall School Impacts.** As discussed above, the Project could result in an increase in students within the City. Residential and non-residential development, including the Project, is subject to Senate Bill (SB) 50 School Impact Fees (established by the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998). As a result of the wide-ranging changes in the financing of school facilities, including the passage of state school facilities bonds intended to provide a major source of financing for new school facilities, Section 65996 of the State Government Code explains that payment of school impact fees established by SB 50 is deemed to constitute full and complete mitigation for school impacts from development that may be required from a developer by any state or local agency. As a result, the impacts related to schools would be *less than significant*.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-28 to 4.12-30) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to schools, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

---

<sup>100</sup> Menlo Park City School District. 2013. *Facility Master Planning Update*. Presentation at the Special Board Meeting May 29, 2013. Available:  
<<http://www.district.mpcsd.org/modules/groups/homepagefiles/cms/1602720/File/FINAL%20Board%20Meeting%20May%2029.pdf?sessionid=d71284ef773f18797e998c18007e01dd>>.  
Accessed: January 23, 2014.

<sup>101</sup> Menlo Park City School District. 2014. *Frequently Asked Questions*. Available:  
<<http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?&sessionid=&pageid=295681>>. Accessed June 27, 2014.

## Parks

### Effects of the Project

Given the availability of City and regional parks, population growth related to development under the Project is not anticipated to increase the use of recreational resources and parks such that substantial physical deterioration would occur. In addition, the residential development portion of the Project would be required to pay recreation in-lieu fees to mitigate any impacts. As such, the impact of the Project on existing park and recreational resources would be ***less than significant***. Please refer to Section XIV, *Recreation*, for additional analysis of impacts on parks.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-30 to 4.12-31) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to parks, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

## Libraries

### Effects of the Project

As discussed above, the City's libraries have a wide range of resources accessible to the community. The Project is expected to increase the population in the City by approximately 603 residents. As stated above, the Menlo Park Library has a goal to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and a ratio of 1.02 sf of library space per capita. The increase in 603 residents would slightly degrade the existing ratios. Nonetheless, since the current ratios are significantly above the goal, the increased population would not degrade the ratios to a level below the goals and standards. It is expected that the existing libraries in the City would be able to accommodate an increase in employment at the Project site and the associated increase in residents. Therefore, impacts would be ***less than significant***.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was not analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. However, since the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts to libraries, no new specific effects would occur. Therefore, no further analysis is required.

<b>XIV. Recreation</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

The Menlo Park Community Services Department is responsible for providing recreational and cultural programs for the residents of the City. The Department's facilities include 221 acres of parkland distributed among 13 parks, 2 community centers, 2 public pools, 2 child care centers, and 2 gymnasiums. Included in the parks and recreational areas are tennis courts, softball diamonds, picnic areas, playgrounds, swimming pools, gymnastics centers, soccer fields, and open space.<sup>102</sup> The City has adopted a goal of maintaining a ratio of 5 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents.<sup>103</sup> Currently, the City provides a net of approximately 221 acres of parkland for its residents, which equates to a ratio of 6.76 acres per capita.<sup>104</sup> The City currently exceeds its goals.

Parks in the vicinity of the Project site include Fremont Park, Nealon Park, and Burgess Park. Fremont Park, located at Santa Cruz Avenue and University Avenue, is a 0.38-acre park that features passive recreational areas, benches, and lighted walkways. Nealon Park, located at Middle Avenue west of El Camino Real, is a 9-acre park that features tennis courts, a softball field, a playground, picnic areas, and an off-leash dog area. Burgess Park, a 9.3-acre park located adjacent to the Civic Center complex, provides diverse facilities such as baseball and soccer fields, tennis courts, a playground, picnic areas, and passive recreation areas. Burgess Pool, Burgess Recreation Center, Arillaga Family Gymnasium, Burgess Gymnastics Center, and the Burgess Skate Park are located adjacent to Burgess Park and offer numerous recreational opportunities to residents of the City.

<sup>102</sup> City of Menlo Park Community Services Department. 2013. *Community Services Department*. Available: <[http://www.menlopark.org/departments/dep\\_comservices.html](http://www.menlopark.org/departments/dep_comservices.html)>. Accessed January 10, 2014.

<sup>103</sup> City of Menlo Park. 2013. *City of Menlo Park General Plan*. Open Space, Conservation, Noise, and Safety Elements. Adopted May 21, 2013.

<sup>104</sup>  $6.76 = (221/\text{January 1, 2013 population of } 32,679) \times 1,000 \text{ residents}$ .

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

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

### Effects of the Project

Development under the Project would generate approximately 700 new employees and approximately 524 new residents at the Project site. In total, the Project could induce up to 603 new residents in the City. Employees and residents would utilize nearby parks as well as other parks and open space resources throughout the City. Development would include the creation of additional open space in the form of Garwood Way Public Park, plazas, and private open space.

New permanent residents in Menlo Park would likely use the proposed open spaces as well as existing recreational resources throughout the City. As noted above, the General Plan sets forth a goal of 5 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 persons. Based on 221 acres of City parkland and an estimated 32,679 City residents in 2013, the City currently exceeds this goal by providing 6.76 acres per capita. The Project would reduce this ratio to 6.64 acres per 1,000 people, which is still above the standard of 5 acres of parks per 1,000 people. In addition, Garwood Way Public Park would be approximately 0.23 acres and would add to the total existing parkland in the City.

Given the availability of City and regional parks, population growth related to development under the Project is not anticipated to increase the use of recreational resources such that substantial physical deterioration would occur. As such, the impact of the Project on existing park and recreational resources would be *less than significant*.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-30 to 4.12-31) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to parks and recreational facilities, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

### Effects of the Project

The Project would not include new or expanded Menlo Park Community Services Department park facilities. However, the Project would include a publically accessible, but privately maintained, park in the northeast corner of the Project site (Garwood Way Public Park). This park could include bocce courts, seating, and tables for game play (chess and checkers). In addition, public and private plazas would be provided throughout the Project site. However, the Garwood Way Public Park would only include approximately 10,000 sf and construction would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment, resulting in a *less-than-significant* impact.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real Downtown Specific Plan**

This checklist item was analyzed throughout the Specific Plan EIR, which considered any impacts from new parks and recreational facilities that could be constructed within the Specific Plan area. These impacts were mitigated throughout the EIR in the respective EIR topics and are applied to the Project, as discussed in Sections I through XVII. The physical conditions, as they relate to recreation facilities, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

<b>XV. Transportation/Traffic</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

- a. ***Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?***

### Effects of the Project

Although the Project is within the development projections envisioned in the Specific Plan EIR, because the Project would likely affect intersections not previously evaluated, this topic requires ***further environmental review*** in the Infill EIR. The Infill EIR will include the analysis of 27 study intersections and 10 roadway segments.

The following 27 intersections will be analyzed in the Infill EIR.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. <i>El Camino Real and Encinal Avenue</i> <sup>105</sup>     | 15. Santa Cruz Avenue and University Drive (S)                   |
| 2. <i>El Camino Real and Valparaiso Avenue/Glenwood Avenue</i> | 16. Laurel Street and Glenwood Avenue                            |
| 3. <i>El Camino Real and Oak Grove Avenue</i>                  | 17. Alma Street and Ravenswood Avenue                            |
| 4. <i>El Camino Real and Santa Cruz Avenue</i>                 | 18. Alma Street and Oak Grove Avenue                             |
| 5. <i>El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue/Menlo Avenue</i>    | 19. Garwood Way and Glenwood Avenue                              |
| 6. <i>El Camino Real and Roble Avenue</i>                      | 20. Derry Lane (Garwood Way)/Merrill Street and Oak Grove Avenue |
| 7. <i>El Camino Real and Middle Avenue</i>                     | 21. Santa Cruz Avenue and University Drive (N)                   |
| 8. <i>El Camino Real and Cambridge Avenue</i>                  | 22. Oak Grove Avenue and University Drive                        |
| 9. University Drive and Valparaiso Avenue                      | 23. Encinal Avenue and Laurel Street                             |
| 10. Laurel Street and Oak Grove Avenue                         | 24. Middlefield Road and Oak Grove Avenue [Atherton]             |
| 11. Laurel Street and Ravenswood Avenue                        | 25. Middlefield Road and Marsh Road [Atherton]                   |
| 12. Middlefield Road and Willow Road                           | 26. Middlefield Road and Glenwood Avenue [Atherton]              |
| 13. Middlefield Road and Ringwood Avenue                       | 27. Encinal Avenue and Middlefield Road [Atherton]               |
| 14. Middlefield Road and Ravenswood Avenue                     |  |

<sup>105</sup> State-controlled intersections are shown with *italic* type.

In addition, 14 residential and non-residential roadway segments will be analyzed:

1. Middlefield Road north of Glenwood Avenue
2. Middlefield Road south of Oak Grove Avenue
3. Ravenswood Avenue east of Laurel Street
4. Valparaiso Avenue west of El Camino Real
5. Oak Grove Avenue west of Laurel Street
6. Oak Grove Avenue east of Laurel Street
7. Glenwood Avenue west of Laurel Street
8. Glenwood Avenue east of Laurel Street
9. Encinal Avenue east of Laurel Street
10. Laurel Street south of Oak Grove Avenue
11. Laurel Street north of Glenwood Avenue
12. Alma Street south of Oak Grove Avenue
13. Merrill Street south of Oak Gove Avenue
14. Garwood Way south of Glenwood Avenue

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.13-40 to 4.13-56). The development under the Specific Plan was determined to result in significant and unavoidable impacts to area intersections local roadway segments, even with implementation of **Mitigation Measures TR-1a, b, c, and d and Mitigation Measure TR-2** (pages 4.13-40 to 4.13-53). Traffic from future development would increase traffic volumes on local freeway segments, but to a less-than-significant level. Because the Project would potentially affect intersections not evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR, this topic requires further environmental review in the Infill EIR.

- b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

As discussed in Section XV(b), this topic requires ***further environmental review*** in the Infill EIR.

- c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project is not located within an airport land use plan area and is not within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The maximum building height at the Project site would be 48 feet. As such, the Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, resulting in ***no impact***. No mitigation would be required.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (page 4.7-14) and was also determined to result in no impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to air traffic patterns, have not changed in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

#### **Effects of the Project**

Although the Project would add vehicles to nearby intersections, the Project would not result in physical changes to these study intersections. Therefore, since design features at the intersections would not be altered as a result of the Project, the collision rates are not expected to increase and no additional hazards would occur.

Based on the site plan, vehicular access to the Project site would be accessible from five driveways: two driveways from El Camino Real to serve the office and retail development and three driveways from Garwood Way to serve the office, retail, and residential uses. In addition, one driveway could potentially be located off of Oak Grove Avenue. At driveways, a substantially clear line of sight should be maintained between the driver of a vehicle waiting at the crossroad and the driver of the approaching vehicle. Adequate time must be provided for the waiting vehicle to either cross, turn left, or turn right, without requiring the through traffic to radically alter its speed. Through site design, the Project Sponsor will ensure that adequate sight distance is provided at the proposed driveways. Therefore, the Project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts relating to hazardous design features. No mitigation is required.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was not analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. However, since the Project would not result in hazardous design features, no new specific effects would occur. Therefore, no further analysis is required.

- e. Result in inadequate emergency access?**

#### **Effects of the Project**

The Project does not include any characteristics (e.g., permanent road closures or roadway modifications) that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency response or evacuation in the Project vicinity. Emergency vehicle access would be permitted from El Camino Real and Garwood Way through the middle of the Project site between the two proposed office buildings. Another access point could potentially be added off of Oak Grove Avenue. Due to the new driveway at Garwood Way, emergency access to the Project site would likely improve over existing conditions. Hydrants and other fire connections would be available as per MPFPD requirements. As such, the Project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts. No mitigation would be required.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was not analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. However, since the Project would adhere to the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City's EOP, and the requirements of the MPFPD, no new specific effects would occur. Therefore, no further analysis is required.

- f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?*

### **Effects of the Project**

The Project could potentially impact pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and amenities to promote the safe use of alternate modes of transportation, and connections to the existing bicycle and pedestrian network. In addition, the Project could generate transit riders, which could impact transit load factors. Therefore, this topic requires **further environmental review** in the Infill EIR.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.13-56 to 4.13-57) and it was determined that development in the Specific Plan area would result in less-than-significant impacts to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. However, because site-specific information was not evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR, this topic requires further environmental review in the Infill EIR.

<b>XVI. Utilities and Service Systems</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
Would the Project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

### Water Supply

The City of Menlo Park (City) is served by four water utilities: Bear Gulch District of California Water Service Company (Cal Water); Menlo Park Municipal Water District (MPMWD); O'Connor Tract Cooperative Water Company; and East Palo Alto Mutual Water Company. Approximately two-thirds of the City's water users receive water from Cal Water, and MPMWD serves the majority of remaining one-third; a small portion of Menlo Park is served with groundwater provided by the O'Connor Tract Cooperative Water Company. East Palo Alto Mutual Water Company serves about ten homes adjacent to East Palo Alto in the Willows neighborhood.

#### Cal Water and Bear Gulch District

Cal Water is an investor-owned public utility supplying water service to 1.7 million Californians through over 440,000 connections. Its 25 separate water districts serve over 50 communities from Chico in the north to the Palos Verdes Peninsula in Southern California. Cal Water's operations for individual service districts are regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). CPUC sets different tariff rates for each of Cal Water's individual districts. Cal Water incorporated in 1926, and has provided water service to the Bear Gulch District since 1936.

Cal Water is a retail water provider; in this capacity it receives wholesale treated water from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to distribute throughout its service area. The Bear Gulch District and Cal Water's Bayshore Districts (Mid-Peninsula and South San Francisco), along with the 27 member agencies of the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA), receive purchased treated water from SFPUC's regional water system. The BAWSCA members purchase approximately two-thirds of the water delivered through the regional water system and the balance is delivered to the City and County of San Francisco and its retail customers.

The Bear Gulch District's system is bordered on the north by Redwood City; on the east by Palo Alto, Stanford University, and unincorporated Santa Clara County; and on the south and west by unincorporated San Mateo County. The Bear Gulch District also serves the Project site. In accordance with the California Water Code and State CEQA Guidelines, Cal Water prepared a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) for the development expected under the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Specific Plan).

The water furnished to customers in the Bear Gulch District is a combination of purchased water and treated surface water. Table 4.12-4 of the Specific Plan Final EIR (page 4.12-16) summarizes Cal Water and the Bear Gulch District's total water supplies over the 25-year planning period from 2010–2035 as analyzed in the WSA. According to the Bear Gulch District *2005 Urban Water Management Plan* (UWMP), in 2010, the Bear Gulch District could access an annual average 12.30 million gallons per day (mgd) from all sources (SFPUC purchased water [11.18 mgd] and local surface water [1.12 mgd]). Surface water supplies from the Bear Gulch Reservoir are held to 0.673 mgd, which is the daily average from the Bear Gulch Reservoir projected in normal, single dry, and multiple dry years as identified in the Bear Gulch District UWMP. The Bear Gulch District intends to use these supplies to meet its customer demands. The 2010 Bear Gulch District UWMP specifies the actual 2010 water supplies furnished for customers in the Bear Gulch District was an annual average of 11.52 mgd from all sources (SFPUC purchased water [10.55 mgd] and local surface water [0.97 mgd]).

## Water Treatment

The City purchases 100 percent of its treated water supplies from SFPUC as agreed upon in their Agreement and its Individual Supply Guarantee (ISG). The purchased water is treated at both the Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant (WTP) and the Harry Tracy WTP. As of 2011, SFPUC is engaged in a variety of water treatment and distribution system improvements projects that comprise its WSIP and evolved out of its earlier Water System Master Plan (2000). The Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) EIR evaluated the program-level impacts associated with implementation of the WSIP, but individual projects would be subject to project-specific environmental review. In 2013, SFPUC completed construction for the expansion of the Sunol Valley WTP, which has the sustainable capacity<sup>106</sup> to treat up to 160 mgd. The Harry Tracy WTP treats 120 mgd, and there are plans for expansion and upgrades to sustainably treat 140 mgd. As of 2013, the Harry Tracy WTP is forecasted to be completed in February 2015.<sup>107</sup> Therefore, at capacity, SFPUC would be capable of treating up to 300 mgd. In addition, SFPUC's Tesla Water Treatment Facility in Tracy, California, completed in 2012, is the largest ultraviolet disinfection treatment plant in California, capable of producing 315 mgd.<sup>108</sup> Therefore, after 2015, SFPUC would be able to treat up to 655 mgd.

## Water Storage and Distribution

The City is divided into two separate pressure zones; the high zone and the low zone. The Project site is within the low zone, where static pressures range from 55 pounds per square inch (psi) to 65 psi. Hydrant tests conducted between 2006 and 2008 indicate, in general, that the following fire flow rates are available with a residual pressure of 20 psi: approximately 5,000 gallons per minute (gpm) at the north end of the Specific Plan area, which includes the Project site. Typically, a minimum of 1,500 gpm with a residual pressure of 20 psi is required to serve new developments.

A 36-inch water main is currently located within a 40-foot-wide SFPUC water line easement to the north of the Project site. In addition, Cal Water owns and maintains the existing 4-inch main within Derry Lane and the existing 6-inch main within Oak Grove Avenue, which are both connected to the existing buildings at the Project site.

## Wastewater Collection and Treatment

The West Bay Sanitary District (WBSD) collects wastewater from customers within the City (including the Project site), Atherton, and Portola Valley, and areas of East Palo Alto, Woodside, and unincorporated San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. WBSD transports wastewater via main line trunk sewers to the Menlo Park Pumping Station (MPPS) located at Bayfront Expressway and Marsh Road. From there, wastewater is transported to the South Bayside System Authority (SBSA) Regional Treatment Plant, located at the eastern end of the Redwood Shores peninsula in Redwood City, approximately 6 miles northwest of the City. WBSD operates a separate sanitary sewer and stormwater conveyance system.

---

<sup>106</sup> *Sustainable capacity* is the highest flow rate at which a treatment plant can be expected to operate, given normal source water conditions, while meeting regulatory water quality and routine maintenance requirements.

<sup>107</sup> San Francisco Water Power Sewer. "HTWTP Long-Term Improvements (WSIP)." Available: <[http://sfwater.org/bids/projectDetail.aspx?prj\\_id=145](http://sfwater.org/bids/projectDetail.aspx?prj_id=145)> Accessed January 30, 2014.

<sup>108</sup> San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. 2011. News Blog: *San Francisco, Federal and State Officials to Dedicate California's Largest Ultraviolet Water Treatment Facility* July 19. Available: <<http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=35&recordid=24>>. Accessed January 23, 2014.

The SBSA Regional Treatment Plant is permitted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) to discharge treated wastewater into the San Francisco Bay (Bay). The SBSA Regional Treatment Plant is jointly owned and operated by WBSD and the Cities of Redwood City, Belmont, and San Carlos as a joint powers authority (JPA). Under SBSA's NPDES permit, the regional treatment plant has a permitted dry weather capacity of 27 mgd and peak wet-weather-capacity of 71 mgd. In 2008, SBSA began implementation of its Conveyance System Master Plan, which is a 10-year capital improvement program (CIP) intended to accommodate projected increases in wastewater flows through 2030. Renovation and refurbishing of SBSA facilities under the CIP will increase treatment capacity to 29 mgd during dry weather and 80 mgd during peak wet weather.<sup>109</sup>

During wet weather events, when wastewater flows exceed SBSA's capacity, flows are temporarily diverted to a 10-million-gallon equalization basin near the connection of the WBSD sewer collection system to SBSA's system at the end of Marsh Road near Bayfront Park.<sup>110</sup> This temporary holding pond is owned and maintained by WBSA and can receive excess flows from WBSD or other member agencies of the JPA. WBSD's entitled allocation of the SBSA plant dry weather flow capacity is 7.97 mgd. The WBSD's current average dry weather flow is 3.60 mgd and the daily peak wet weather flow is 14.4 mgd.<sup>111</sup> As such, there is available capacity in the WBSD's entitled allocation of wastewater to the SBSA to accommodate growth within the WBSD's service area. Further, the SBSA is in the process of ensuring that future wastewater treatment demands are met through implementation of the CIP.

## Stormwater

A 12-inch stormwater main is located under Garwood Way, which leads north into the stormwater system under Glenwood Avenue, and from there to the receiving waters of the Atherton Channel. A stormwater main is also located under El Camino Real, which fronts the Project site. This main is approximately 30 inches in diameter west of the Project site, increasing in stages to 42 inches in diameter to the northwest of the Project site, prior to the main's confluence with the Atherton Channel. El Camino Real and its associated drainage conveyances are under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), while the Garwood Way/Glenwood Avenue system is maintained by the City. The City published a citywide storm drainage study in May 2003 that identified existing deficiencies within the existing stormwater collection system.

## Solid Waste

The Shoreway Environmental Center (Shoreway), at 333 Shoreway Road in San Carlos, serves as a regional solid waste and recycling facility for the receipt, handling, and transfer of solid waste and recyclables collected from the RethinkWaste service area. The South Bayside Waste Management Authority (RethinkWaste), a JPA with 12 member agencies (including the City), owns the facility. Residential and commercial solid waste and recyclable materials that are collected by the franchise hauler, Recology San Mateo County, and are taken to Shoreway for processing and shipment. The facility

---

<sup>109</sup> South Bayside System Authority. 2008. *SBSA Announces \$339 Million, 10-Year Capital Improvement Program*, Press Advisory, May 9. Available: <[http://www.sbsa.org/storage/assets/CIP\\_Press\\_Release5-9-08.pdf](http://www.sbsa.org/storage/assets/CIP_Press_Release5-9-08.pdf)>. Accessed: January 23, 2014.

<sup>110</sup> Bill Kitajima, West Bay Sanitary District, email communication, May 6, 2013.

<sup>111</sup> Bill Kitajima, West Bay Sanitary District, email communication, May 6, 2013.

is operated by South Bay Recycling (SBR) under a 10-year contract with RethinkWaste as of January 1, 2011.<sup>112</sup>

Shoreway is separately permitted by the California State Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) to receive 3,000 tons per day of solid waste and recyclables. As of January 1, 2011, Recology provides recycle, compost, and garbage collection services for the 93,000 RethinkWaste residences and 10,000 businesses.<sup>113</sup>

Materials are consolidated and loaded into large transfer trailers at Shoreway for shipment offsite to Ox Mountain/Corinda Los Trancos Landfill in Half Moon Bay (Ox Mountain), to other landfills, and to recycling facilities for construction/demolition waste and organics materials. In total, Ox Mountain is permitted to receive 3,588 tons per day with a remaining capacity of over 44 million cubic yards. It is anticipated that Ox Mountain will reach capacity in 2018.<sup>114</sup>

In 2012 (the most recent data available), the City shipped approximately 26,771.71 tons of waste to landfills and disposal facilities.<sup>115</sup> Effective July 1, 2012, Assembly Bill (AB) 341 requires that all businesses that generate 4 or more cubic yards of garbage per week to recycle.

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

### a. *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

#### Effects of the Project

Refer to discussion under Section XVI(b), below, for a discussion of the Project's consistency with Regional Water Board requirements.

#### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-35 through 4.12-36) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to wastewater treatment requirements, have not changed in substantially the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

---

<sup>112</sup> RethinkWaste, South Bayside Waste Management Authority. 2013. *Shoreway Overview*. Available: <<http://www.rethinkwaste.org/shoreway-facility>>. Accessed: January 23, 2014.

<sup>113</sup> RethinkWaste, South Bayside Waste Management Authority. 2013. *Shoreway Overview*. Available: <<http://www.rethinkwaste.org/about/about-us>>. Accessed: January 23, 2014.

<sup>114</sup> California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2013. *Facility/Site Summary Details: Corinda Los Trancos Landfill (Ox Mtn) (41-AA-0002)*. Available: <<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Detail/>>. Accessed: January 23, 2014.

<sup>115</sup> California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2012. *Jurisdictional Diversion/Disposal Rate Detail*. Available: <<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/DiversionProgram/JurisdictionDiversionDetail.aspx?JurisdictionID=299&Year=2012>>. Accessed: January 23, 2014.

- b. 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?**

## Effects of the Project

### Water Supply

The Project would result in approximately 220 residential units, between approximately 195,000 and 210,000 square feet (sf) of office space, and up to 22,000 sf of retail/restaurant uses. Using the water demand factors in the Specific Plan Final EIR, as shown in Table XVI-1, the Project would result in approximately 63.6 acre-feet per year (AFY) in additional water demand.

**Table XVI-1. Proposed Project Water Demand**

Land Use	Area or Type <sup>a</sup>	Units	Water Demand Factor	Gallons per Day	MGD	AFY
Residential Development-Multiple Family	220	DU <sup>b</sup>	112 gpd/DU <sup>c</sup>	24,640	0.025	27.4
Retail	22,000 <sup>d</sup>	sf	0.53 gpd/sf	11,660	0.012	12.8
Commercial	210,000 <sup>d</sup>	sf	0.10 gpd/sf	21,000	0.021	23.4
<b>Total Water Demand</b>				<b>57,300</b>	<b>0.057</b>	<b>63.6</b>

<sup>a</sup> The land use assumptions in this table are the maximum of each land use type that could occur on the Project site. The Project could not be developed to each of these maximums but the calculations are provided to present the most conservative water demand scenario.

<sup>b</sup> DU = dwelling units  
gpd = gallons per day  
sf = square feet

<sup>c</sup> Residential water demand factors provided by ESA.

<sup>d</sup> As a conservative scenario, the retail and commercial square footages represent the maximum amount proposed.

Source: Greenheart Land Company. 2013. El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR.

The City adopted the Bear Gulch District 2010 UWMP.<sup>116</sup> In the UWMP, Cal Water projected that demands in the commercial, industrial, and institutional (CII) sector would increase from 1,610 AFY (1.437 mgd) in 2010 to 2,266 AFY (2.024 mgd) in 2040, an increase of 656 AFY, or 0.586 mgd. It is projected that demands in the residential sector (single-family and multi-family) will increase from 10,861 AFY (9.696 mgd) in 2010 to 11,479 AFY (10.248 mgd), an increase of 618 AFY, or 0.552 mgd. The projections in the UWMP are based on projected growth in land uses as anticipated by the City. Development of the Project site was assumed in the land use projections in the 2010 UWMP. As a result, the demand generated by the Project has been considered and the water providers have determined that adequate supplies are available to serve future uses at the site. Thus, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on water supply.

In addition, the WSA prepared for the Specific Plan EIR evaluated water supply for development in the Specific Plan area, which includes the Project site. Development of the Project is within the land

<sup>116</sup> California Water Service Company. *Bear Gulch District 2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. 2011. Available: <[https://www.calwater.com/docs/uwmp/bg/2010\\_Urban\\_Water\\_Management\\_Plan\\_\(BG\).pdf](https://www.calwater.com/docs/uwmp/bg/2010_Urban_Water_Management_Plan_(BG).pdf)>. Accessed: January 29, 2014.

use projections in the Specific Plan EIR. Overall, the WSA for the Specific Plan EIR determined that annual average water demand would result in 222.12 AFY. The WSA concludes that under normal year conditions the Bear Gulch District would have sufficient capacity to meet the water demands of the Specific Plan area, including for the Project site, as evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR. Thus, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on water demand.

### Water Treatment Facilities

As described above, the City purchases 100 percent of its treated water supplies from SFPUC. The purchased water is treated at the Sunol Valley WTP and the Harry Tracy WTP. The Harry Tracy WTP has a peak capacity of 140 mgd and sustainable capacity of 120 mgd. As part of the WSIP, the Harry Tracy WTP would be expanded to sustainably treat 180 mgd and the Sunol Valley WTP was recently expanded to sustainably treat 160 mgd. When the Harry Tracy WTP is operating at capacity, along with the Sunol Valley WTP, SFPUC would be capable of supplying up to 340 mgd. Furthermore, the newly constructed SFPUC Tesla Water Treatment Facility in Tracy, California, (part of the WSIP) is the largest ultraviolet disinfection treatment plant in California, capable of producing 315 mgd. Therefore, after 2015, SFPUC would be able to deliver up to 655 mgd of treated water.

The Project would acquire its water supply from the Bear Gulch District. Implementation of the Project would result in approximately 63.6 AFY, or 0.057 mgd, of additional water demand from the Bear Gulch District. The Bear Gulch District has an existing (2010) water supply of 12,907 AFY (11.52 mgd) and a future (2040) water supply of 14,160 AFY (12.64 mgd). Operation of the Project would not require the Bear Gulch District to purchase additional water supplies from SFPUC and, therefore, would not require SFPUC to deliver additional water supplies over its normal-year system-wide target of 265 mgd. As of 2011, SFPUC has sufficient capacity in its water treatment facilities to meet its daily system-wide demands (BAWSCA and City of San Francisco). Furthermore, at the time the Project would become operational, the water treatment facility improvement projects described previously would all be complete and SFPUC would be capable of treating up to 655 mgd. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not require the expansion of existing water treatment facilities or the construction of new facilities. The Project would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to existing water treatment facilities.

Furthermore, as described in the Specific Plan EIR, development of the Specific Plan area would not prompt a need to expand treatment facilities in order to meet its demands. The Project is within the land use projections evaluated in the Specific Plan and, thus, would not result in impacts not previously disclosed. Thus, the Project would not require the expansion or construction of new water treatment facilities, resulting in a **less-than-significant** impact.

### Wastewater

It is estimated that 100 percent of indoor water demand at the Project would become wastewater conveyed to the SBSA Regional Treatment Plant. As shown in Table XVI-1, implementation of the Project would result in the generation of approximately 0.057 mgd of wastewater associated with indoor uses, assuming a one-to-one ratio. As described above, WBSD's average daily flow during dry weather is approximately 3.60 mgd, compared to WBSD's dry weather allocation of approximately 7.97 mgd. Wastewater discharge from the Project site would constitute slightly more than 1 percent of WBSD's remaining available capacity entitlements from SBSA.<sup>117</sup> Therefore, WBSD's available

---

<sup>117</sup>  $7.975 \text{ mgd dry weather allocation} - 3.60 \text{ mgd average daily flow} = 4.375 \text{ mgd of remaining capacity. } (0.057 \text{ mgd generated by Project} / 4.375 \text{ mgd}) * 100 = 1.3 \text{ percent.}$

capacity entitlements from SBSA would be sufficient to accommodate the projected wastewater flow that would result from implementation of the Project. Because the SBSA Regional Treatment Plant would have adequate capacity to process the wastewater generated from the Project, implementation of the Project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Board, and the Project would have a less-than-significant impact.

The Specific Plan EIR estimated that, upon buildout of the Specific Plan area, approximately 0.3 mgd of additional wastewater would be generated over existing conditions, equating to an approximately 2 percent increase over treatment rates at the SBSA (15 mgd) and 1 percent increase over the current SBSA capacity (29 mgd). Further, the Specific Plan EIR states that full buildout of the Specific Plan would generate an average wastewater flow rate of approximately 175.5 gpm and peak flows of approximately 614 gpm and 884,652 gpd. The Specific Plan EIR also states that, according to the WBSD, the need for increased capacity in the system's trunk lines is minimal. The SBSA receives a dry weather average below the existing treatment plant capacity. Wet weather flows, which increase significantly due to inflow and infiltration of rainwater into the wastewater system, are adequately accommodated through existing facilities. The Specific Plan Final EIR concludes that impacts to wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant. The Project is within the development projections evaluated in the Specific Plan and would not result in any additional impacts beyond what is concluded in the Specific Plan EIR. Thus, the Project would not require the expansion or construction of a new wastewater treatment facility, resulting in a *less-than-significant* impact.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-31 to 4.12-36) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to water and wastewater treatment facilities, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- c. *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?***

### **Effects of the Project**

Project site improvements would include the construction of approximately 130,000 sf of new building footprints. Implementation of the Project would increase impervious surfaces to 233,800 sf (approximately 83.3 percent), compared to 214,400 sf of existing impervious surfaces. Approximately 46,800 sf of pervious landscaped areas would be provided throughout the site. Up to 10 stormwater treatment areas with about 11,500 sf in total would be located throughout the Project site in order to limit stormwater runoff. These biotreatment areas would be open, level, vegetated areas that would allow runoff to be distributed evenly across the area and would comply with the San Mateo County NPDES C.3 requirements for bioswales stormwater infiltration/treatment.

The Project would be required to include Low Impact Development (LID) treatment measures for stormwater management. Multiple strategies can be employed to offset this increase in direct runoff from impervious surface so that the actual stormwater discharge from the site would not increase. Potential treatment measures could include techniques, such as use of onsite infiltration through

landscaping or vegetated swales that reduce pollutant loading in offsite discharges. Incorporation of these types of source control design measures can even potentially improve upon existing conditions. The Project, like existing conditions, would continue to drain to the underground storm drains.

The Specific Plan further recommends that new buildings incorporate green roofs (Specific Plan Guideline E.3.8.12) that harvest rain water that can reduce peak stormwater volumes and/or flow rates to relieve both existing and future system capacity limitations. The Specific Plan also recommends the use of porous paving material on driveways and parking areas (Specific Plan Guidelines D.2.47, D.4.09, D.5.20, D.6.03, D.6.04 and E.3.8.13) to minimize stormwater runoff from paved surfaces, as well as stormwater management techniques such as the use of bioswales on surface parking lots.

Compliance with applicable stormwater management requirements and Specific Plan guidelines, and implementation of a landscaping plan designed to provide stormwater treatment areas, would ensure that the Project would not significantly increase stormwater drainage from the Project site. As such, the Project would not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, resulting in a *less-than-significant* impact.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.8-16 to 4.8-20) and was also determined to be less than significant with implementation of Specific Plan standards and design guidelines, as listed above. Therefore, these uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate the impacts of the Project. No additional mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to stormwater drainage facilities, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?*

### **Effects of the Project**

Refer to discussion Section XVI(b), above, for a discussion of the availability of water supplies to serve Project demands.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-35 to 4.12-36) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to water supplies, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

### Effects of the Project

Refer to discussion Section XVI(b), above, for a discussion of the availability of adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the Project.

### Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-35 to 4.12-36) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to wastewater treatment facilities, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

- f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

### Effects of the Project

Operation of the Project would result in generation of solid waste beyond existing conditions. Using generation rates from the Specific Plan EIR, Table XVI-2 estimates the increase in solid waste that would occur.

**Table XVI-2. Estimated Solid Waste Generated by the Project**

Land Use	Units, Square Footage	Waste Generation Rate	Estimated Waste (tons/year)	Estimated Landfill Waste (55% diversion rate) (tons/year)
Residential	220	0.42 lb/unit/day	15.3	6.9
Commercial/Retail	232,000	5 lbs/1,000 sf/day	192.1	86.4
		Total	207.4 tons/year	93.3 tons/year
			0.57 tons/day	0.26 tons/day

Source: California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. *Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates for Residential, Commercial, and Service Establishments. Estimated Solid Waste Generation and Disposal Rates*. Available: <<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastechar/wastegenrates/>>. Accessed: January 26, 2014.

As described above, waste generated at the Project site would be collected by Recology San Mateo and hauled to Shoreway. Shoreway is permitted to receive 3,000 tons of refuse per day and currently receives approximately 1,500 tons per day. Once collected and sorted at Shoreway, solid waste is transported to Ox Mountain. The landfill is permitted to receive 3,588 tons per day, or approximately 1.3 million tons per year, and has a remaining capacity of over 44 million cubic yards. Solid waste generated by operation of the Project would represent less than 0.1 percent of the

permitted capacity of Shoreway and Ox Mountain.<sup>118</sup> As such, Shoreway and the Ox Mountain would have sufficient capacity to serve the Project, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

The Specific Plan EIR determined that impacts to landfill capacity would be less than significant and, overall, the total anticipated development under the Specific Plan would not exceed remaining capacity at solid waste facilities. The Project is within the growth projections evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR and, as such, would not result in impacts not already evaluated. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Recycling Ordinance, which requires salvage or recycling of at least 60 percent of construction-related solid waste generation. Therefore, the Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity, resulting in a *less-than-significant* impact.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-37 to 4.12-38) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to landfills, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

#### ***g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

### **Effects of the Project**

Construction and operation of the Project would comply with all applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. State law (AB 341 and AB 939) requires that businesses recycle and that cities achieve a 50 percent diversion of solid waste from landfills. The Project would adhere to these laws. In addition, the Project would be required to adhere to the City's Construction and Demolition Recycling Ordinance. Therefore, implementation of the Project would have a *less-than-significant* impact with regard to compliance with solid waste-related statutes and regulations.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR (pages 4.12-37 to 4.12-38) and was also determined to result in a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures were required. The physical conditions, as they relate to solid waste statutes and regulations, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

---

<sup>118</sup> Shoreway capacity = 1,500 tons per day.  $(0.26 \text{ tons per day from the Project} / 1,500 \text{ tons per day}) * 100 = 0.02$  percent. Ox Landfill = 3,588 tons per day permitted.  $(0.26 \text{ tons per day from the Project} / 3,588 \text{ tons per day}) * 100 = 0.007$  percent.

<b>XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance</b>	Significant Impact/ Further Study Needed	Less-than-Significant Impact or Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Polices
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Environmental Checklist and Discussion

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

### Effects of the Project

Construction of the Project would result in short-term impacts on cultural resources and noise. However, in each case, mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce the significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Further, as discussed in Section III, *Biological Resources*, the

Project would not adversely affect biological resources. The Project would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number of rare plants or animals. The Project could adversely affect biological resources if special-status and/or protected species would be found during preconstruction surveys or construction activities. However, implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1a, Mitigation Measure BIO-1b, Mitigation Measure BIO-5a, Mitigation Measure BIO-5b and Mitigation Measure BIO-5c**, as presented in the Specific Plan EIR, would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

As described in Chapter IV, *Cultural Resources*, there are no historic resources at the Project site or in the surrounding area that would be affected by the Project. Therefore, demolition of the existing non-historic buildings at the Project site and construction of the proposed buildings would have a less-than-significant impact on historic resources. The Project could adversely affect cultural resources during construction activities if the presence of buried artifacts or remains were discovered. However, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-2 and Mitigation Measure CUL-3**, as presented in the Specific Plan EIR, would reduce impacts on archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains to *less than significant*.

However, the Project would have the potential to substantially degrade the environment due to operational and construction criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Implementation of **Mitigation Measures AIR-1a and AIR-1b, Mitigation Measure GHG-1, Mitigation Measures GHG-2a and GHG-2b, and Mitigation Measure TR-2** would reduce the impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. However, the Project would not result in impacts more severe than what has been disclosed in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, although impacts of the Project would be *significant and unavoidable*, this has been previously analyzed. Although significant and unavoidable impacts were identified, the Project would not result new specific effects or more significant effects. Consequently, this topic does not require further environmental review.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed throughout the Specific Plan EIR, which considered any impacts associated with air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, and greenhouse gases. These impacts were mitigated throughout the Specific Plan EIR in the respective EIR topics and are applied to the Project, as discussed in Sections II, III, IV, and VI. The physical conditions, as they relate to the degradation of the physical environment, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project.

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

### **Effects of the Project**

As described above, the Project would result in several potentially significant project-level impacts. However, in most cases, mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Further, the Project would not directly result in substantial

population growth beyond that expected for the City and in the Specific Plan area and, therefore, the Project would not contribute to population-driven cumulative impacts (such as population and housing, utilities, recreation, and public services). All reasonably foreseeable future development in the City would be subject to the same land use and environmental regulations that have been described throughout this document. Furthermore, all development projects are guided by policies identified in the Specific Plan and regulations established in the City's Municipal Code. Therefore, compliance with applicable land use and environmental regulations would ensure that environmental effects associated with the Project would not combine with effects from reasonably foreseeable future development in the City to cause cumulatively significant impacts. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant*.

However, the Project would result in *significant and unavoidable* cumulative impacts related to operational and construction criteria pollutant emissions, GHG emissions, and conflicts with applicable air quality and GHG policies. In addition, cumulative air quality and hazardous materials release impacts could result during Project construction and cumulative noise and transportation impacts could result during Project operation. Therefore, this topic requires *further environmental review* in the Infill EIR.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed throughout the Specific Plan EIR, which considered cumulative impacts. These impacts were mitigated throughout the EIR in the respective EIR topics and are applied to the Project, as discussed above. Except for air quality, hazardous materials, noise, and transportation, the physical cumulative conditions have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. However, cumulative conditions as they relate to air quality, hazardous materials, noise, and transportation will be subject to further environmental review in the Infill EIR.

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

### **Effects of the Project**

As identified in this document, the Project would generally not directly or indirectly cause adverse effects on human beings with implementation of mitigation measures. Impacts on topics that could affect the human environment, such as agriculture and forestry resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities would be less than significant. As identified, the Project would have a potentially significant impact on biological resources and cultural resources. These issues could, in turn, affect humans. However, implementation of the mitigation measures identified in each applicable section of this document, and in Attachment A, would reduce potentially significant impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

Regardless, the Project would have *significant and unavoidable* impacts with regard to air quality and GHG emissions, which could have a substantial adverse effect on humans. In addition, the Project could result in significant impacts related to air quality emissions during construction, hazardous materials releases during construction, operational traffic noise, and increased traffic during operation. Therefore, this topic requires *further environmental review* in the Infill EIR.

### **Analysis in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR**

This checklist item was analyzed throughout the Specific Plan EIR, which considered any impacts associated with adverse effects on human beings. These impacts were mitigated throughout the EIR in the respective EIR topics and are applied to the Project, as discussed in Sections I through XVI. The physical conditions, as they relate to the degradation of the physical environment, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. For most topics, no substantial new information has since been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and there would be no new specific effects as a result of the Project. However, further environmental analysis is required in the Infill EIR as it relates to air quality, hazardous materials, noise, and transportation.

