

2. *Executive Summary*

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a summary of the conclusions of this EIR, which consists of the Draft EIR and this Response to Comments Document, and includes an overview of the proposed project. This chapter also provides a summary of the alternatives to the proposed project, identifies issues to be resolved, areas of controversy, and conclusions of the analysis contained in Chapters 4.0 through 4.14 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). For a complete description of the proposed project, see Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. For a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project, see Chapter 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, of the Draft EIR.

This EIR addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An EIR is a public document designed to provide the public and local and State governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making.

This EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA¹ and the CEQA Guidelines² to determine if approval of the identified discretionary actions and related subsequent development could have a significant effect on the environment (i.e., significant impact). The City of Menlo Park, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable City technical personnel and review of all technical subconsultant reports. Information for this EIR was obtained from on-site field observations; discussions with affected agencies; analysis of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies, reports, data, and similar literature in the public domain; and specialized environmental assessments (e.g., air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic).

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This EIR has been prepared to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals.

¹ The CEQA Statute is found at California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Sections 21000-21177.

² The CEQA Guidelines are found at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The main purposes of this EIR as established by CEQA are:

- To disclose to decision-makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
- To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
- To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in the statutes and in the CEQA Guidelines. It provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

2.2.1 DRAFT EIR ORGANIZATION

The Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction.** Provides an overview describing the Draft EIR document.
- **Chapter 2: Executive Summary.** Summarizes the environmental consequences that would result from implementation of the proposed project the alternatives to the proposed project, the recommended mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of environmental impacts with and without mitigation.
- **Chapter 3: Project Description.** Describes the proposed project in detail, including the characteristics, objectives, and the structural and technical elements of the proposed action.
- **Chapter 4: Environmental Evaluation.** Organized into 14 sub-chapters corresponding to the environmental resource categories identified in Appendix G, Environmental Checklist, and Appendix F, Energy Conservation, of the CEQA Guidelines, this chapter provides a description of the physical environmental conditions in the City of Menlo Park as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published, from both a local and regional perspective, as well as an analysis of

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, and recommended mitigation measures, if required, to reduce their significance.

The environmental setting included in each sub-chapter provides baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Each sub-chapter also includes a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project; and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project.

- **Chapter 5: Alternatives to the Proposed Project.** This chapter considers three alternatives to the proposed project, which are the CEQA-required “No Project” Alternative, the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative, and the Reduced Intensity Alternative.
- **Chapter 6: CEQA-Mandated Assessment.** Discusses growth inducement, cumulative impacts, significant unavoidable effects, and significant irreversible changes as a result of the proposed project. Additionally, this chapter identifies environmental issues that were determined not to require further environmental review during the scoping process pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15128.
- **Chapter 7: Organizations and Persons Consulted.** Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of the Draft EIR for the proposed project.
- **Chapter 8: Common Acronyms and Abbreviations.** Lists the common acronyms and abbreviations found in the Draft EIR.
- **Appendices:** The appendices for this EIR (presented on CD in PDF format attached to the back cover) contain the following supporting documents:
 - Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Scoping Comments
 - Appendix B: Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs
 - Appendix C: Public Process and Participation Process
 - Appendix D: Existing Conditions Report
 - Appendix E: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Data
 - Appendix F: Cultural Resources Data
 - Appendix G: Noise Data
 - Appendix H: Public Services Data
 - Appendix I: ConnectMenlo Water Supply Evaluation
 - Appendix J: Housing Element Water Supply Assessment
 - Appendix K: Transportation Data

2.2.2 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This Response to Comments Document is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction.** This chapter discusses the use and organization of this Response to Comments Document.
- **Chapter 2: Executive Summary.** This chapter is a summary of the conclusions of the Draft EIR and the Response to Comments Document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Chapter 3: Revisions to the Draft EIR.** Additional corrections to the text and graphics of the Draft EIR are contained in this chapter. Underline text represents language that has been added to the EIR; text with ~~strikethrough~~ has been deleted from the EIR.
- **Chapter 4: List of Commenters.** Names of agencies, organizations, and individuals who commented on the Draft EIR are included in this chapter.
- **Chapter 5: Comments and Responses.** This chapter lists the comments received from agencies, organizations, and the public on the Draft EIR, and provides responses to those comments.
- **Appendices:** The appendices for the Response to Comments Documents (presented on CD in PDF format attached to the back cover) contain the following supporting documents:
 - Appendix A: Comment Letters
 - Appendix B: Revised Transportation Data
 - Appendix C: Proposed Bayfront Area Zoning Update

2.2.3 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EIR

According to Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of an EIR is to:

Inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

Because of the long-term planning horizon of the proposed project and the permitting, planning, and development actions that are related both geographically and as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions for implementation, this EIR has been prepared as a program EIR for the proposed project, pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Once a program EIR has been certified, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether additional CEQA review needs to be prepared. However, if the program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as possible, subsequent activities could be found to be within the program EIR scope, and additional environmental review may not be required (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c]). When a program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into the subsequent activities (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c][3]). If a subsequent activity would have effects that are not within the scope of a program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR. For these subsequent environmental review documents, this Program EIR will serve as the first-tier environmental analysis. This program EIR can also serve to streamline future environmental review of subsequent projects. See Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Draft EIR, for additional discussion on application of this program EIR to future development projects in Menlo Park.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.3 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT

With the Housing, Open Space/Conservation, Noise and Safety Elements of the General Plan having been recently updated, the focus of the proposed project is on the Land Use and Circulation Elements. The City of Menlo Park has undertaken a community-based planning process to review changes to these elements as part of a focused General Plan Update. A major focus of the proposed project is balancing potential development impacts and the provision of community benefits, especially for the Belle Haven neighborhood. Targeted community benefits include alternative transportation to alleviate severe traffic congestion, housing to support both the adjacent neighborhood and the increasing workforce, and expanded service and retail uses.

The Land Use Element frames the type and scale of potential development that may occur, particularly in the Bayfront Area, which is the area generally between US 101 and the San Francisco Bay and where most change is expected in Menlo Park over the next two decades. The proposed Land Use and Circulation Elements are intended to guide development and conservation in the city through the 2040 buildout horizon of this General Plan. These two elements are central components of the General Plan because they describe which land uses should be allowed in the city, where those land uses should be located, how those land uses may be accessed and connected, and how development of those uses should be managed so as to minimize impacts and maximize benefits to the city and its residents. The Circulation Element addresses transportation issues throughout the city, and both updated Elements will be consistent with the other General Plan Elements. The proposed project aims to improve transportation connections citywide for all modes of travel and to upgrade traffic metrics to keep up with the area's fast rate of development.

This EIR also assesses the proposed zoning provisions for the Bayfront Area, which is the focus of future land use changes under the proposed project, to implement the updated General Plan programs, including development regulations and design standards for the Bayfront Area. The updated Zoning Ordinance will include the creation of three new zoning districts in the Bayfront Area. Properties in the Bayfront Area will be rezoned with the new zoning designations for consistency with the General Plan.

2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This EIR analyzes alternatives to the proposed project that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and feasibly attain some of the proposed project objectives. There is no set methodology for comparing the alternatives or determining the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative involves weighing and balancing all of the environmental resource areas by the City. The following alternatives to the proposed project were considered and analyzed in detail:

- No Project Alternative (represents continuation of the current General Plan)
- Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative (results in 50 percent less of the proposed project's new non-residential development in the M-2 Area only)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Reduced Intensity Alternative (results in 25 percent less of the proposed project’s new non-residential and residential development in the M-2 Area only)

Table 2-1 provides a summary of the development projections for each alternative that is analyzed in this EIR. As shown in Table 2-1, the proposed project provides the most conservative and worst-case analysis for CEQA purposes.

TABLE 2-1 ALTERNATIVES PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL COMPARISON SUMMARY

Category	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative ^c	Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative ^d	Reduced Intensity Alternative ^e
Non-Residential Square Feet	4.1 million	1.8 million	2.6 million	3.5 million
Hotel Rooms ^a	400	0	200	300
Residential Units	5,500	1,000	5,500	4,375
Population ^b	14,150	2,580	14,150	11,258
Employees	9,900	4,400	7,150	8,525

Notes:

a. An unknown number of additional hotel rooms could be proposed under the current General Plan.

b. Assumes 2.57 persons per household per Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) *Projections 2013, Subregional Study Area Table*.

c. This represents the previously-approved and ongoing development potential under the existing General Plan. This represents what could be built if the proposed project were not approved, which is the previously-approved and ongoing development potential under the existing General Plan.

d. The “Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative” assumes a 50 percent reduction of the 2.3 million square feet of non-residential development proposed in the Bayfront Area (1.2 million square feet) plus the previously-approved and ongoing development potential under the existing General Plan (1.4 million square feet).

e. The “Reduced Intensity Alternative” assumes a 25 percent reduction in the amount of residential (3,375 units) and non-residential (1.7 million square feet) development in the Bayfront Area plus the previously-approved and ongoing development potential under the existing General Plan (150 units and 1.4 million square feet non-residential).

Chapter 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, of the Draft EIR, includes a complete discussion of these alternatives and of alternatives that were considered, but not carried forward for detailed analysis. Also Chapter 5, Responses to Comments, of this Response to Comments Document, includes additional detailed breakdown of development projections for each alternative under Master Response 4, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

2.5 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the City of Menlo Park, as lead agency, related to:

- Whether the EIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the proposed project.
- Whether the benefits of the proposed project override those environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
- Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
- Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the proposed project besides those mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR.
- Whether there are any alternatives to the proposed project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic objectives.

2.6 AREAS OF CONCERN

The City issued an NOP on June 18, 2015. The scoping period for this EIR was between June 18 and July 20, 2015, during which interested agencies and the public could submit comments about the proposed project. The City also held a public scoping meeting on September 21, 2015. During this time the City received 22 comment letters from 10 agencies and service providers, and eight organizations and members of the public, which are included as Appendix A of this Draft EIR.

The following is a discussion of issues that are likely to be of particular concern to agencies and interested members of the public during the environmental review process. While every concern applicable to the CEQA process is addressed in this Draft EIR, this list is not necessarily exhaustive, but rather attempts to capture those concerns that are likely to generate the greatest interest based on the input received during the scoping process.

- Aesthetic: impacts from increased height, sources of light and glare
- Affordable Housing: availability of affordable housing stock
- Air Quality: operational and construction impacts, health risk due to close proximity to major roadways
- Approved Projects: cumulative impacts from Facebook Campus Expansion Project
- Biological Resources: wetlands, human-wildlife interface
- Climate Adaptation: flood risk along Bayfront due to projected future sea level rise
- Public Services: impacts from population growth on schools and fire services
- Utilities and Service Systems: water quality, hydrology, storm water runoff
- Vehicular Circulation: traffic impact, parking demand, safe pedestrian access, bicycle safety connections

2.7 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance.

The proposed project has the potential to generate significant environmental impacts in a number of areas. As shown in Table 2-2, some significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level if the mitigation measures identified in this Draft EIR are adopted and implemented. However, pursuant to Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, which requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, as shown in Table 2-1, significant unavoidable impacts were identified in the areas of Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Population and Housing (Cumulative), and Transportation and Circulation. In addition, cumulative impacts with respect to Population and Housing were found to be significant and unavoidable. For a complete summary of the significant and unavoidable impacts, please see Section 6.2 in Chapter 6, CEQA-Mandated Assessment, of this Draft EIR. As described in detail in Chapter 6, the proposed project would have no significant impact on agricultural, forestry and mineral resources due to existing conditions in the City of Menlo Park. Accordingly, these topics have not been analyzed further in this Draft EIR.

Table 2-2 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this Draft EIR and presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified. It is organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapters 4.1 through 4.14. Table 2-2 is arranged in four columns: 1) environmental impact; 2) significance without mitigation; 3) mitigation measures; and 4) significance with mitigation. For a complete description of potential impacts, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapters 4.1 through 4.14.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
Aesthetics			
AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the view from a scenic highway, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people on- or off- site to substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-5: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics.	LTS	N/A	N/A
Air Quality			
AQ-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-2a: Despite implementation of the proposed project policies as identified in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, Table 4.2-8, criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would cause a substantial net increase in emissions that exceeds the Bay Area Quality Management District (BAAQMD) regional significance thresholds.	S	AQ-2a: Prior to issuance of a building permits, all development projects in the city that are subject to CEQA and exceed the screening sizes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City’s Planning Division a technical assessment evaluating potential project-related operational air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If operational-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as identified in BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines, the project applicant is required to incorporate	SU

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
<p>AQ-2b: Despite implementation of the proposed project policies, criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project construction activities would generate a substantial net increase in emissions that exceeds the BAAQMD regional significance thresholds.</p>	S	<p>mitigation measures into the development project to reduce air pollutant emissions during operation. The identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division prior to building permit issuance.</p> <p>AQ-2b1: Prior to building permit issuance, the City shall require applicants for all development projects in the city to comply with the current Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) basic control measures for reducing construction emissions of PM10 (Table 8-1, Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for All Proposed Projects, of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines).</p> <p>AQ-2b2: Prior to issuance of a building permit, development projects in the City that are subject to CEQA and exceed the screening sizes in the BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City of Menlo Park a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as identified in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the project applicant is required to incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities to below these thresholds (e.g., Table 8-2, Additional Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for projects with Construction Emissions Above the Threshold of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, or applicable construction mitigation measures subsequently approved by BAAQMD). These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans), subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division prior to building permit issuance. Division.</p>	SU
<p>AQ-3a: Warehousing operations could generate a substantial amount of diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from off-road equipment use and truck idling. In addition, some warehousing, research and</p>	S	<p>AQ-3a: As part of the discretionary review process for development applications, applicants for all non-residential projects within the City that: 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
development, and industrial facilities may include use of transport refrigeration units (TRUs) for cold storage that could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.		<p>powered TRUs, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of a proposed project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City's Planning Division. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds 10 in one million (10E-06), PM2.5 concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Mitigation measures may include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible. ▪ Electrifying warehousing docks. ▪ Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. ▪ Restricting off-site truck travel through the creation of truck routes. <p>Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific HRA shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of a proposed project, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.</p>	
AQ-3b: Placement of new sensitive land uses near major sources of air pollution could be exposed to elevated concentrations of air pollutants.	S	AQ-3b: As part of the discretionary review process, applicants for all residential and other sensitive land use projects (e.g., hospitals, nursing homes, day care centers) anywhere in the City within 1,000 feet of a major sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs) (e.g., warehouses, industrial areas, freeways, and roadways with traffic volumes over 10,000 vehicle per day), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the source/edge of the nearest travel lane, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City's Planning Division. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children ages 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), PM2.5 concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Air intakes located away from high volume roadways and/or truck loading zones. ▪ Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized maximum efficiency rating value (MERV) filters. <p>Measures identified in the HRA shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.</p>	
AQ-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not create or expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-5: Despite implementation of the General Plan policies, criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the General Plan would generate a substantial net increase in emissions that exceeds the BAAQMD regional significance thresholds.	S	AQ-5: Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2a through AQ-3b.	SU
Biological Resources			
BIO-1: Impacts to special-status species or the inadvertent loss of bird nests in active use, which would conflict with	S	BIO-1: As part of the discretionary review process for development projects on sites in the M-2 Area, the City shall require all project	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
<p>the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code could occur as a result of new development potential in the Bayfront Area and from existing and ongoing development potential in the remainder of the city if adequate controls are not implemented.</p>		<p>applicants to prepare and submit project-specific baseline biological resources assessments (BRA) if the project would occur on or within 10 feet of a site(s) containing natural habitat with features such as mature and native trees or unused structures that could support special-status species and other sensitive biological resources, and active nests of common birds protected under Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Sensitive biological resources triggering the need for the baseline BRA may include: wetlands, occurrences or suitable habitat for special-status species, sensitive natural communities, and important movement corridors for wildlife such as creek corridors and shorelines. The baseline BRA shall be prepared by a qualified biologist. The baseline BRA shall provide a determination on whether any sensitive biological resources are present on or within 10 feet of the property, including jurisdictional wetlands and waters, essential habitat for special-status species, and sensitive natural communities. The baseline BRA shall include consideration of possible sensitive biological resources on undeveloped lands within 10 feet of the property as well, particularly lands of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge (Refuge). If sensitive biological resources are determined to be present, appropriate measures, such as preconstruction surveys, establishing no-disturbance zones during construction, and applying bird-safe building design practices and materials, shall be developed by the qualified biologist to provide adequate avoidance or compensatory mitigation if avoidance is infeasible. Where jurisdictional waters or federally and/or State-listed special-status species would be affected, appropriate authorizations shall be obtained by the project applicant, and evidence of such authorization provided to the City prior to issuance of grading or other construction permits. For properties that are within 10 feet of undeveloped lands, particularly permanent open space lands of the Refuge, this shall include consideration of the potential effects of additional light, glare, and noise generated by the project, as well as the possibility for increased activity from humans and/or domesticated pets and their effects on the nearby natural habitats. The City of Menlo Park Planning Division may require an independent peer review of the adequacy of the baseline</p>	

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		BRA as part of the review of the project to confirm its adequacy. Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific BRA shall be incorporated as a component of a proposed project and subsequent building permit, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.	
BIO-2: Impacts to coastal salt marsh vegetation in the baylands, and possibly areas of riparian scrub and woodland along San Francisquito Creek and other drainages in the study area could occur as a result of new development potential in the Bayfront Area and from existing and ongoing development potential in the remainder of the city if adequate controls are not implemented.	S	BIO-2: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.	LTS
BIO-3: Implementation of the proposed project could result in direct and indirect impacts to wetland habitat if adequate controls are not implemented.	S	BIO-3: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.	LTS
BIO-4: Implementation of the proposed project could result in impacts on the movement of fish and wildlife, wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites if adequate controls are not implemented.	S	BIO-4: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.	LTS
BIO-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-6: Impacts to sensitive habitat in the Stanford Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) area could occur as a result of existing development potential in the study area that is located within the Stanford HCP area if adequate controls are not implemented.	S	BIO-6: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.	LTS
BIO-7: Implementation of the proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to biological resources.	S	BIO-7: Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4 and BIO-6.	LTS

Cultural Resources

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
<p>CULT-1: Future development in Menlo Park could lead to demolition and alteration that has the potential to change the historic fabric or setting of historic architectural resources such that the resource’s ability to convey its significance may be materially impaired.</p>	S	<p>CULT-1: At the time that individual projects are proposed on any site citywide with a building more than 50 years old or any site adjoining a property with a building more than 50 years old, the City shall require the project applicant to prepare a site-specific evaluation to determine if the project is subject to completion of a site-specific historic resources study. If it is determined that a site-specific historic resources study is required, the study shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architecture or Architectural History. At a minimum, the study shall consist of a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System, an intensive-level pedestrian field survey, an evaluation of significance using standard National Register Historic Preservation and California Register Historic Preservation evaluation criteria, and recordation of all identified historic buildings and structures on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 Site Record forms. The study shall describe the historic context and setting, methods used in the investigation, results of the evaluation, and recommendations for management of identified resources. If applicable, the specific requirements for inventory areas and documentation format required by certain agencies, such as the Federal Highway Administration and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), shall be adhered to.</p> <p>If the project site or adjacent properties are found to be eligible for listing on the California Register, the project shall be required to conform to the current <i>Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, and Restoring Historic Buildings</i>, which require the preservation of character defining features which convey a building’s historical significance, and offers guidance about appropriate and compatible alterations to such structures.</p>	LTS
<p>CULT-2a: Implementation of the proposed project could have the potential to cause a significant impact to an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.</p>	S	<p>CULT-2a: If a potentially significant subsurface cultural resource is encountered during ground disturbing activities on any parcel in the city, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until a qualified archeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. All developers in the study area shall</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
CULT-2b: Future development in Menlo Park could impact archeological resources without proper consultation with Native American Tribes.	S	include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction activities shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) criteria by a qualified archeologist. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses; prepare a comprehensive report complete with methods, results, and recommendations; and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered resources. The report shall be submitted to the City of Menlo Park, Northwest Information Center (NWIC), and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), if required.	LTS
CULT-3: Implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to directly or indirectly affect a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature.	S	CULT-2b: As part of the City’s application approval process and prior to project approval, the City shall consult with those Native American Tribes with ancestral ties to the Menlo Park city limits regarding General Plan Amendments in the city and land use policy changes. Upon receipt of an application for proposed project that requires a General Plan Amendment or a land use policy change, the City shall submit a request for a list of Native American Tribes to be contacted about the proposed project to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Upon receipt of the list of Native American Tribes from the NAHC, the City shall submit a letter to each Tribe on the provided list requesting consultation with the Native American Tribe about the proposed project via the via the City’s preferred confirmation of receipt correspondence tracking method (e.g., Federal Express, United States Postal Service Certified Mail, etc.). CULT-3: In the event that fossils or fossil bearing deposits are discovered during ground disturbing activities anywhere in the city, excavations within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. Ground disturbance work shall cease until a City-approved qualified paleontologist determines whether the resource	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
<p>CULT-4: Ground-disturbing activities as a result of future development in Menlo Park could encounter human remains the disturbance of those remains could result in a significant impact under CEQA.</p>	S	<p>requires further study. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed (in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards [Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995]), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction activities are allowed to resume at the location of the find. If avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of construction activities on the discovery. The excavation plan shall be submitted to the City of Menlo Park for review and approval prior to implementation, and all construction activity shall adhere to the recommendations in the excavation plan.</p> <p>CULT-4: Procedures of conduct following the discovery of human remains citywide have been mandated by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA). According to the provisions in CEQA, if human remains are encountered at the site, all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease and necessary steps to ensure the integrity of the immediate area shall be taken. The San Mateo County Coroner shall be notified immediately. The Coroner shall then determine whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC within 24 hours, who will, in turn, notify the person the NAHC identifies as the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of any human remains. Further actions shall be determined, in part, by the desires of the MLD. The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations regarding the disposition of the remains following notification from the NAHC of the discovery. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the owner shall, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. Alternatively, if the owner does not accept the MLD’s recommendations, the owner or the descendant may request mediation by the NAHC.</p>	LTS
<p>CULT-5: Ground-disturbing activities as a result of future</p>	S	<p>CULT-5a: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-2a.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
development in Menlo Park could encounter Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) the disturbance of which could result in a significant impact under CEQA.		CULT-5b: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-2b. CULT-5c: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-4.	
CULT-6: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in a significant cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resources.	S	CULT-6: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-1, CULT-2a, CULT-2b, CULT-3, and CULT-4.	LTS
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity			
GEO-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landsliding.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to development on unstable geologic units and soils or result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not create substantial risks to property as a result of its location on expansive soil, as defined by Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-5: Implementation of the proposed project would have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-6: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils, and seismicity.	LTS	N/A	N/A

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
GHG-1: The proposed project would result in a substantial increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from existing conditions by the proposed General Plan horizon year 2040 and would not achieve the 2040 efficiency target, which is based on a trajectory to the 2050 goal of an 80 percent reduction from 1990 levels pursuant to Executive Order S-03-05. Additional state and federal actions are necessary to ensure that state and federally regulated sources (i.e., sources outside the City’s jurisdictional control) take similar aggressive measures to ensure the deep cuts needed to achieve the 2050 target.	S	GHG-1: Prior to January 1, 2020, the City of Menlo Park shall update the Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address the GHG reduction goals of Executive Order B-30-15 and Executive Order S-03-05 for GHG sectors that the City has direct or indirect jurisdictional control over. The City shall identify a GHG emissions reduction target for year 2030 and 2040 that is consistent with the GHG reduction goals identified in Executive Order B-30-15 and Executive Order S-03-05. The CAP shall be updated to include measures to ensure that the City is on a trajectory that aligns with the state’s 2030 GHG emissions reduction target.	SU
GHG-2: While the proposed project supports progress toward the long term-goals identified in Executive Order B-30-15 and Executive Order S-03-05, it cannot yet be demonstrated that Menlo Park will achieve GHG emissions reductions that are consistent with a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2030 or an 80 percent reduction below 1990 levels by the year 2050 based on existing technologies and currently adopted policies and programs.	S	GHG-2: Implement of Mitigation Measure GHG-1.	SU
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HAZ-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
<p>HAZ-4: Implementation of the proposed project could occur on sites with known hazardous materials and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</p>	S	<p>HAZ-4a: Construction at the sites of any site in the City with known contamination, shall be conducted under a project-specific Environmental Site Management Plan (ESMP) that is prepared in consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), as appropriate. The purpose of the ESMP is to protect construction workers, the general public, the environment, and future site occupants from subsurface hazardous materials previously identified at the site and to address the possibility of encountering unknown contamination or hazards in the subsurface. The ESMP shall summarize soil and groundwater analytical data collected on the project site during past investigations; identify management options for excavated soil and groundwater, if contaminated media are encountered during deep excavations; and identify monitoring, irrigation, or other wells requiring proper abandonment in compliance with local, State, and federal laws, policies, and regulations.</p> <p>The ESMP shall include measures for identifying, testing, and managing soil and groundwater suspected of or known to contain hazardous materials. The ESMP shall: 1) provide procedures for evaluating, handling, storing, testing, and disposing of soil and groundwater during project excavation and dewatering activities, respectively; 2) describe required worker health and safety provisions for all workers potentially exposed to hazardous materials in accordance with State and federal worker safety regulations; and 3) designate personnel responsible for implementation of the ESMP.</p> <p>HAZ-4b: For those sites throughout the city with potential residual contamination in soil, gas, or groundwater that are planned for redevelopment with an overlying occupied building, a vapor intrusion assessment shall be performed by a licensed environmental professional. If the results of the vapor intrusion assessment indicate the potential for significant vapor intrusion into an occupied building, project design shall include vapor controls or source removal, as appropriate, in accordance with regulatory agency requirements. Soil vapor mitigations or controls could</p>	LTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		include vapor barriers, passive venting, and/or active venting. The vapor intrusion assessment and associated vapor controls or source removal can be incorporated into the ESMP (Mitigation Measure HAZ-4a).	
HAZ-5: The proposed project would not be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport it results in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the study area.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-6: The proposed project would not be within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the study area.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
HAZ-7: The proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-8: The proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-9: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.	S	HAZ-9: Implement Mitigation Measures HAZ-4a and HAZ-4b.	LTS
Hydrology and Water Quality			
HYDRO-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).			
HYDRO-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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 amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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 which would result in flooding on- or off-site.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-7: Implementation of the proposed project would 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-8: Implementation of the proposed project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-9: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a levee or dam break or flooding as a result of sea level rise.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
HYDRO-10: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-11: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A
Land Use Planning			
LU-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LU-2: Future development proposals in Menlo Park could be inconsistent with the applicable goals, policies and programs in the General Plan that have been prepared to reduce and/or avoid impacts to the environment and the supporting Zoning standards.	S	LU-2: As part of the discretionary review process for development projects, all proposed development anywhere in Menlo Park is required to demonstrate consistency with the applicable goals, policies, and programs in the General Plan and the supporting Zoning standards to the satisfaction of the City of Menlo Park’s Community Development Department. A future project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning standards if, considering all its aspects, it will further the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan and supporting Zoning standards and not obstruct their attainment.	LTS
LU-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LU-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning.	S	LU-4: Implement Mitigation Measure LU-2.	LTS
Noise			
NOISE-1: Future projects in Menlo Park could result in development that exceed noise limits required under Title 24 and the City’s regulations.	S	NOISE-1a: To meet the requirements of Title 24 and General Plan Program N1.A, project applicants shall perform acoustical studies prior to issuance of building permits for citywide development of new noise-sensitive uses. New residential dwellings, hotels, motels, dormitories, and school classrooms must meet an interior noise limit	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>of 45 dBA CNEL or L_{dn}. Developments in areas exposed to more than 60 dBA CNEL must demonstrate that the structure has been designed to limit interior noise in habitable rooms to acceptable noise levels. Where exterior noise levels are projected to exceed 60 dBA CNEL or L_{dn} at the façade of a building, a report must be submitted with the building plans describing the noise control measures that have been incorporated into the design of the project to meet the 45 dBA noise limit. Project applicants for all new multi-family residential projects subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department, prior to building permit issuance, must perform acoustical studies within the projected L_{dn} 60 dB noise contours, so that noise mitigation measures can be incorporated into project design and site planning, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.</p> <p>NOISE-1b: Stationary noise sources and landscaping and maintenance activities citywide shall comply with Chapter 8.06, Noise, of the Menlo Park Municipal Code.</p> <p>NOISE-1c: Project applicants for all development projects in the city shall minimize the exposure of nearby properties to excessive noise levels from construction-related activity through CEQA review, conditions of approval and/or enforcement of the City’s Noise Ordinance. Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, and/or building permits for development projects, a note shall be provided on development plans indicating that during on-going grading, demolition, and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction activity is limited to the daytime hours between 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday, as prescribed in the City’s municipal code. ▪ All internal combustion engines on construction equipment and trucks are fitted with properly maintained mufflers, air intake silencers, and/or engine shrouds that are no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer. 	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
NOISE-2: Future projects in Menlo Park could cause exposure of people to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stationary equipment such as generators and air compressors shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive uses. ▪ Stockpiling is located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors. ▪ Limit unnecessary engine idling to the extent feasible. ▪ Limit the use of public address systems. ▪ Construction traffic shall be limited to the haul routes established by the City of Menlo Park. <p>NOISE-2a: To prevent architectural damage citywide as a result of construction-generated vibration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to issuance of a building permit for any development project requiring pile driving or blasting, the project applicant/developer shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. The maximum levels shall not exceed 0.2 inch/second, which is the level that can cause architectural damage for typical residential construction. If maximum levels would exceed these thresholds, alternative methods such static rollers, non-explosive blasting, and drilling piles as opposed to pile driving shall be used <p>To prevent vibration-induced annoyance as a result of construction-generated vibration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities, such as blasting, pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, within 200 feet of sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. A vibration study shall be conducted for individual projects where vibration-intensive impacts may occur. The study shall be prepared by an acoustical or vibration engineer holding a degree in engineering, physics, or allied discipline and who is able to demonstrate a minimum of two years of experience in preparing technical assessments in acoustics and/or groundborne vibrations. The study is subject to review and approval of the Community Development Department. <p style="text-align: center;">Vibration impacts to nearby receptors shall not exceed the vibration</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>annoyance levels (in RMS inches/second) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Workshop = 0.126 ▪ Office = 0.063 ▪ Residential Daytime (7AM–10PM)= 0.032 ▪ Residential Nighttime (10PM to 7 AM) = 0.016 <p>If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses, additional requirements, such as use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques, shall be implemented during construction (e.g., nonexplosive blasting methods, drilled piles as opposed to pile driving, preclusion for using vibratory rollers, use of small- or medium-sized bulldozers, etc.). Vibration reduction measures shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the project and applicable building plans, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.</p> <p>NOISE-2b: To reduce long-term vibration impacts of future development citywide on existing or potential future sensitive uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Locate sensitive uses away from vibration sources. ▪ Design industrial development to minimize vibration impacts on nearby uses. Where vibration impacts may occur, reduce impacts on residences and businesses through the use of setbacks and/or structural design features that reduce vibration to levels at or below the guidelines of the Federal Transit Administration near rail lines and industrial uses. ▪ Work with the railroad operators (e.g., Caltrain, Union Pacific, etc.) to reduce, to the extent possible, the contribution of railroad train noise and vibration to Menlo Park's noise environment. 	
<p>NOISE-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project.</p>	LTS	N/A	N/A
<p>NOISE-4: Future projects in Menlo Park could result in construction-related noise that exceeds noise limits required under the City's regulations.</p>	S	<p>NOISE-4: Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-1c.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
NOISE-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause exposure of people residing or working in the vicinity of the study area to excessive aircraft noise levels, for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause exposure of people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE-7: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to noise.	S	NOISE-7: Implement Mitigation Measures NOISE-1a through NOISE-1c, NOISE-2a, NOISE-2b, and NOISE-4.	LTS
Population and Housing			
POP-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, or growth, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to population and housing.	S	There are no available mitigation measures available to reduce this impact because the regional growth projections	SU
Public Services and Recreation			

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
PS-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A		N/A
PS-2: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to fire protection services.	LTS	N/A		N/A
PS-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A		N/A
PS-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to police services.	LTS	N/A		N/A
PS-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered park facilities or other recreational facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A		N/A
PS-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A		N/A
PS-7: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant	LTS	N/A		N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
cumulative impacts with respect to parks.			
PS-8: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-9: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to school services.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-10: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-11: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to libraries.	LTS	N/A	N/A
Transportation and Circulation			
TRANS-1a: Implementation of the proposed project would exceed the City's current impact thresholds under the 2040 Plus Project conditions at some roadway segments in the study area.	S	TRANS-1a: Widen impacted roadway segments at appropriate locations throughout the city to add travel lanes and capacity to accommodate the increase in net daily trips.	SU
TRANS-1b: Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased delay to peak hour motor vehicle traffic exceeding the significance threshold at some of the study intersections.	S	TRANS-1b: The City of Menlo Park shall update the existing Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to guarantee funding for citywide roadway and infrastructure improvements that are necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards. The fees shall be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a more intensive use. The fees collected shall be applied toward circulation improvements. The fees shall be calculated by multiplying the	SU

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel room by the appropriate rate. Transportation Impact fees shall be included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City shall use the Transportation Impact Fees to fund construction (or to recoup fees advanced to fund construction) of the transportation improvements identified below, among other things that at the time of potential future development may be warranted to mitigate traffic impacts. It should be noted that any project proposed prior to the adoption of an updated TIF will be required to conduct a project-specific Transportation Impact Assessment to determine the impacts and necessary transportation mitigations that are to be funded by that project.</p>	
		<p>As part of the update to the TIF program, the City shall also prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the proposed project. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the improvements and facilities required to mitigate the impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed project. The following examples of improvements and facilities would reduce impacts to acceptable level of service standards and these, among other improvements, could be included in the TIF program impact fees nexus study:</p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sand Hill Road (westbound) and I-280 Northbound On-ramp (#1): Modify the signal-timing plan during the PM peak hour to increase the maximum allocation of green time to the westbound approach during the PM peak hour. ▪ Sand Hill Road (eastbound) and I-280 Northbound Off-ramp (#2): Add an additional northbound right-turn lane on the off-ramp to improve operations to acceptable LOS D during the AM peak hour. ▪ El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue (#28): One eastbound right-turn lane on Menlo Avenue to improve conditions. 	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Willow Road and Newbridge Street (#33): Implement measures on Chilco Street south of Constitution Drive to reduce or prevent cut-through traffic through the Belle Haven neighborhood, such as peak-hour turn restrictions from Constitution Drive to southbound Chilco Street, and measures to enhance east/west circulation from Willow Road via O’Brien Drive and the proposed mixed-use collector street opposite Ivy Drive, extending east to University Avenue, to discourage use of Newbridge Street. ▪ Willow Road and Hamilton Avenue (#36): Provide primary access to potential future development sites east of Willow Road via O’Brien Drive and/or the proposed Mixed-Use Collector that would intersect Willow Road between Hamilton Avenue and O’Brien Drive. Implement measures on Chilco Street south of Constitution Drive to prevent cut-through traffic through the Belle Haven neighborhood, such as peak-hour turn restrictions from Constitution Drive to southbound Chilco Street. Although the provision of an eastbound left-turn lane on Hamilton Avenue where it approaches Willow Road would reduce the delay, this potential mitigation is not recommend because it would encourage cut-through traffic via Chilco Street and Hamilton Avenue, potentially affecting the Belle Haven neighborhood. Therefore, to avoid facilitating the use of Chilco Street and Hamilton Avenue as cut-through routes in the adjacent residential neighborhood, mitigating this traffic impact is not recommended at this time, consistent with City policies that discourage cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods. The improvements should be incorporated into the updated fee program for ongoing consideration. ▪ Bayfront Expressway and Willow Road (#37): Evaluate the potential for grade separation to allow conflicting movements to occur simultaneously. The evaluation must consider traffic improvements, along with potential secondary impacts caused by potential right-of-way acquisition, impacts to adjacent wetlands and the Dumbarton Rail corridor, as well as potential impacts or benefits for multi-modal accommodation. If found feasible, the updated fee program should incorporate fair-share contributions 	

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>from future development towards grade separation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bayfront Expressway and University Avenue (#38): Evaluate the potential for grade separation to allow conflicting movements to occur simultaneously. The evaluation must consider traffic improvements, along with potential secondary impacts caused by potential right-of-way acquisition, impacts to adjacent wetlands and the Dumbarton Rail corridor, as well as potential impacts or benefits for multi-modal accommodation. If found feasible, the updated fee program should incorporate fair-share contributions from future development towards grade separation. ▪ Chilco Street and Constitution Drive (#45): Install a traffic signal and signalized crosswalks at the intersection. Construct three southbound lanes on the one-block segment of Chilco Street, between Bayfront Expressway and Chilco Street, to include two southbound left-turn lanes to accommodate the volume of left-turning vehicles entering the project site. In addition, during the AM peak hour, provide a “split-phase” signal operation on Chilco Street. Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Chilco Street approaching Constitution Drive. Construct two outbound lanes on Chilco Street between Constitution Drive and Bayfront Expressway. If the Facebook Campus Expansion Project is approved, this mitigation measure would be required to be constructed as a requirement of that project. ▪ Chrysler Drive and Constitution Drive (#46): Construct a southbound left-turn on Chrysler Drive, approaching Constitution Drive. ▪ University Avenue and Adams Drive (#47): Install a traffic signal at this intersection. ▪ University Avenue and Bay Road (#51): Realign the eastbound and westbound approaches to allow replacement of the east/west “split-phase” signal on Bay Street with standard protected signal phases in order to allow eastbound and westbound pedestrian crossings to occur simultaneously, which would allow for an increase in green time allocated to northbound/southbound movements on University Avenue and reduce peak-hour delay at 	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>this intersection. This intersection is located in the City of East Palo Alto and under the control of Caltrans. If this measure if found feasible by the City of East Palo Alto, the improvements should be incorporated into the City of Menlo Park’s updated fee program to collect fair-share contributions from future development towards such improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ University Avenue and Donohoe Street (#54): Mitigating this impact would require providing additional westbound lane capacity on Donohoe Street, including an extended dual left-turn pocket, dedicated through lane, and dual right-turn lanes; providing a southbound right-turn lane on University Avenue and lengthening the northbound turn pockets. However, this mitigation is likely to be infeasible given right-of-way limitations, proximity to existing US 101 on- and off-ramps, and adjacent properties. In addition, this intersection is located in the City of East Palo Alto and under the control of Caltrans. If this measure if found feasible by the City of East Palo Alto, the improvements should be incorporated into the City of Menlo Park’s updated fee program to collect fair-share contributions from future development towards such improvements. ▪ University Avenue and US 101 Southbound Ramps (#56): Mitigating this impact would require modifications to the US 101 Southbound On/Off Ramps and at this location This intersection is located in the City of East Palo Alto and under the control of Caltrans. If this measure if found feasible by the City of East Palo Alto, the improvements should be incorporated into the City of Menlo Park’s updated fee program to collect fair-share contributions from future development towards such improvements. ▪ Chilco Street and Hamilton Avenue (#60): Installation of a traffic signal would mitigate this impact to less than significant levels, but would have the undesirable secondary effect of encouraging the use of Chilco Street as a cut-through route, which conflicts with City goals that aim to reduce cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods. Therefore, to avoid facilitating cut-through traffic, mitigating this traffic impact by increasing 	

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		capacity is not recommended at this time, but should be incorporated into the updated fee program for ongoing consideration.	
TRANS-2: Implementation of the proposed project would result in impacts to Routes of Regional Significance.	S	Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	SU
TRANS-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
TRANS-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANS-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANS-6a: Implementation of the proposed project would not provide adequate pedestrian or bicycle facilities to connect to the area-wide circulation system.	S	TRANS-6a: The City of Menlo Park shall update the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to provide funding for citywide bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards. The fees shall be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a more intensive use. The fees collected shall be applied toward improvements that will connect development sites within the area circulation system, including the elimination of gaps in the citywide pedestrian and bicycle network. The fees shall be calculated by multiplying the proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel room by the appropriate rate. Transportation Impact fees shall be included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City shall use the transportation Impact fees to fund construction (or to recoup fees advanced to fund construction) of the transportation improvements identified in this mitigation measure, among other things that at the time of potential future development may be warranted to mitigate traffic impacts. It should be noted that any project proposed prior to the adoption of an updated TIF will be required to conduct a project-specific Transportation Impact Assessment to determine the impacts	SU

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>and necessary pedestrian or bicycle facilities mitigations that are to be funded by that project.</p> <p>As part of the update to the TIF program, the City shall also prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the proposed project. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the bicycle and pedestrian improvements and facilities required to mitigate the traffic impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed project. The following examples of pedestrian and bicycle improvements would reduce impacts to acceptable standards, and these, among others improvements, could be included in the updated TIF program, also described under TRANS-1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US 101 Pedestrian & Bicycle Overcrossing at Marsh Road, and Marsh Road Corridor Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements (Haven Avenue to Marsh Road/Bay Road): Provide pedestrian and bicycle circulation between the Bayfront Area east of US 101 with the area circulation system west of US 101 along Marsh Road, including access to schools and commercial sites west of Marsh Road that are accessed via Bay Road and Florence Street. Improvements should facilitate pedestrian and bicycle circulation between Haven Avenue and across US 101 near Marsh Road. The recommended improvement would include a dedicated pedestrian and bicycle crossing adjacent to Marsh Road. Alternatively, the provision of continuous sidewalks with controlled pedestrian crossings and Class IV protected bicycle lanes on the Marsh Road overpass, if feasible, could mitigate this impact. ▪ Ringwood Avenue Corridor Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements (Belle Haven to Middlefield Road): Eliminate pedestrian and bicycle facility gaps on primary access routes to the Ringwood Avenue bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing of US 101 (located near the terminus of Ringwood Avenue and Market Place). 	

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>Improvements should include complete sidewalks on the north side of Pierce Road and bicycle facility improvements on the proposed Ringwood Avenue-Market Place-Hamilton Avenue bicycle boulevard (see Street Classification Map in Chapter 3, Project Description). These improvements would also enhance pedestrian and bicycle access to Menlo-Atherton High School.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ University Avenue Pedestrian Improvements: Eliminate gaps in the sidewalk network on those portions of University Avenue that are within the Menlo Park City limits. The TIF Program should also include a contribution towards elimination of sidewalk gaps outside the City limits (within the City of East Palo Alto) to ensure that continuous sidewalks are provided on the west University Avenue between Adams Drive and the Bay Trail, located north of Purdue Avenue. ▪ Willow Road Bikeway Corridor (Bayfront Expressway to Alma Street): Provide a continuous bikeway facility that eliminates bicycle lane gaps, provides Class IV bicycle lanes on the US 101 overpass and where Willow Road intersects US 101 northbound and southbound ramps, and upgrades existing Class II bicycle lanes to Class IV protected bicycle lanes where feasible, particularly where the speed limit exceeds 35 miles per hour (mph). ▪ Willow Road Pedestrian Crossings (Bayfront Expressway to Newbridge Street): Provide enhanced pedestrian crossings of Willow Road at Hamilton Avenue, Ivy Drive (including proposed new street connection opposite Ivy Drive), O'Brien Drive and Newbridge Street. Enhanced crossings should include straightened crosswalks provided on each leg, high visibility crosswalk striping, accessible pedestrian signals, and pedestrian head-start signal timing (leading pedestrian intervals) where feasible. These enhanced crossings would provide improved access between the Belle Haven neighborhood and potential future development between Willow Road and University Avenue. ▪ Dumbarton Corridor Connections: Through separate projects, 	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
<p>TRANS-6b: The project would generate a substantial increase in transit riders that cannot be adequately serviced by existing public transit services, and the project would generate demand for transit services at sites more than one-quarter mile from existing public transit routes.</p>	S	<p>TRANS-6b: The City of Menlo Park shall update the existing Shuttle Fee program to guarantee funding for citywide operations of City-sponsored shuttle service that is necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards. The fees shall be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a more intensive use. The fees collected shall be applied toward circulation improvements and right-of-way acquisition. The fees shall be calculated by multiplying the proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel room by the appropriate rate. Shuttle fees shall be included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City shall use the Shuttle fees to fund operations of City-sponsored shuttle service to meet the increased demand.</p> <p>As part of the update to the Shuttle Fee program, the City shall also prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the proposed project. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the transit improvements and facilities required to mitigate the transit impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed project. The types of transit-related improvements and facilities that would reduce impacts to acceptable standards including increasing the fleet of City-sponsored</p>	SU

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		Shuttles and adding additional transit stop facilities within one-quarter mile from residential and employment centers These, among other improvements, could be included in the Shuttle Fee program impact fees nexus study.	
TRANS-6c: The project would result in increased peak-hour traffic delay at intersections on Bayfront Expressway, University Avenue and Willow Road, as identified in TRANS-1, that could decrease the performance of transit service and increase the cost of transit operations.	S	TRANS-6c: The City should continue to support the Dumbarton Corridor Study, evaluating the feasibility of providing transit service to the existing rail corridor and/or operational improvements to Bayfront Expressway, Marsh Road and Willow Road, such as a dedicated high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane, bus queue-jump lanes, or transit-signal priority that could reduce travel time for current bus operations.	SU
Utilities and Service Systems			
UTIL-1: Implementation of the proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to the serve the study area from existing entitlements, conservation plans and resources, and would not require new or expanded entitlements.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-2: Implementation of the proposed project would require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-3: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to water service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
UTIL-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-7: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to wastewater service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-8: Implementation of the proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the proposed project's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-9: Implementation of the proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-10: Implementation of the proposed project, when considered with the other jurisdictions that divert solid waste to the Ox Mountain Landfill, could result in potential lack of landfill capacity for disposal of solid waste under cumulative conditions.	S	UTIL-10: The City shall continue its reduction programs and diversion requirements in an effort to further reduce solid waste that is diverted to the landfill and lower its per capita disposal rate citywide. In addition, the City shall monitor solid waste generation volumes in relation to capacities at receiving landfill sites to ensure that sufficient capacity exists to accommodate future growth. The City shall ensure any waste management firm it contracts with has access to a new landfill site(s) to replace the Ox Mountain landfills, at such time that this landfill is closed.	LTS
UTIL-11: Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-12: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to stormwater infrastructure.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, N/A = Not Applicable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	N/A	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
UTIL-13: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in natural gas and electrical service demands, and would not require new energy supply facilities and transmission infrastructure or capacity enhancing alterations to existing facilities.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-14: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to energy conservation.	LTS	N/A		N/A

This page intentionally left blank.