



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLANNING DIVISION

(650) 330-6702

INITIAL STUDY

1. Project title
New Medical/Dental Office Building: 1706 El Camino Real
File: PLN2007-00022
2. Lead agency
City of Menlo Park
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park, CA 94025-3469
3. Contact person
Lorraine Weiss, Project Planner
415-921-5344
4. Project location
1706 El Camino Real (southeast corner of El Camino Real and Buckthorn Way)
APN #060-343-040
5. Project Applicant
Joe Colonna for 1706 ECR, LLC
1150 University Drive, #113
Menlo Park, CA 94025
- Property Owner
1706 ECR, LLC
1150 University Drive, #113
Menlo Park, CA 94025
6. General Plan designation
El Camino Real Professional/Retail Commercial
7. Zoning
C-4, General Commercial District– Applicable to El Camino Real
8. Description of project
Demolish an existing one-story, 6,875-square-foot commercial building (formerly Gaylord's Restaurant), and construct a new two-story, approximately 10,166-square-foot medical/dental office building with 61 surface parking spaces and related site improvements on a 27,292 square foot lot located at 1706 El Camino Real in the C-4 (General Commercial District - Applicable to El Camino Real) zoning district. The application includes a request for a subdivision map to subdivide one parcel into six medical/dental office condominium units within the building.

Ingress and egress would be by one central shared driveway located on El Camino Real near the southern property boundary that also serves as ingress for 1702 and 1704 El Camino Real. This driveway would continue to provide right-turn ingress and egress to and

from El Camino Real. A new right-turn lane would be in front of the property on El Camino Real which turns onto Buckthorn Way. There would be no parking on Buckthorn Way adjacent to the site.

The proposed project would require the following approvals:

1. Use Permit for construction of a new building;
2. Architectural Control for design review of the new building and related site improvements;
3. Tentative Map for the creation of six medical/office condominium units within the buildings; and
4. Mitigated Negative Declaration to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting

The subject property is located at 1706 El Camino Real at the southeast corner of El Camino Real and Buckthorn Way. This property is located two blocks south of the City's border with the Town of Atherton. Similar to the adjacent building that fronts El Camino Real, the property is zoned C-4 (General Commercial – Applicable to El Camino Real). The neighborhood is characterized by a mix of uses, including commercial and multiple-family residential uses fronting El Camino Real to the north and south, multiple-family residences and a hotel (Red Cottage Inn Suites) to the east, and El Camino Real (a major arterial) to the west. Caltrans has jurisdiction over the El Camino Real right-of-way. Buckthorn Way connects to Stone Pine Lane, forming a u-shaped street accessible only from El Camino Real.

Existing Site Conditions

The site is currently developed with a one-story, 6,875-square-foot commercial building. This structure was most recently occupied by a restaurant, Gaylord's, and has been vacant since December 2006. Existing ingress to the subject site is provided just north of the building along El Camino Real and ingress and egress is located along Buckthorn Way. A 12.5-foot easement at the southern end of the property provides egress for the subject property, and 1702 and 1704 El Camino Real. A sidewalk is provided along the El Camino Real property frontage. Currently, there is no curb or sidewalk along Buckthorn Way bordering the site. On-street parking is provided for approximately four vehicles in front of the existing building along El Camino Real, and no on-street parking is provided along Buckthorn Way adjacent to the project site.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required

CalTrans
Menlo Park Fire Protection District
West Bay Sanitary District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors marked below with an "X" would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Aesthetics | 10. Land Use and Planning |
| 2. Agricultural Resources | 11. Noise |
| 3. Air Quality | 12. Population and Housing |
| 4. Biological Resources | 13. Public Services |
| 5. Cultural Resources | 14. Recreation |
| 6. Energy and Mineral Resources | X 15. Transportation/Circulation |
| 7. Geology and Soils | 16. Utilities and Service Systems |
| 8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials | X 17. Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| 9. Hydrology and Water Quality | 18. No Potentially Significant Impacts |

DETERMINATION (completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- X I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Lorraine Weiss, Contract Planner

Date

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. AESTHETICS | | | | |
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION:

- a) **No Impact.** The project site is located in an urban area developed with commercial and residential uses. There are no designated scenic vistas within or adjacent to the site. Therefore, there would be no impact to a scenic vista.
- b) **No Impact.** The proposed project is located on El Camino Real, which is a State Route, but not designated as a scenic highway. No historic structures are located on the site or in the surrounding vicinity of the project site nor scenic trees or rock croppings that would be removed as part of the project. Therefore, there would be no impact to scenic resources.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is located two blocks south of the northern city limit of Menlo Park, adjacent to the Town of Atherton. The proposal includes a contemporary Santa Barbara style two-story building, which would be 26 feet in height to the top of roof and 32 feet to the top of the mechanical equipment screen. The design incorporates a semi-arched entry into the breezeway at the center of the building, which is replicated on both the El Camino Real and parking lot facades. The proposed project consists of six office suites. The first floor plan provides two office suites, an elevator and elevator equipment room, and two sets of stairs to the second level office suites. Additionally, the first floor provides at-grade covered parking, which is tucked under a portion of the second floor. The second floor, which spans the width of the ground floor, consists of four office suites, two sets of unenclosed stairs, a janitor room and the elevator. The office suites range in size from 1,433 to 2,062 square feet.

The project site is within an urban area and would be consistent with its surroundings. The proposed project would increase the size and height from the existing building, but it would not be

expected to significantly degrade the visual character because it is generally compatible with the scale of existing buildings along El Camino Real. The proposed project requires use permit and architectural control approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. During the design review process the decision-making body will look closely at the aesthetics of the overall project in relationship to the existing neighborhood and the location at the entry to the City. Required findings include ensuring that the proposed architecture and site design of the project is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood, the development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City, that the development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and that the development provides adequate parking as required in applicable City Ordinances, and has made adequate provisions for access to parking. The architectural control process ensures that the project would not be approved without the decision-making body's determination that the required findings can be made for the project. Therefore, impacts on visual quality and character would be less than significant.

- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project plans show exterior lighting provided in the parking lot and on the exterior building walls. Lighting would be directed to illuminate specific areas of the site and shielded to prevent spillover and glare effects on adjacent uses. As a standard condition of project approval, a lighting plan will be required and shall provide the location, architectural details and specifications for all exterior lighting subject to review and approval by the Planning Division prior to building permit issuance. A photometric study shall be included which shows that the lighting shall minimize glare and spillover onto adjacent properties. Therefore, impacts on lighting would be less than significant.

Sources

City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994
City of Menlo Park Zoning Ordinance
Field Observations
Proposed Plans

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

DISCUSSION:

- a-c) **No Impact.** The California Department of Conservation defines urban and built-up land as being “occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel.” The subject parcel is located within an urbanized area which is surrounded by commercial development. The site does not include active agricultural uses, nor is the site zoned for agricultural uses, and is not designated by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The subject parcel is not under a Williamson Act contract. There are no agricultural land uses on the subject parcel.

Based on the above discussion, the project does not have the potential for a significant adverse effect on the environment related to agricultural resources.

Sources

California Department of Conservation, *Important Farmland in California Map*, 2004.
City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION:

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The entire San Francisco Bay Area is currently designated as “non-attainment” for the state one-hour ozone standard. The Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy reviews the region’s progress over the years in reducing ozone levels, describes current conditions, and charts a course for future actions to further reduce ozone levels in the Bay Area. The control strategy, a central element of the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, outlines a set of control measures to further reduce ozone precursor emissions in order to reduce ozone levels in the Bay Area and to reduce transport of pollution to downwind regions.

Because the proposed project does not include residential units that would increase the City of Menlo Park’s population, the project would mirror the population-growth and vehicle-miles-traveled assumptions included in the *Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy*. As a result, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the *Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy*, and

the impact would be less than significant. The proposed project would comply with all applicable rules and regulations that have been developed as part of the *Bay Area 2005 Strategy* and, will follow the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA mitigation recommendations listed in the next response below. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plans.

- b,c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The California Air Resources Board (CARB) coordinates and oversees both state and federal air quality control programs in California. The CARB is required by the California Clean Air Act (CCAA) to designate areas of the State as “attainment”, “nonattainment”, or “unclassified” for each of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). An attainment designation signifies that pollutant concentrations did not violate the standard for that pollutant. A nonattainment designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once, excluding those occasions when a violation was caused by an exceptional event, as defined in the criteria. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) also establishes air pollution standards – the National Ambient Air Quality (NAAQS). The NAAQS are equal to or less stringent than the CAAQS.

The entire San Francisco Bay Area is currently designated as a “non-attainment” area for the state ozone standard. This means that the level of ozone during a one-hour period exceeds the standard of 0.09 parts per million (ppm) on more than one day per year, excluding when a violation was caused by an exceptional event. The Bay Area Air Basin is currently designated as a nonattainment area for the state PM₁₀ standard, and as nonattainment for the federal PM₂₅ standard. All other pollutants are designated as an attainment or unclassified area for federal standards and as an attainment area for the state standard.

Pollutants from Construction Activities

Construction activities are generally short-term in duration, but may still cause adverse air quality impacts. Development of the project would require preparation of the site and construction of the proposed project. Construction activities typically result in emissions of PM₁₀ and PM₂₅, usually in the form of fugitive dust from activities such as demolition, excavation, grading, and vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces.

The proposed project would generate PM₁₀ emissions from various construction activities, including demolition, grading, excavation, and the operation of equipment and vehicles. The *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* establishes thresholds of significance for construction and operation (post-construction) phases of projects. According to these guidelines, the BAAQMD’s approach to CEQA analyses of construction impacts is to emphasize implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures rather than detailed quantification of emissions. According to the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*, if all the feasible control measures for PM₁₀ indicated in its Table 2 (as appropriate, depending on the size of the project area) are implemented, then air pollutant emissions from construction activities would be considered a less than significant impact. With implementation of these standard dust control measures, the project impact would be less than significant. These dust control measures include the following:

- a) Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- b) Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- c) Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved

- access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- d) Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
 - e) Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
 - f) Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff onto public roadways.

Pollutants from Operational Activities

The BAAQMD generally does not recommend a detailed air quality impact analysis for projects generating less than 2,000 vehicles trips per day, unless warranted by the specific nature of the project or project setting. The proposed project includes the construction of an approximate 10,166-square-foot commercial building (and demolition of an existing 6,875-square foot building) on a site which is zoned for commercial use and designated in the General Plan for commercial use. As noted above, emissions of particulate matter from construction would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of standard dust control measures. The proposed development with medical offices would generate approximately 426 daily trips including 27 AM net-new peak hour trips and 41 PM net-new peak hour trips. Consequently, the proposed project would not need a detailed air quality impact analysis. With the estimated number of trips generated by the proposed project, the daily vehicle emissions generated on an average weekday and weekend would be substantially less than the thresholds of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and particulate matter (PM₁₀) (80 pounds per day), and CO (550 pounds per day). Therefore, the project operational impacts on local and regional air quality would be less than significant.

- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The BAAQMD defines sensitive receptors as facilities where sensitive population groups (children, elderly, acutely and/or chronically ill) are likely to be located. These land uses include residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and medical clinics. The project is located in a commercial district within an urbanized area, however, is located adjacent to residential uses to the north and east. As discussed in sections b and c, implementation of the standard dust control measures would aid in minimizing construction emissions. The impacts to sensitive receptors in the area would be less than significant. The latest inventory of major Toxic Air Contaminant sources prepared by the BAAQMD shows no major sources in the vicinity of the proposed project site. As further discussed in the Transportation/Traffic section below, the scope of the project represents less vehicle trips than the former restaurant use and, therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would create substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project could result in diesel exhaust emission due to the use of on-site diesel equipment. Diesel exhaust would be short-term in duration and only temporary during construction activities, and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance. The proposed project would not include the long-term odorous emission source as defined by BAAQMD Guidelines due to the commercial development, a medical/dental office use, which does not generate objectionable odors. Therefore, construction and operation of the project would result in less than significant objectionable odors.

Sources

Field Observations

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines – Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans*, December 1999

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2001, Toxic Air Contaminant Control Program Annual Report 2000.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES | | | | |
| Would the proposal: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

DISCUSSION:

- a) **No Impact.** Urban development surrounds the site, which in general, provides low habitat value for wildlife at the site. The proposed use is located on a previously developed parcel located in an urbanized area and is not in proximity to habitat for any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species. Therefore, there would be no impact as a result of his project.
- b) **No Impact.** The property upon which the proposed use would be located does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat, nor does it contain California Department of Fish and Game jurisdictional area, and is surrounded by urban development. Therefore, there would be no impact as a result of this project.
- c) **No Impact.** The project site itself does not contain any wetlands or federally protected waters. Therefore, there would be no impact to wetlands as a result of this project.
- d) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not interfere with the movement of migratory wildlife species or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, there would be no impact to wildlife movement or nursery sites.

Less than Significant Impact. The project proposes the removal of eight non-heritage trees. A Tree Survey (Appendix A), prepared by McClenahan Consulting dated November 27, 2006, has been submitted that details the species, size, and conditions of the trees on site, discusses the impacts of the proposed development on these trees, and provides tree preservation guidelines for trees on adjacent parcels in close proximity to the site. The trees on site are located adjacent to the building in a narrow planting strip. There are two neighboring trees located on the neighbor's property to the east (trees #9 and #10). The trees that are on site which are proposed for removal include five loquat trees, 6.5 inches, 7.9 inches and 6.8 inches multi-trunk, 4.7 inches, 5.6 inches and 5.6 inches multi-trunk, and 7.0 inches in diameter, a privet tree, 6.7 inches in diameter, and two pittosporum trees, 4.6 inches and 4.8 inches. The pittosporum trees have inherent structural defects and are old and decaying. All of these trees proposed for removal are located adjacent to the existing building at the southeast portion of the site which would be in the path of the future drive aisle, parking, or circulation improvements.

Two trees are located on the neighboring property including a Valley oak tree, 41.6 inches in diameter and an Italian stone pine tree, 10.7 inches in diameter. The tree protection zone for the Valley oak tree is 20 feet and 6 feet for the Italian stone pine tree. Should any construction activity be proposed within the dripline area of these trees (trees #9 and #10), further review will be required by the consulting Project Arborist. Additionally, as a condition of project approval, the applicant would be required to comply with the tree preservation guidelines provided in the Tree Survey prepared by McClenahan Consulting, dated November 27, 2006.

The preliminary landscape plans propose nineteen (19) new trees including jacaranda trees in the parking lot, Ginkgo biloba trees along El Camino Real, and chanticleer pear street trees along Buckthorn Way. Shrubs and vines are proposed to accent the site. The applicant will be

required as a condition of project approval to submit a complete landscape and irrigation plan compliant with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance concurrent with submittal of a complete building permit application for review and approval by the Planning Division.

- f. **No Impact.** The proposed project is located in an urban area on a previously developed site and would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conversation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, there would be no impact as a result of this project.

Sources

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), 2006. Wildlife Habitat and Data Analysis Branch, California Natural Diversity Database, California Native Plant Society (CNPS). *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants* (online edition, v6-05c). California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, CA.
 City of Menlo Park Municipal Code
 Field Observations
 Project Plans
Tree Survey, McClenahan Consulting, LLC, dated November 27, 2006

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES | | | | |
| Would the Proposal: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION:

- a-d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The site has not been identified as a historical or archaeological resource, or a unique paleontological resource, or identified with human remains. Development of the proposed project would not affect any known historical resources or archaeological

resource. However, if unidentified historical resources are uncovered during grading and construction activities these resources could be damaged or destroyed during construction. The following standard procedure would be followed and therefore the impact would be less than significant: Should a historic or archaeological deposit be encountered during project construction activities, the construction contractor shall halt construction in the vicinity of the find and notify the City. Construction activities shall be redirected and a qualified archaeologist in consultation with the City shall: 1) evaluate the archaeological deposit to determine if it meets the CEQA definition of historical or unique archeological resource; and 2) make recommendations about the treatment of the deposit, as warranted. If the deposit does not meet the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological resource, then no further study or protection of the deposit is necessary. If the deposit does meet the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological resource, then it shall be avoided to the extent feasible by project construction activities. If avoidance is not feasible, then adverse effects to the deposit shall be alleviated as specified in CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) (for historic resources) or CEQA section 21083.2 (for unique archaeological resources).

The discovery of human skeletal remains anywhere within a project area is a significant event. If human remains are discovered during the course of the project, then the following standard procedures as outlined below would be followed. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during construction at the project site, the construction contractor shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation and notify the County Coroner and an appropriate representative of the Native American groups shall be consulted. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands. If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission by phone within 24 hours of making that determination.

Source:

San Mateo County Historical Association, 1990. *Menlo Park Historical Building Survey*.
CEQA Guidelines

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

6. GEOLOGY & SOILS

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

DISCUSSION:

- a.i) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is not located in a special studies zone identified on the Alquist-Priolo Maps as defined by the California Geological Survey. The City of Menlo Park is located within a seismically sensitive area. The San Andreas Fault lies approximately 4.6 miles west from the City’s westernmost boundary, and the Hayward and Calaveras Faults lies approximately 14.4 and 20.4 miles respectively east from the easternmost boundary. These faults are considered to be active and have a long history of seismic activity. Therefore, it may be assumed that the proposed project will be subjected to seismic induced hazards at some time during its lifetime. The project is required to adhere to the standards of the California Building Code which is intended to address seismic risks to an acceptable level. Because the project site is not located on an active or potentially active fault, the potential for surface fault rupture is low and the impact is considered less than significant.
- a.ii) **Less than Significant Impact.** The site is located in the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area. and the site is located in a strong seismic risk area, subject to very strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. The site is located in Seismic Zone 4, as designated by the current Uniform Building Code, which is expected to experience the greatest effects from earthquake groundshaking. The proposed project would likely experience at least one major earthquake (6.7 magnitude or greater) before 2032 (USGS, 2003). The intensity of such an

event would depend on the causative fault and the distance to the epicenter, the moment magnitude, and the duration of shaking. Although some structural damage is typically not unavoidable during an earthquake, building codes and construction ordinances have been established to protect against building collapse and major injury during a seismic event. The project would be required to comply with the following standard requirement prior to building permit issuance: The structural design of the project shall meet all of the seismic standards of the California Building Code for construction within this seismic zone and incorporate the design recommendations of the Soil Engineering Study, prepared by ES Geotechnologies, (dated June 2007) (Appendix B).

- a.iii) **Less than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction refers to the sudden, temporary transformation of loose saturated granular sediments from a solid state to a liquefied state as a result of seismic ground shaking. Liquefaction-related phenomena include seismically-induced settlement, flow failure, and lateral spreading. While there would be considerable groundshaking, seismic ground failure, including liquefaction and subsidence of the land are possible, but not likely at the site. Therefore, impacts related to seismically induced ground failure and liquefaction would be considered less than significant with the project development.
- a.iv) **No Impact.** Landslides occur when forces such as excessive rainfall or earthquakes loosen unstable materials from hillsides causing the material to slide downhill. The project site and surrounding vicinity are relatively flat and is not susceptible to slope instability. Therefore, the potential for landslides to occur within the project vicinity would be low and result in no impact.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would involve excavation, soil stockpiling, and minimal grading. These activities would expose areas of soil that have previously been covered. The soils at this site include a mixture of gravels, sands, clays, and silts. Exposed soil could be subject to erosion by wind and storm water runoff. The extent of erosion that could occur varies depending on soil type, vegetation/cover, and weather conditions. The project applicant would be required to comply with the standard requirement to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutants to storm water discharges. Compliance with the BMPs would reduce potential erosion of exposed soil and reduce potential erosion impacts. Therefore, erosion impacts during construction activities would be considered less than significant.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** Direct impacts related to the potential for landslides are addressed in item 6a(iv) above. The proposed project would not be subject to landslides. Based on the available geologic information, no impacts related to unstable geologic units or soils would be anticipated. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** Expansive soil occurs when clay particles interact with water causing volume changes in the clay soil. The clay soil swells when saturated and contracts when dried. This phenomenon generally decreases in magnitude with increasing confinement pressure at depth. These volume changes may damage lightly loaded foundations, retaining walls and shallow improvements. There does not appear to be near surface soils with a high expansion potential. Therefore, this impact would be considered to be less than significant.
- e) **No Impact.** The proposed project would be served by City sewer and not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system. Therefore, there is no potential impact related to adequate support of such facilities

Sources:

- California Geological Survey (CGS), 2006
- California Uniform Building Code
- City of Menlo Park General Plan
- Soil Engineering Study*, ES Geotechnologies, June 2007

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS | | | | |
| Would the proposal: | | | | |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

DISCUSSION:

- a,b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The site was previously occupied by a restaurant. Demolition of the existing building and construction activities proposed by the project may involve use and transport of materials including building demolition debris, fuels, oils, and other chemicals used during construction. Asbestos could be found in the existing building. If found, the following standard requirement would be implemented: The applicant shall comply with Bay Area Air Quality Management District Regulation II, Rule 2 (Hazardous Materials, Asbestos Demolition, Renovation, and Manufacturing) when demolishing the building. With proper handling of asbestos, the impact would be less than significant.

The types of hazardous materials associated with the medical office would include cleaning and disinfectant chemicals such as bleach, ammonia, ethyl alcohol, and hydrogen peroxide; chemical used for preservation of bio-samples; and bio-wastes such as blood, tissue, urine, and feces. All chemicals and medical waste materials would be stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) and the Medical Waste Management Act (MWMA; California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.1), administered by the San Mateo County Environmental Health Department. Therefore, project impacts related to the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Cleaning solvents, paints, landscape fertilizers, and pesticides typically used in a commercial setting would also be used at the project site. The potential for accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances is low to none with typical commercial office uses of these products. Because the amount of these materials would be used in minimal amounts, the construction and operational use of the commercial building on the site would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, emission or disposal of hazardous materials, nor is it expected to cause significant hazards to the public or the environment through an accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, the potential impact to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant.

- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed medical/dental office use does not propose to generate hazardous emissions. As stated in 7 a and b above, the project would involve the use of hazardous materials associated with medical office uses, but all chemicals and waste would be handled according to applicable federal, state and local regulations. Therefore, the potential to affect existing or proposed schools in the project vicinity is low to none. The schools in closest proximity to the subject site are: 1) Menlo School at 50 Valparaiso in Atherton, approximately 0.6 miles away; 2) Encinal School at 195 Encinal in Atherton, approximately 0.7 miles away; and 3) Sacred Heart at 150 Valparaiso in Atherton, approximately 0.7 mile away. Therefore, less-than-significant impacts would occur related to emissions or handling of hazardous materials in close proximity to schools.

- d) **No Impact.** The site is not on a hazardous materials sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- e,f) **No Impact.** The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or within the vicinity of an airstrip. Therefore, the project does not have the potential to result in a safety hazard impact for people residing or working in the project area.
- g) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would require Menlo Park Fire Protection District's (MPFPD) review and approval for adequate emergency access. The subject site is currently developed and located in an urban area. Given that the project would be reviewed by the MPFPD and the construction involved at the site would not considerably impact thoroughfares, the impact of the project to emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant.
- h) **No Impact.** The subject parcel is located in a developed area, and is not intermixed with or adjacent to wildlands. Therefore, the project does not have the potential impact of exposing people to risk as a result of wildland fires.

Source:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List)*. Accessed November 2007.

City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994
Soil Engineering Study, ES Geotechnologies, June 2007

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY | | | | |
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |

would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION:

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the commercial building would involve shallow foundation and utility excavations, creation of soil stockpiles, and surface grading. The potential at the proposed project site for erosion and sediment transport is low because 1) the site is relatively flat, and 2) sedimentation would be managed using standard construction and engineering best management practices (BMPs). The BMPs would be a condition of project approval and are standard construction practices used to reduce erosion and sedimentation. All on-site runoff must also comply with San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP).

Though the construction of the proposed commercial building would increase the building square footage from the 6,875 square feet that previously existed to approximately 10,148 square feet, it would decrease the amount of impervious surface area. With the development of the proposed project, there would be approximately 24,000 square feet of impervious surface area.

The proposed site would consist of a two-story building with six medical/dental office suites. The majority of the site impervious area containing roof or asphalted areas would generate quick runoff that is collected through the proposed site's storm drain system that directs runoff into the City's storm drain system. The proposed site would have 0.55 acres (88%) impervious consisting of the building roof, asphalt drive aisles and concrete sidewalks. Approximately 3,300 square feet (12%) of the site would be landscaped areas. An infiltration basin has been proposed in order to provide biological treatment and retention of a portion of storm water runoff from impervious areas, and a mechanical treatment unit is provided to treat the remaining runoff not treated by the infiltration basin. Additionally, the applicant would be required to implement performance standards set forth under the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program. The SMCWPPP program establishes performance standards for new development, redevelopment, and construction site controls. The performance standards include water quality protection to the maximum extent practicable. Implementation of the BMPs, performance standards, and City standard conditions would minimize the potential for construction-related surface water pollution and would ensure that water quality would not be compromised by erosion and sedimentation during construction. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- b) **No Impact.** Development of the proposed commercial building would not result in the substantial depletion of groundwater resources. No groundwater extraction is proposed with project development, as the water supply for the proposed building would be supplied by the California Water Service Company. Therefore, the proposed project would not effect groundwater supplies.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The drainage system would be required to be designed and improved in accordance with the objectives of the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program. Additionally the project would be required to comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Nonpoint Discharge Permit which prohibits surface grading between October 15 and April 15, unless an erosion control plan is prepared by the applicant and approved by the City Engineer. The decrease in the amount of runoff and sediment generated from the site would be a less than significant impact.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project would include grading and construction of the site improvements. Currently, the property has no drainage system. The project proposes to decrease the amount of storm water runoff and improvements would allow water to drain from the site into the public storm drain system. Due to the improvements made on site, substantial increases in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off the site would not occur. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the amount of impervious surfaces would decrease. Therefore, impacts associated with alteration of existing drainage patterns would be less than significant.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** As indicated in the previous response, currently, the property has no drainage system and with the development of the new building proposes to decrease the amount of storm water runoff and improvements would allow water to drain from the site into the public storm drain system. The proposed project would be designed to have a zero net increase in stormwater. Additionally, adhering to the goals and objectives of the San Mateo Countywide Pollution Prevention Program would result in storm water volumes decreasing and the quality of storm water discharge is likely to improve. The project is subject to a standard requirement to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) for water quality treatment on the project site per the City's Grading and Drainage Guidelines. The project would need to submit a grading and drainage plan with BMPs included. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would construct a new commercial building for medical/dental offices. Development projects can degrade water quality through temporary construction impacts or over the long term through operations. The proposed development is not industrial in nature and there is no indication that the proposed project would degrade the City of Menlo Park's water quality. Standard conditions of project approval would be required to minimize the impacts to the existing hydrology and drainage of the property. Water quality degradation associated with long term operations would be less than significant.
- g) **No Impact.** The project does not propose housing and the subject parcel is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the risk of large scale flooding is low and the project would not result in impacts to flooding.
- h) **No Impact.** Also see response to discussion g) above. The proposed structure would not impede or redirect 100-year flood flows as the site is not located in the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, flood-related impacts would be less than significant.
- i) **No Impact.** The project is not located near a levee or dam and is not within a flood zone. Therefore, the project would not expose people to risk as a result of flooding and no impacts related to flooding or dam failure would occur with project development.
- j) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project would not expose people to a significant risk due to inundation by tsunami, mudflow, or seiche. Tsunamis, which are large ocean waves generated by seismic events are rare, and if generated would be expected to inundate lower-lying coastal areas east of the project site. Seiches are seismically-induced waves that occur in an enclosed body of water such as a lake, and would not affect the project site. Additionally, areas in the vicinity of the subject site are flat and there is no risk of mudflows in these areas. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact.

Source:

City of Menlo Park General Plan
Federal Emergency Management Agency, *FEMA Map, 1984*
Soil Engineering Study, ES Geotechnologies, November 2006
Project Plans

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |

plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

DISCUSSION:

- a) **No Impact.** The medical/dental office project would be constructed on an existing previously developed commercial parcel that is surrounded by existing development including commercial properties fronting El Camino Real to the south, Menlo College and single-family residences across El Camino Real to the west, and single family residential to the north and east. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community and would have no impact related to such.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The parcel is designated for El Camino Real Professional/Retail Commercial in the General Plan, and is zoned Commercial District (C-4). The proposed project would not change the General Plan land use designation or zoning. Because the proposed project would be located on a site designated in the City’s General Plan for commercial development and medical/dental office use is permitted within the C-4, General Commercial District– Applicable to El Camino Real zoning, the project would not result in a fundamental conflict with any applicable land use plan, or policy.

The project is consistent with the applicable development standards outlined in the City’s Zoning Ordinance and Municipal Code, though, includes a Use Permit request for construction of a new building.

The development includes replacement trees as required by the City and tree protection measures will be implemented consistent with the consulting arborist’s recommendations in the Tree Survey as described in Section 4 (Biology) above which would result in a less than significant impact.

- c) **No Impact.** There would be no conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, since no such plans have been developed on or adjacent to the site. Therefore, no impact would occur with project development as it relates to a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Source:

Field Observations
 City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994
 City of Menlo Park Municipal Code
 City of Menlo Park Zoning Ordinance
 Project Plans
Tree Survey, McClenahan Consulting, LLC, dated November 27, 2006

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

11. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

DISCUSSION:

- a) The project site is currently a previously developed parcel and does not contain any known mineral resources. Therefore, there would be no environmental impact associated with mineral resources as a result of this project.
- b) The City of Menlo Park General Plan does not discuss any locally-important mineral resource recovery site in the vicinity of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no environmental impact associated with locally important mineral resources as a result of this project.

Source:

City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

12. NOISE

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION:

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** Operation of the proposed project would not involve the use of any on-site noise equipment that would generate noise levels in excess of standards established in local plans. However, equipment used for construction operations would be anticipated to include an excavator or front loader, a dozer, a loader, a grader, and a water truck. According to the U.S. EPA, the noise levels of concern are typically associated with site preparation due to the equipment associated with clearing and excavation, which range in noise levels from 79 to 91 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The simultaneous operation of construction equipment could potentially result in noise levels of approximately 94 dBA at 50 feet from the proposed project site. The sensitive noise land uses located within the vicinity of the proposed project are the residential areas to north and east and Menlo College across El Camino to the west.

Construction noise is regulated by Municipal Code Chapter 8.06, Noise, which provides an exception for construction activity between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday. The project would be required to comply with the following construction noise control measures:

- *Construction activity shall be allowed only between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday. Construction is prohibited on Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays.*
- *All powered construction equipment shall be equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers recommended by the manufacturers and pavement breakers and jackhammers shall*

be equipped with acoustical attenuating shields or shrouds recommended by the manufacturers.

- *Construction equipment shall have sound-control devices no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. No equipment shall have an un-muffled exhaust.*
- *Signs shall be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and a day and evening contact number for the City in the event of problems.*
- *Contact information for an on-site complaint and enforcement manager shall be posted to allow for responses to and tracking of complaints.*
- *Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds; or insulation barriers or other measures shall be incorporated to the extent feasible.*

Construction period impacts would still occur with implementation of the noise control measures detailed above. However, because they would be short-term in duration, and minimized by the above practices, the construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Operation of the proposed project would not result in perceivable groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. However, heavy equipment associated with proposed project construction activities could generate perceptible vibration in the immediate vicinity of the site. Heavy trucks passing by and the use of jack hammers during concrete or pavement removal are activities that would most likely to cause temporary groundborne vibration. The proposed project would not include the use of blasting techniques or pile driving which can cause excessive vibration.

The level of groundborne vibration that could reach sensitive receptors would depend on the distance to the receptor, what equipment is used, and the soil conditions surrounding the construction site. The impact from construction related vibration would be temporary and short-term and confined to only the immediate area, and therefore the impact would be less than significant.

- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project does not include the construction or long-term operation of any facilities that would result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The proposed project would generate project-related traffic. However, the amount of trips from the proposed project would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The use of construction equipment, necessary to complete the project, would generate a substantial increase in the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project. However, construction related noise would be short term and temporary. By adhering to the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, Chapter 8.06, Noise and implementing the standard noise control measures listed in 12 a above, the potential construction-related noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

e,f) **No Impact.** The project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of an airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, there would be no environmental impact associated with an airport and use plan or proximity to an airport or private airstrip.

Source:

City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994

City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, Chapter 8.06, Noise Ordinance

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

DISCUSSION:

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in an increase in the population as it does not involve the construction of any new housing or the extension of roads or other infrastructure. The project also would not be a significant job generator. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly and there is no impact related to population growth as a result of this project.
- b) **No Impact.** There are no existing residential dwellings on the subject site. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace a substantial number of existing housing units and there is no impact related to this is as a result of this project.
- c) **No Impact.** See the discussion of b) above.

Source:

City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994
Project Description from Applicant
Project Plans

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

14. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i. Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv. Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| v.) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION:

a) i,ii) **Less than Significant Impact.** The site is currently being served by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District (MPFPD) and Menlo Park Police. Fire stations in closest proximity to the subject site include Station #6 at 700 Oak Grove in Menlo Park, approximately 1.2 miles from the site and located in downtown Menlo Park, and Station #1 at 300 Middlefield Road in Menlo Park. Station #3 is located at 32 Almendral in Atherton, approximately .09 miles from the site, and primarily serves the Town of Atherton. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in population growth or employment and therefore, the demand for new services would be minimal. The MPFPD would review project plans before permits are issued to ensure compliance with all applicable fire code standards and to ensure that adequate fire and life safety measures are incorporated into the project in compliance with all applicable

State and City fire safety regulations. Because the proposed project would not result in the need for new or expanded public services, the project's potential impact on fire and police protection services would be less than significant.

- a) iii) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not generate any demand for increased school services as no housing is proposed. Therefore, no impact to schools would occur with project development.
- a) iv) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not increase demand for park facilities, as no housing is proposed. Therefore, no impact to parks would occur with project development.
- a) v) **Less than Significant Impact.** As discussed in the Traffic and Circulation section below, the proposed medical/dental office project would result in an increase in trip generation from the vacant building, but not from its previous restaurant use and would not increase the need for maintenance of local roadways. The project provides improvements to the property frontages on El Camino Real and Buckthorn Way.

In addition, as described in the above discussion, the project would have a negligible increase in population or employment and would likely not result in demand for other governmental services (i.e.; roadways, libraries, and community centers). Therefore, a less than significant impact to other public facilities would occur with project development.

Source:

City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994
Project Description from Applicant
Project Plans

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 15. RECREATION | | | | |
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

DISCUSSION:

- a) **No Impact.** The development of the proposed project would not result in an increase in demand for recreational facilities as no housing is proposed. Therefore, no impact would occur on recreational resources with project development.
- b) **No Impact.** The project does not propose recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, there would be no adverse physical effect on the environment from the construction or expansion of recreational facilities on-site.

Source:

City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994
Project Description from Applicant
Project Plans

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** A traffic study entitled *1706 El Camino Real Medical Offices Transportation Impact Analysis* (dated February 24, 2009) was prepared for the proposed project. This document is included in Appendix C. The study was prepared according to the methodology recommended in the City of Menlo Park’s Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines. Levels of service for this study were calculated based on the San Mateo City/County Association of Government’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) Traffic Impact Guidelines and also City of Menlo Park’s and the City of Menlo Park Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines.

Traffic Volumes and Levels of Service – Near Term Conditions Plus Project

The proposed project with approximately 10,166 square feet of medical/dental office use is estimated to generate 426 daily trips, including 27 AM peak hour trips and 41 PM peak hour trips. During the AM peak hour, there would be 21 inbound trips and 6 outbound trips. During the PM peak hour, there would be 11 inbound trips and 30 outbound trips. No traffic is currently generated by the project site as the property is currently vacant.

It is anticipated that the majority of trips related to the medical office uses would be made by patients. For patient trips, a distribution pattern similar to commercial uses was presumed, and therefore the proposed medical office land uses were assumed to use commercial distribution patterns. During the PM peak hour, the increase in traffic would result in an increase in delay of 8.1 seconds at the intersection of El Camino Real and Spruce Avenue and 15.5 seconds at the intersection of El Camino Real to Buckthorn Way. The level of service would remain at Level of Service (LOS) F.

The Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) determined that there were potentially significant impacts in the near-term at the following two intersections during the PM Peak hour:

- Buckthorn Way and El Camino Real, and
- Spruce Avenue and El Camino Real.

Both of these intersections are “T” intersections at El Camino Real with stop control on the side street, but no stop on El Camino Real. LOS for these intersections is determined based on the worst approach delay, which in these cases is the side street and not El Camino Real.

The intersection of Buckthorn Way and El Camino Real would have a potentially significant impact during the PM peak hour due to the westbound approach from Buckthorn Way to El Camino Real. The westbound approach currently operates at LOS F and the increase in delay would be greater than 4 seconds (the San Mateo City/County Association of Governments’ threshold due to the jurisdiction of the intersection in Atherton) because of additional traffic on El Camino Real from the proposed development. The additional traffic from the development on El Camino Real reduces the number of gaps in traffic for existing left turning vehicles and increases the delay.

The intersection of Spruce Avenue and El Camino Real would also have a potentially significant impact during the PM peak hour due to the westbound approach from Spruce Avenue to El Camino Real. The westbound approach currently operates at LOS F and the increase in delay will be greater than 4 seconds due to additional traffic on El Camino Real from the proposed developments. The additional traffic from the development on El Camino Real reduces the number of gaps in traffic for existing left turning vehicles and increases the delay.

Traffic Volumes and Levels of Service – Long Range Cumulative Conditions Plus Project

The TIA also included a long-term analysis for the proposed project. The two intersections from the near-term analysis continued to indicate a potentially significant impact during the PM peak hour. Additionally, the intersection of Buckthorn Way and El Camino Real would have a potentially significant impact during the AM peak hour (refer to Table 9 of the TIA).

Impacts

Intersection Impact 1: El Camino Real and Buckthorn Way. The project does not add traffic on Buckthorn Way, though, will add traffic to northbound and southbound El Camino Real. With the proposed project, there would be an increase of average delay to the westbound approach from Buckthorn Way to El Camino Real greater than four seconds during the PM peak hour under the near term with project and long range with project conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact under the City's and County's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines.

During the AM peak hour, the intersection operates at acceptable levels of service under the Near Term plus Project Scenario; however, would deteriorate from LOS D to LOS E with the addition of cumulative background growth. Under the Long Term Scenario, the proposed project would result in an increase of average delay to the critical approach by approximately 51 seconds. Therefore, during the AM peak hour, the proposed project would contribute to the cumulatively deficient intersection.

Intersection Impact 2: El Camino Real and Spruce Avenue. The westbound approach from Spruce Avenue to El Camino Real would operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour under Near Term Plus Project Conditions and Long Range Plus Project Conditions. With the addition of project related trips to the northbound and southbound through movements, there would be an increase of average delay to the westbound approach from Spruce Avenue to El Camino Real of greater than four seconds during the PM peak hour. This is considered a potentially significant impact under the City's and County's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines.

MITIGATION: The project would be required to include TRANS-1, TRANS-2, and TRANS-3 mitigations as a condition of approval.

TRANS-1: Concurrent with a complete building permit submittal package, the applicant shall submit a Transportation Demand Management Plan (bike racks, commute assistance, etc.) subject to review and approval by the Planning and Transportation Divisions.

TRANS-2: Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay a Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) of \$1.60 per square foot of gross floor area to contribute to future improvements and programs to improve Citywide Transportation.

TRANS-3: The applicant shall contribute an annual fee of \$0.105 per square foot of gross floor area as part of the City's annual shuttle fee.

Significance After Mitigation:

With implementation of mitigation measures TRANS-1, TRANS-2, and TRANS-3, the impacts would be deemed less than significant.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The San Mateo County Congestion Management Program (CMP) Land Use Analysis Program guidelines require that Routes of Regional Significance be evaluated to determine the impact of added project-generated trips for projects that create more than 100 PM peak hour trips. Since the proposed project is projected to generate fewer than 100 peak hour trips, a CMP analysis was not conducted. Therefore, the project would not cause an exceedance, either individually or cumulatively, of a level of service standard established by the San Mateo County Congestion Management Agency, and would result in a less than significant impact.
- c) **No Impact.** No uses or structures are proposed that could affect air traffic patterns, nor is an airport located in proximity to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial safety risks related to air traffic and would have no impact.
- d) **No Impact.** The project would not involve hazards to design features, such as sharp curves, or create hazardous conditions by introducing incompatible uses.

Ingress and egress would be by one central shared driveway located on El Camino Real near the southern property boundary that also serves as ingress for 1702 and 1704 El Camino Real. This driveway would continue to provide right-turn ingress and egress from El Camino Real. A new right-turn lane would be in front of the property on El Camino Real which turns onto Buckthorn Way. There would be no parking on Buckthorn Way adjacent to the site.

Additionally, new pedestrian access along El Camino Real and Buckthorn Way would be incorporated into the project. The City of Menlo Park Transportation Division has reviewed preliminary plans and concurred that the proposed driveway configuration would provide adequate sight distance for vehicles entering and exiting the project site and the project does not pose safety hazards. The project would be conditioned to restrict on-street parking on the project's frontages on El Camino Real south of the project access point to accommodate the right turn pocket into the project site. Therefore, with the above noted conditions, there would be no substantial increase in traffic hazards as a result of the proposed project and this impact would be less than significant.

- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not have a substantial effect on emergency access to the project area. The project site would be served by one existing ingress and egress driveway on El Camino Real which is shared with other uses along El Camino Real adjacent to and south of the proposed project. Fire suppression and emergency response would continue to be provided by the MPFPD. The project would require review and approval of the plans for emergency access. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts related to emergency access.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The TIA reviewed the parking proposed for the project. The proposed project parking requirements were evaluated based on the City of Menlo

Park Municipal Code requirements and the expected parking demand. In the C-4 (ECR) zoning district, the parking requirement, regardless of the specific commercial use, is six spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area. Based on the gross floor area of 10,166 square feet, the total number of required parking spaces would be 61 stalls for the proposed project. The proposed project includes 61 parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed project would provide adequate onsite parking.

- g) **No Impact.** As part of the improvement plans to the site, the applicant is proposing a new sidewalk with curb and gutter, and a landscape strip adjacent to the street along the El Camino Real property frontage. Additionally, currently there is no sidewalk on Buckthorn Way immediately to the north of the subject site. As part of the improvements to the site, the applicant is proposing to install curb and gutter, a planter strip to the street, and a detached public sidewalk. New entry monuments are also proposed on Buckthorn Way as a means to identify the beginning of a residential neighborhood to discourage non-residential vehicles from traveling down Buckthorn Way, and to reduce vehicle speeds towards the residential neighborhood beyond the subject site. The actual design and dimensions of these entry monuments is yet to be determined, but would most likely resemble monuments on the adjacent Spruce Avenue. The proposed right-of-way improvements would not result in any permanent features that would substantially affect or alter existing facilities nor interfere with construction of any future planned facilities, such as bike lanes, for alternative modes of transportation. Additionally, the applicant will be preparing a Transportation Demand Management plan to encourage alternative means of transportation. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies or plans supporting alternative transportation and no impact would result from the project.

Source:

- City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994
- City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, Chapter 16.72, Parking, Zoning Ordinance
- Project Description from Applicant
- Project Plans
- 1706 El Camino Real Medical Offices, Traffic Impact Analysis, Final Report*, prepared by DKS Associates, February 24, 2009
- 1906 El Camino Real TIA – Addendum Letter Re: Alternative Land Use and Sensitivity*, prepared by DKS Associates, October 25, 2007

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project' solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION:

- a,b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Wastewater generated on-site would be conveyed to the West Bay Sanitary District and transported via main line trunk sewers to the Menlo Park Pumping Station. From the pumping station, the wastewater goes to the South Bayside System Authority Regional Treatment Plant in Redwood City. The amount of wastewater that is anticipated by the project is incremental and would not be expected to exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. There is capacity within the system to treat the wastewater generated by the proposed project. No expansion in wastewater treatment facilities is expected to be necessary as a result of the proposed project. The anticipated impact is less than significant.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed site would consist of a two-story building with six medical/dental office suites. The majority of the site impervious area containing roof or asphalted areas would generate quick runoff that is collected through the proposed site's storm drain system that directs runoff into the City's storm drain system. The proposed site would have 0.55 acres (88%) impervious consisting of the building roof, asphalt drive aisles and concrete sidewalks. Approximately 3,300 square feet (12%) of the site would be landscaped areas. An infiltration basin has been proposed in order to provide biological treatment and retention of a portion of storm water runoff from impervious areas. , and a mechanical treatment unit is provided to treat the remaining runoff not treated by the infiltration basin. Additionally, the applicant

would be required to implement performance standards set forth under the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program. The SMCWPPP program establishes performance standards for new development, redevelopment, and construction site controls. The performance standards include water quality protection to the maximum extent practicable. Implementation of the BMPs, performance standards, and City standard conditions would minimize the potential for construction-related surface water pollution and would ensure that water quality would not be compromised by erosion and sedimentation during construction. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** As indicated in response to b) above, this is an infill site that was previously developed, and it is anticipated that there would be sufficient water supply available to serve the site as neighboring properties have water supplied to them. Because the subject site is presently vacant, the California Water Service Company must indicate the availability of water and any associated requirements (such as pipe size). The project will be conditioned to include any requirements of the California Water Service Company.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would generate a small amount of waste that would not be expected to exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. The existing facilities would be used for the proposed project, and no additional wastewater treatment facilities would need to be constructed to accommodate the proposed project. Therefore, no impact to wastewater services would occur with development of the project.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would generate a small amount of solid waste. Given the scope of the demolition and renovation, the project will have a less than significant impact on solid waste disposal associated with demolition and construction materials. As a standard condition of approval, the project sponsor will be required to comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance to reduce the amount of waste deposited in the landfill.
- g) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would need to comply with all federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the project's impact on solid waste would be less than significant.

Source:

City of Menlo Park General Plan, adopted 1994
Project Description from Applicant
Project Plans

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?
("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

DISCUSSION:

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** Based on background research and site visits, with the implementation of proposed project conditions, the project does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the proposed project results in less than significant impact as it relates to these criterion.
- b) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** Development of the proposed project on a previously developed infill site, would not result in significant cumulative environmental impacts. The proposed project could contribute to environmental effects in the area of traffic/circulation with new development. Mitigation measures incorporated in the Initial Study, however, mitigate any potential contribution to cumulative impacts associated with these environmental issues. Therefore, the proposed project with mitigation results in less than significant impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed development of the site with a medical/dental offices and site related improvements would have less than significant impact effects on human beings during construction of the new development since the project would adhere to standard requirements and procedures.

Appendix (Available Upon Request)

- A. Tree Survey prepared by McClenahan Consulting, LLC, dated November 27, 2006
- B. Soils Engineering Study prepared by ES Geotechnologies, dated June 2007
- C. 1706 El Camino Real Medical Offices Transportation Impact Analysis prepared by DKS Associates, dated February 24, 2009