



## CITY OF SAN MATEO

### Initial Study

1. Project Title and Number: PA12-040 Draper University Phase I
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of San Mateo, Planning Division  
330 W. 20th Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94403
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Julia Yeh,  
Phone: 650-522-7216, Email: [jyeh@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:jyeh@cityofsanmateo.org)
4. Project Location and APN: 36-44 E. Third Ave (APNs: 034-143-240, -280, -290),  
37 E. Fourth Ave (APNs: 034-143-230), and  
51-65 E. Third Ave (APNs: 034-142-030, -180)
5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address: Timothy Draper, Heart of San Mateo  
2882 Sand Hill Road #150, Menlo Park, CA 94025
6. General Plan Designation: Downtown Retail Core
7. Zoning: Central Business District (CBD)
8. Description of Project: Establish Phase I of a new private school in three existing buildings at 36-44 E. Third Ave ("Benjamin Franklin Hotel"), 37 E. Fourth Ave, and 51-65 E. Third Ave ("Collective") and provide improvements in the Benjamin Franklin Court area including new landscaping, trees, pavement, access stairs, & signage. Project is comprised of three properties zoned CBD (Central Business District) and a public alley.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Commercial to the north, east, south and west.
10. Requested Applications: Mitigated Negative Declaration, Site Plan and Architectural Review, Site Development Permit, and Downtown Economic Development Permit.
11. Other Public Agencies whose approval is Required: None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:


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

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


**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Julia Yeh, Associate Planner

9/27/12  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald Munekawa, Chief of Planning

9/27/12  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

### DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Items identified in each section of the environmental checklist below are discussed following that section. Required mitigation measures are identified (if applicable) where necessary to reduce a projected impact to a level that is determined to be less than significant. The General Plan Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse number 89100308) is herein incorporated by reference in accordance with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines. Copies of this document and all other documents referenced herein are available for review at the City of San Mateo Planning Division, 330 W. 20th Avenue, San Mateo.

---

The following sources are referenced in the Initial Study Checklist, and are hereby incorporated by reference into this document:

While these documents are not attached with the circulated Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, all referenced documents are available for review at the City of San Mateo Planning Division.

1. City of San Mateo General Plan
2. City of San Mateo Municipal Code
3. Project Plans
4. Site Visits and Analysis
5. State of California Hazardous Waste & Substances List
6. Uniform Building Code
7. Uniform Fire Code
8. Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines, April 1996
9. USGS Map Showing Faults and Earthquake Epicenters in San Mateo County, CA
10. Citywide Archaeological Investigations, City of San Mateo, CA
11. San Mateo Historic Resources Inventory
12. Design Review by ARG dated September 25, 2012
13. Draper University Parking Analysis and TDM Plan by Nelson Nygaard dated September 20, 2012

# I. AESTHETICS

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4
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"/>	1,2,3,4
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"/>	1,2,3,4
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"/>	2,3,4

## Discussion

### *Item a, b – No Impact*

The project is a proposed reuse of existing commercial buildings in an urban setting in downtown San Mateo and is not located along a designated scenic roadway, nor are there any significant trees, rock outcroppings, or other significant scenic elements on the existing properties. Thus, the project will not result in significant impacts on scenic vistas. It should also be noted that the applicant will also be planting new vegetation on-site and in the public alley.

While two buildings of the three building which comprise the proposed school are identified as historic buildings on the City’s 1989 Historic Resources Inventory, neither building is located along a state scenic highway. Therefore, no impact to scenic resources is anticipated.

NOTE: Information on the project’s impact on the historic buildings is discussed in Section V Cultural Resources (below).

### *Items c, d – Less Than Significant Impact*

While the construction is likely to have a perceived aesthetic impact by adjacent businesses and visitors to downtown, the impact is temporary in nature and limited to the duration of construction. The project is not expected to result in long term degradation to the visual character or quality of the site and surroundings. Additionally, while the proposed exterior changes to the historic Benjamin Franklin Hotel building include new exterior lighting, the building is located in an urban setting with ample lighting on existing buildings, the the major streets and public alleys. The proposed exterior lighting serves a dual purpose in identifying the building and helps improve security around the site by illuminating the publicly accessible areas.

## II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

<b>ISSUES:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<p><i>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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</i></p> <p><b>Would the project:</b></p>					
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3
<p>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3
<p>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3

### Discussion

#### *Items a-c – No Impact*

The project site currently has a General Plan land use designation of Downtown Retail Core and is zoned Central Business District (CBD). The site is located in an urban downtown setting and is not used for agricultural purposes nor are there any agricultural uses in the surrounding area that would be affected by the proposed project. The area surrounding the project site is primarily composed of commercial buildings. No Williamson Act contracts exist because there is no agricultural land uses in the project area. In fact, there are no Williamson Act lands within the City limits. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts to agricultural resources.

### III. AIR QUALITY

<b>ISSUES:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<i>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.</i> <b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,10
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,10
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3,10
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,10
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4

#### Discussion

##### *Items a- d – No Impact*

The proposed project consists of the reuse of two historic buildings and one commercial building in downtown San Mateo. The reuse of the three buildings for a private school use limited to 180 students and no more than 20 staff generates less vehicle trips than the previous uses in all three buildings and therefore is not expected to generate significant levels of air pollutants. Therefore, it does not conflict with nor does it obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan.

There are no sensitive receptors adjacent to the area of the proposed school in that it is located in an urban commercial downtown setting. The paved parking area to the rear of the Collective Building, where most vehicle emissions resulting from this project are likely to be produced, is an existing parking lot and is not located near any sensitive receptors.

The proposed private school use does not include any laboratory facilities and therefore is not expected to generate objectionable odors affecting the general public. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

##### *Item e – Less than Significant Impact*

The project has the potential to generate dust and other pollutants during grading and construction. The impact of dust generated by demolition, grading and construction activities is temporary in nature and limited to site preparation and construction. The City of San Mateo’s Building Division and Public Works Department will impose the following standard conditions of approval to minimize dust and vehicle emissions during grading and construction activities.

Standard Condition of Approval.

**BUILDING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES** - The following provision to control traffic congestion, noise, and dust shall be followed during site excavation, grading and construction:

The allowed hours of Building construction activities may be waived or modified through an exemption from the hours of work designated in Section 23.06.060, for limited periods, if the Building Official finds that:

- a) The following criteria are met:
  - 1) Permitting extended hours of construction will decrease the total time needed to complete the project thus mitigating the total amount of noise associated with the project as a whole; or
  - 2) An emergency situation exists where the construction is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition resulting in obvious and eminent peril to public health and safety. If such a condition exists, the City may waive any of the remaining requirements outlined below.
- b) The exemption will not conflict with any other conditions of approval required by the City to mitigate significant impacts.
- c) The contractor or owner of the property will notify residential and commercial occupants of property adjacent to the construction site of the hours of construction activity which may impact the area. This notification must be provided three days prior to the start of the construction activity.
- d) The approved hours of construction activity will be posted at the construction site in a place and manner that can be easily viewed by an interested member of the public.

The Building Official may revoke the exemption at any time if the contractor or owner of the property fails to abide by the conditions of exemption or if it is determined that the peace, comfort and tranquility of the occupants of adjacent residential or commercial properties are impaired because of the location and nature of the construction. The waiver application must be submitted to the Building Official ten (10) working days prior to the requested date of waiver.

(BUILDING)

**MATERIAL HAULING AND CONSTRUCTION WORKER PARKING** - For material delivery vehicles equal to, or larger than two-axle, six-tire single unit truck (SU) size or larger as defined by FHWA Standards, the applicant shall submit a truck hauling route that conforms to City of San Mateo Municipal Code Section 11.28.040 to the approval of the City Engineer. The haul route for this project shall be: **From: Site to East Fourth Avenue to State Highway 101. To: State Highway 101 to East Third Avenue to Site.** A letter from the applicant confirming the intention to use this hauling route shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works, and approved, prior to the issuance of any City permits. All material hauling activities including but not limited to, adherence to the approved route, hours of operation, staging of materials, dust control and street maintenance shall be the responsibility of the applicant. All storage and office trailers will be kept off the public right-of-way. Tracking of dirt onto City streets and walks will not be allowed. Any job-related dirt and/or debris that impacts the public right-of-way shall be removed immediately. No wash down of dirt into storm drains will be allowed. All material hauling activities shall be done in accordance with applicable City ordinances and conditions of approval. Violation of such may be cause for suspension of work. (PUBLIC WORKS)

**BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMP)** -- The applicant shall perform all construction activities in accordance with the City's Storm Water Management and Discharge Control Rules and Regulations (SMMC 7.38.020), and the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) by reference. Detailed information can be located at: <http://www.flowstobay.org/documents/business/construction/SWPPP.pdf>  
(PUBLIC WORKS)

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,19
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4

#### Discussion

##### *Items a - f – No Impact*

The project site is not identified in the General Plan as being a habitat area for documented rare, threatened, and endangered animal or plant species, and, therefore, no adverse impacts are anticipated.

While existing vegetation and trees are proposed to be removed as part of the project, more than 20 new 24 inch box size trees are proposed to be planted on the project site and in the adjacent public alley generally known as the Benjamin Franklin Court. The City’s arborist has inspected the existing landscaping and trees in the project area, which are in poor to fair condition, and agrees with the project architect’s proposed replacement landscaping and trees as appropriate species for the area. The project does not conflict with of the City’s tree preservation ordinance.

There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community plans applicable to the project site. No special-status species would be adversely affected, no sensitive natural vegetation would be removed, and no significant adverse impacts on creeks or wetlands would occur as a result of the project. Additionally, the proposed project would not conflict with conservation goals and policies of the General Plan relating to protection of biological and wetland resources. No significant impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is

required.

The proposed project is not anticipated to conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved conservation plans because no such conservation plans have been adopted which encompass the project vicinity. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

The project is located in an urban setting and is not located in an area identified as a habitat for any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the state's Department of Fish and Game or the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,13
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,12
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,12
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,12

### Discussion

#### *Items b - f – No Impact*

This site has not been identified as an archaeological resource in the Citywide Archaeological Survey or the San Mateo Historic Resources Inventory. The site has no known paleontological resources or unique geologic features that would suggest the presence of these resources. Additionally, the site has no known human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Thus, this project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique historical, archaeological or paleontological resource; geologic feature; or disturb any human remains.

#### *Items a – Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*

While the Collective Building at 51 – 65 E. Third Ave is a historic building, no exterior changes shall be made and therefore, therefore no significant impact is anticipated. The building at 37 E. Fourth Avenue is not a historic building and therefore proposed interior and minor exterior alterations to the building’s storefront is not anticipated to have a significant impact on a cultural resource.

The proposed project includes exterior modifications to the historic Benjamin Franklin Hotel building. The proposed changes have been reviewed by the City’s Historic Consultant, Architectural Resources Group (ARG), for consistency with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards as well as the City’s Downtown Historic Design Guidelines. ARG evaluated the impact of the proposed project on the integrity of the historic resource and found that while the integrity of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel would be slightly diminished by the proposed project, overall, the historic resource would retain the physical characteristics that convey its historical significance and that justify its potential eligibility for the California Register. Similarly, ARG found that the integrity of the San Mateo Downtown Historic District would only be minimally impacted by the proposed project. As defined by CEQA, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse change, material impairment, or cumulative impacts to the individual resource, the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, or the San Mateo Downtown Historic District.

In its initial, ARG identified one area of concern relating to the preservation of the existing “Benjamin Franklin” signs on the East and West elevations of the building. ARG supported the project architect’s idea of encasing of the existing “Benjamin Franklin” signs with a custom structure that would protect the signs while allowing the future installation of “Draper University” signs on top of the encasing. The specific details

for the encasement will be provided for further review during the Building Permit Application stage. The recommendations, including the mitigation measure, of the Historic Consultant are incorporated as part of the Conditions of Approval for this project and will be implemented by the Planning Division.

Mitigation Measure

HISTORICAL CONSULTANT RECOMMENDATIONS – The recommendations in ARG’s Design Review (dated September 25, 2012) are hereby incorporated as conditions of approval and subsequent building permit plans shall be evaluated for consistency with the Design Review document. The final building permit plans shall provide constructions details for further review by the City’s Historical Consultant to ensure compliance with the approved Planning Application and with ARG’s Design Review dated September 25, 2012. Additionally, the applicant shall provide a \$5,000 deposit and shall be responsible for the full costs of consultant services to review the building permit plans. (PLANNING)

One area of inconsistency with the project plan is that it shows incorrect information with regards to the entry at 65 E. Third Avenue and partition walls inside the Peninsula Banquet Room. The project architect has agreed to revise the scope of work to remove the proposed modification to the Collective Building and remove the partition walls from Phase I of the Draper University project. The following condition ensures the final building permit plans also show the reduction in scope of work.

Condition of Approval

CHANGE TO PROJECT SCOPE & PLANS – All subsequent building permit drawings shall show a reduction in the scope of work in that:

- (a) No exterior changes shall be made to the Collective Building (at 51 – 65 E. Third Ave) in Phase I, and
- (b) The partition walls shown in area known Astaria’s Peninsula Banquet Room or the Sarah Room shall be removed from the scope of work for Phase I. This does not preclude the applicant from applying for the partition walls in the future, subject to meeting all applicable regulations at the time of application.

(PLANNING/BUILDING/FIRE)

## VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,11, 16
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,16
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,16
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,16
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,16
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,6,16
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,6,16
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,6,16

### Discussion

#### *Items a – e – No Impact*

The site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no faults are known to exist on site. Therefore, the site is not subject to fault or ground rupture. The project site is on flat terrain and is not prone to landslides. Additionally, the potential for erosion, liquefaction, landslides are low on the project site because of the flat terrain and the project proposes no change to the grade as it is a reuse of existing buildings and includes minimal change to existing landscaped areas.

The project consists of reusing existing commercial and hotel buildings for a school use. Existing sanitary sewer capacity exists to serve the commercial uses in downtown San Mateo. (See discussion in Section XVI – Utilities and Service Systems.)

## VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,8
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,8

### Discussion

#### *Items a, b – No Impact*

The City has adopted a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Program, and is utilizing the corresponding monitoring tool, in conformance with CEQA Guidelines section 15183.5. In addition, the Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Program has been designed to meet the requirements of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines and the corresponding criteria for a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Strategy as defined by the BAAQMD. The Program quantifies specific policies in the Sustainable Initiatives Plan and General Plan, and concludes that with the combination of the Sustainable Initiative Plan, General Plan policies, regional, and State policies and programs, the City will reach its 2020 greenhouse gas emission reduction target.

The levels at which the contribution to greenhouse gases are deemed not to be cumulatively considerable are set forth in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Program as shown in the chart below:

Emissions Reduction Summary (Metric Tons CO <sub>2</sub> e)		
	2020	2030
Business-as-usual Forecast	721,367	764,267
Emissions Reduction Target	519,384	305,707
Emissions Forecast with SIP, General Plan, regional, and state policies and programs.	516,750	411,875

Applying the City's General Plan Policies and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Program, this project will not result in the City exceeding the levels set forth above. As a result, the greenhouse gas impacts are less than significant.

## VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,5
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3

### Discussion

#### *Items a-h – No Impact*

The project site is not listed as a contaminated site in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. Utility easements are located on and adjacent to the project site. Electromagnetic fields (EMFs) are naturally occurring and are present in things found in nature (such as visible light) to house hold items (radio waves) to larger man made items (X-rays). Current discussions regarding EMFs focus on whether exposure to EMFs is hazardous. Available studies on EMFs have conflicting findings on whether there is an associated health risk and that studies have not found a threshold value, dose response or causative relationship that demonstrates significant adverse effect from EMFs. Additionally, there is no regulatory standard which establishes a threshold for exposure to EMFs.

The proposed reuse of existing commercial and hotel buildings will not generate additional hazardous waste, increase risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances, interfere with emergency services, or increase exposure of people to hazardous waste.

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport, airport land use plan, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would therefore not result in a safety hazard related to these land uses.

No barriers to movement would result from the proposed project. Minor roadway changes are proposed, which would be designed to allow inflow and egress into the project site as well as improve roadway conditions. The proposed project would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The site is surrounded on all four sides by commercial use and the proposed reuse of existing buildings at this site is not expected expose people or structures to any significant risk due to fires as the building's sprinkler systems will be upgraded as required to meet applicable California Fire Codes.

## IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,8
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,8
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 would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,8
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,8
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,8
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,8
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"/>	1,3,4
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"/>	1,3,4
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"/>	1,3,4
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4

### Discussion

#### *Items a - j – No Impact*

The project consists of the reuse of existing commercial and hotel buildings for a private school use in the urbanized downtown area of the city and is not anticipated to adversely affect groundwater resources, or

interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in the project area because the project does not use ground water. Runoff from the replacement paving of existing paved walkways will be directed to existing or upgraded drainage lines and is not expected to alter or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff into existing stormwater drainage systems. Some water absorption by the landscape areas are to be expected, however, it is not expected to adversely affect groundwater resources, or adversely affect water quality.

The site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and is therefore not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

The project site is not located in the area identified by the General Plan as a potential inundation area due to seiche, or tsunami, or mudflow.

## X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
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 plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4

### Discussion

#### *Items a-c – No Impact*

The project site is surrounded by commercial uses in the urbanized downtown area of the city. The proposed reuse of existing commercial and hotel buildings would not physically divide the downtown area.

The project is consistent with the policies and goals outlined in the San Mateo General Plan, Downtown Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, and other applicable ordinances. Furthermore, the proposed school use may be permitted in the Central Business District subject to approval of a Special Use permit or a Downtown Economic Development Permit.

There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community plans applicable to the project site.

## XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,4
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,4

### Discussion

*Items a, b – No Impact*

Mineral resources are not known to exist on the project site. Locally-important mineral resources do not exist on the project site.

## XII. NOISE

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project result in:</b>					
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
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"/>	1,3,4
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"/>	3,4
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"/>	3,4

### Discussion

#### *Item a, b, c, e, f – No Impact*

The project site is not located near significant vibration sources, nor will the project generate ground-borne vibration; therefore the project will have no impact. Additionally, the project is not expected to generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels because noise from mechanical equipment associated with the project must meet the City's property line noise requirements.

The project site is located approximately 5 miles south of San Francisco International Airport - outside the CNEL 65 dB noise contour for SFO and is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. While airplanes occasionally fly over the project site may produce increases in ambient noise levels, the project would not expose people to long-term excessive noise levels because loud noises produced by airplanes are short-term and periodic. These noise levels are not high enough to impact human health in the project area, thus the project will have no impact.

#### *Item d - Less Than Significant*

The project would result in short-term increases in noise levels during construction, however, these noise levels are temporary in nature and is not anticipated to result in long term significant noise impacts to the community.

### XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3

**Discussion**

*Item a, b, c – No Impact*

The project consists of the reuse of two commercial buildings and a hotel building. The reuse of these buildings for a private school use with on-site dormitory is not anticipated to induce a substantial population growth in the area in that a hotel building provides short term housing and a proposed dormitory would provide short term housing for the school’s students during the school term. The project does not include an increase in the number of dorm rooms and would be limited to a maximum of 180 students based on double occupancy in the dorm rooms.

No housing and residents will be displaced as a result of this project as the existing hotel is vacant and has been vacant since the late 1990’s for various reasons including bankruptcy.

## XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
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:					
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,7
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3

### Discussion

#### *Item a – Less than significant impact*

Public services are provided to the community as a whole and are typically financed on a community-wide basis at the local, state and/or federal level. New developments will usually create an incremental increase in the demand for these services. The amount of the demand will vary widely depending on the nature/specific characteristics of the development and type of services. The impacts of a project on public services and facilities is generally a fiscal impact in that the project may increase the demand for a type of service, causing an eventual increase in the cost of providing the service (such as more personnel hours to patrol an area, additional fire equipment needed to service a tall building, etc.). These impacts are not considered environmental issues.

The reuse of existing commercial and hotel buildings will result in a negligible increase in the demand for services given that the hotel building is currently vacant and has a limited draw on public services. Due to anticipated incremental increases in demand on City services, the project will be subject to various applicable impact fees (i.e. school district fees if applicable based on California state law) and the applicant will therefore be required to pay these fees to meet the project's anticipated demand for services. However, the project is located in an urbanized area currently served by municipal services (including fire protection, police protection, and maintenance of public facilities such as roads), therefore, it is not anticipated that a project of this type and size will significantly change or impact public services or require the construction of new or remodeled public service facilities.

The project will not require the construction of any new service facilities; therefore, the project would not result in a significant public services impact.

## XV. RECREATION

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3

### Discussion

#### *Items a-b – Less Than Significant Impact*

The existing commercial and hotel buildings have been accounted for in the city's General Plan, which examined recreational opportunities. The General Plan also does not require that a reuse of commercial and hotel buildings for a private school use with on-site dormitory in the Central Business District zoned area of the City incorporate a recreational element on site.

The project includes a the construction of a roof top sports court at the rear of the site which connects to the existing on-site swimming pool area on the south side of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel property for use by the school students and staff.

While the students and staff may utilize the recreational facilities at Central Park or at any other public recreational facility in the City, the provision of onsite recreational amenities will lessen the demand on these public facilities.

## XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,17
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,17
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,17
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"/>	1,3,4,17
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4,17
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,17

### Discussion

#### *Items c, d, e, f – No Impact*

The proposed project would not result in any change in air traffic patterns, nor is it expected to increase hazards, because the proposed project consists of the reuse of existing buildings.

The project is consistent with the adopted General Plan, Downtown Plan, and Pedestrian Master Plan with regards to providing and maintaining a pedestrian friendly walking environment. Additionally, the project will provide on-site bicycle racks at grade and bicycle rooms within the school for student use, which is consistent with the city's goals in encouraging and facilitating bicycle use. The proposed project does not conflict with policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Currently, bus service is available in downtown along El Camino Real and Caltrain service is available at the Downtown Caltrain station at First Ave and Railroad. The proposed project would not interfere or impede existing services.

The project will not impede emergency access nor would it create new hazards as no new structures are proposed.

*Items a, b – Less Than Significant*

The project proposes to reuse existing commercial and hotel buildings for a private school use, which is expected to generate fewer trips in that the proposed school use would have approximately 180 students and 14 staff, similar to the number of occupants in the hotel at full occupancy and with hotel staff. In addition to that, the proposed school use is spread across three buildings: Benjamin Franklin Hotel building, Fourth Avenue building, and Collective Building. Whereas, a hotel use is expected to operate independently from the two commercial buildings and each of those commercial buildings would generate vehicle trips based on their customers and employees. Therefore, the project is not anticipated generate a significant impact on traffic circulation, nor would it conflict with any congestion management programs. However, based on anticipated usage of transportation routes, a standard Transportation Improvement Impact Fee shall be required as a condition of approval.

Additionally, the proposed project was reviewed by the City's parking consultant, Nelson Nygaard. The consultant evaluated the shared parking analysis of the proposed school use and the various existing businesses that are proposed to remain through Phase I of the Draper University project. The findings of the shared parking analysis show a weekday peak parking demand of 102 spaces occurring at noon and a Saturday peak parking demand of 71 occurring at 11 AM. If parking is not shared amongst uses, the weekday peak parking demand increases slightly to 105 and increases more significantly on Saturdays to 86.

The findings show that there are a number of TDM measures that Draper University can implement to encourage students and employees to use non auto modes of transportation including the following:

- Bicycle parking
- Bicycle loaner program
- Transportation information
- Transit passes
- Welcome packets
- Carsharing
- Pre-tax transit benefits

The TDM programs described in Nelson Nygaard's September 20, 2012 memo could reduce the weekday peak shared parking demand by 6% and the Saturday peak parking demand by 4%, reducing the total number of parking spaces needed to 96 and 68, respectively.

Additionally, the City of San Mateo is currently in the process of forming a Downtown TMA and participation in the programs offered by a TMA could also help to reduce vehicle trips. Projects being constructed in the downtown area are asked to contribute seed money to the formation of this organization which will provide transportation programs that can be utilized by employees, residents and students in the downtown. Given its scale, Draper University is being asked to contribute \$15,000 to the Downtown TMA.

Conditions of Approval

**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT FEE** - The applicant shall pay a fee proportional to the project's share of transportation improvements needed to serve cumulative development within the City of San Mateo. The fee amount will be based upon the City Council resolution in effect at the time the building permit application is made. The fee shall be paid prior to issuance of the superstructure building permit. (PUBLIC WORKS)

**TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION (TMA)** – This project is required to participate in the TMA, including annual payment of membership dues, when it has been established by the City and to pay \$15,000.00 toward the formation of the TMA. Payment shall be made prior to issuance of the building permit. (PUBLIC WORKS)

## XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3
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"/>	1,3
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"/>	1,2,3
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"/>	1,3
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"/>	1,3
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3
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"/>	1,3

### Discussion

#### *Items a - g – Less Than Significant*

The use of the existing commercial and hotel buildings is has been accounted for in the General Plan and General Plan EIR. While the proposed project is not expected to generate a significant increase in utility usage, water consumption, solid waste, storm water and wastewater, there will be an incremental increase in demand on services. The proposed change in use from commercial and hotel use to school use is expected to generate an incremental increase in demand on services base on the fact that students are more likely to stay on campus for a longer period of time than the typical hotel guest and therefore more likely to generate a slightly higher demand on services.

The Public Works department has been determined that there is enough capacity in the existing utility, water, and service systems to accommodate the incremental increase generated by the proposed project. Consistent with City requirements, the City's Public Works department requires that the applicant pay impact fees in order to meet the increased demands to the Wastewater Treatment Plant created by this project and a Sanitary Sewer Connection Charge; both are incorporated as conditions of approval of the project. (Note: The City-Wide Sewer System Study was conducted in June 2005 which informed the project scopes for infrastructure improvements. The data is dynamic and the City periodically refines the project scope based on current flow data. The sewer system study is on file at the City of San Mateo's Public Works Department.)

Recology provides solid waste disposal service to the City of San Mateo. The additional contributions to the landfill anticipated to be generated by this project is not expected to be a significant impact on the landfill's capacity. The project has been reviewed by the Public Works Department in consultation with Recology for the size and location of the waste/recycling collection areas and the accessibility for pick up. The waste/recycling collection areas/rooms are provided for each building, and the staging areas are servable by Recology.

Construction and demolition debris from the project site would be addressed by the City's Construction and Demolition Debris program and is a standard requirement for construction projects.

Conditions of Approval

WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PHASE II IMPACT FEE - In order to meet the increased demands on the Wastewater Treatment Plant created by this project, the applicant shall contribute fees toward the Plant expansion based upon the average projected sanitary flow, as determined under the City Council resolution in effect at the time the building permit application is made. The fee shall be paid prior to issuance of the superstructure building permit. (PUBLIC WORKS)

SANITARY SEWER INCREASE CHARGE - The applicant shall pay a fee proportional to the project's share of the increase amount of sewage generated by the project. The fee will be based upon the City Council resolution in effect at the time the building permit application is made. The fee shall be paid prior to issuance of the superstructure building permit. (PUBLIC WORKS, BUILDING)

## XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<i>ISSUES:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Supporting Information Sources</i>
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4,5
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,3,4

### Discussion

#### *Item a, b, c – No Impact*

The project is not expected to have any environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, fish, wildlife, or endangered plant or animal, either directly or indirectly. The project is not expected to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory in that there is no grading work other than that associated with the removal of existing paved walkways, landscaping and trees for the purpose of replacing them with new walkways, landscaping and trees.