

**Station Park Green  
1700 and 1790 S. Delaware Street  
(APN 035-200-180 and 035-200-060)**

**Addendum to the Station Park Green (PA 07-030)  
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration  
State Clearinghouse No. 2010082076**

**A. INTRODUCTION**

This environmental document is an Addendum to the Station Park Green Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2010082076), adopted on January 18, 2011, by the City Council of the City of San Mateo (the "MND"). The MND tiered off of the Rail Corridor Plan EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2003042170). The program studied in the MND matched that described in the Specific Plan and Design Guidelines, and authorized under the Development Agreement (the "Original Project"), all of which were also studied and approved by the City Council on January 18, 2011. That program includes:

- Up to 599 dwelling units;
- A minimum of 25,000 gross square feet ("gsf") and up to 60,000 gsf of retail / services / restaurant uses;
- A minimum of 10,000 gsf and up to 45,000 gsf of office use; and
- Approximately 2.0 acres of privately maintained open space open to the general public.

The Project Applicant ARJAX Railroad Associates II, LLC remains the same. However, since adoption of the MND, refinements and modifications to the previously Original Project have been proposed (the "Revised Project"). These include the following:

- Simplified Block Pattern - The Project would feature eight (8) blocks instead of twelve. There would continue to be four (4) open space blocks, but there would be only four (4) developed blocks, instead of the eight (8) previously studied and approved.
- Internal Streets and Open Space - The number of internal streets will necessarily be reduced, although the typology (cross-sections) of streets is expected to remain the same. The open space network will be simplified into fewer, larger blocks, the materials and finishes will be same. The Revised Project also includes additional open space (more than 2 acres) compared to the Original Project.

The Project Applicant is now prepared to submit fully developed Site Plan and Architectural ("SPAR") plans, which provide more detailed project information. Section E.2 below outlines refinements to the project included in the SPAR-level plans. The purpose of this Addendum is to address these proposed refinements in the context of the MND. As demonstrated in this Addendum, the MND continues to serve as the document required under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") for assessing the environmental impacts of to the Revised Project.

## **B. BACKGROUND**

The City of San Mateo prepared the MND to address potentially significant environmental impacts resulting from the project. The range of potential environmental effects assessed included aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems. The MND found that all impacts have been mitigated to below a level of significance through implementation of mitigation measures. In approving the Original Project, the City of San Mateo imposed a combined Conditions of Approval & Mitigation Monitoring Program.

## **C. PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM**

Once a project has been approved, the lead agency's role in project approval is completed, unless further discretionary approval on that project is required. (CEQA Guidelines sec. 15162(c).) The Revised Project, however, does require further discretionary approval, including amendments to the Specific Plan and Design Guidelines, SPAR, and a Parcel Map. Accordingly, the Lead Agency must determine whether a Subsequent EIR or MND is required for the Revised Project.

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 set criteria for that determination. If the following criteria are all true, then a Subsequent EIR or MND is *not* required, and an Addendum is the appropriate document:

- No new significant impacts will result from the project or from new mitigation measures.
- No substantial increase in the severity of environmental impact will occur.
- No new feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would reduce impacts previously found not to be feasible have, in fact, been found to be feasible.

Based upon the information provided in Section A, above, the modifications to the Original Project will not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the MND. Nor are there any previously infeasible alternatives that are now feasible. None of the other factors set forth in Section 15162(a)(3) [new information of substantial importance] is present. Therefore, an Addendum is appropriate. The City has prepared this Addendum to address the environmental effects of the Revised Project *vis a vis* the Original Project.

## **D. CONCLUSIONS**

The conclusions of the analysis in this Addendum remain consistent with those made in the previously-adopted MND. Specifically, based upon substantial evidence in the light of the whole record:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the Original Project that will require major revisions of the MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Revised Project is undertaken that will require major revisions to the MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and

- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the MND was adopted shows that:
  - The Revised Project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the MND;
  - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the MND;
  - No mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would, in fact, be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the Revised Project, but the Project Applicant declines to adopt them.

(See CEQA Guidelines sec. 15162(a).) Therefore, the lead agency has determined to prepare this Addendum. (Id., subd. (b).)

## **E. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Revised Project includes residential and commercial uses within the range of uses and square footage identified in the Original Project. The Revised Project includes the following:

- 599 dwelling units (1-BR, 2-BR and 3-BR Dwelling Units);
- 26,000 gross square feet (“gsf”) of retail / services / restaurant uses;
- 11,000 gsf of office uses; and
- More than 2.0 acres of privately maintained open space open to the general public.

For a detailed comparison of the Revised Project and the Original Project please refer to Section E.2 below.

### **E.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING**

The project site comprises approximately 12 acres located at the southwesterly corner of the intersection of South Delaware Street and Concar Drive in the City of San Mateo (the “Site”). The Site is currently improved with a “big-box” *Kmart*/office building, a *Michael's* retail store, a *Shell* gas station, large surface parking lots, and minimal landscaping. The Site is located adjacent to a variety of uses, including: commercial and office uses directly to the west (including the Delaware Street Post Office); multi-family and single-family uses to the north and east; retail uses to the east and south along the State Route 92 corridor; and the Hayward Park CalTrain Station, rail line and park-and-ride lot directly to the south. Both the City’s General Plan and its zoning code designate the entire Site for Transit Oriented Development (“TOD”).

### **E.2 PROJECT REFINEMENTS SINCE MND ADOPTION**

As studied and approved under the Original Project, the Revised Project would include: up to 599 residential units (with a mix of studio, 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom and 3 bedroom units); 11,000 gsf of

office uses; and 26,000 gsf of neighborhood-serving retail uses. The entire development will continue to be focused on an approximately one-acre central park.

<b>Uses</b>	<b>Original Project</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>
<i>Residential Uses</i>	Up to 599 units	599 units
<i>Retail/Restaurant/Service</i>	25,000-60,000 gsf	26,000 gsf
<i>Office Uses</i>	10,000-45,000 gsf	11,000 gsf
<i>Public Open Space</i>	2.0 acres	2.0+ acres

The Rail Corridor Plan set all the development standards for the Site, and these standards were, in turn, reflected in the Specific Plan and Design Guidelines. See the table below for a comparison of the Revised Project to the Rail Corridor Plan:

<b>Development Standard</b>	<b>Rail Corridor Plan</b>	<b>Revised Project</b>
Max. Floor Area Ratio (All Uses)	3.0	2.3
Max. Floor Area Ratio (Retail)	0.3	<0.3
Max. Building Height	55 feet (35 ft. along S. Delaware St. )	55 feet (35 ft. along S. Delaware St.)
Min. Setbacks	None Required	None Required

The Revised Project will provide below market rate (“BMR”) units in accordance with the Development Agreement. All dwelling units at the Site are planned to be offered for rental.

The Revised Project would actually include more publicly accessible open space than was anticipated under the Original Project, with more than 2.0 acres in the form of a one-acre central park and additional open space areas at the entrances into the Site. A secondary open space under the Original Plan, called *The Gardens*, has been eliminated. In its place *The Gateway Park* and *The Community Park* were added. Coupled with the revised internal roadway system, these adjusted open spaces will provide better connections and vistas from the surrounding area through the Site and to the Hayward Park train station, making both *The Park* and train station more accessible to the public.

*The Greenway Pocket Parks* also have been added to the edge of the Site along the existing park-and-ride lot for the train station. It is the ultimate goal of the Specific Plan to integrate the Site seamlessly with the adjacent Joint Powers Board property by providing for direct adjacency of buildings and the connection of vehicular, bike and pedestrian ways. The new open space serves that goal.

The Revised Project proposes parking ratios consistent with the Specific Plan. Station Park Green is intended as a pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use, transit-oriented development, which offers the opportunity to share parking stalls between uses with different parking demand periods.

- The Residential, Office, and Retail/Services/Restaurant uses permitted under this Plan generate particular levels and patterns of parking demand.
- Parking facilities within the Plan Area will be able to accommodate these demand fluctuations more efficiently than segregated supplies, by accommodating peaking uses with stalls left vacant by other uses.

The Corridor Plan provides that conditions of approval for all developments within the Corridor Plan Area will establish minimum and maximum parking standards for the development, with a goal of achieving an overall reduction in new vehicle trips of at least 25 percent corridorwide. Accordingly, trip reduction strategies for Station Park Green have been evaluated as part of the environmental review process

Shared parking is one key strategy. A shared parking analysis was performed by Nelson Nygaard Consulting Associates and Hexagon Transportation Consultants as part of the environmental review of this Plan (Station Park Green Shared Parking Analysis, May 12, 2010).

- The analysis considered three maximized build-out scenarios possible under the Plan – maximum permitted retail, maximum permitted office, and maximized mix of retail and office – and accounted for how parking demand can be expected to vary by time of day, for both weekdays and Saturdays.
- The supply exceeded estimated demand under all scenarios.

Pursuant to Section 27.90.050 of the San Mateo Municipal Code, the uses permitted under this Plan shall require off-street motor vehicle parking according to the following schedule, which includes visitor parking:

LAND USE	PARKING REQUIREMENT
Studio Dwelling Unit	1.0 (stalls per unit)
1-BR Dwelling Unit	1.3 (stalls per unit)
2-BR Dwelling Unit	1.5 (stalls per unit)
3-BR Dwelling Unit	1.8 (stalls per unit)
Office	0.32 (stalls per 1,000 sq. ft.)
Retail/Restaurant/Services	2.06 (stalls per 1,000 sq. ft.)

Given its proposed mix of Studio, 1-BR, 2-BR and 3-BR Dwelling Units, the Revised Project requires 778 parking stalls to satisfy the Zoning Ordinance. The Revised Project actually will include 781 residential parking stalls, which is three (3) more than the required number. All 781 residential stalls will be reserved for the exclusive use of residents and their visitors.

With approximately 11,000 square feet of Office, and approximately 26,000 square feet of Retail/Restaurant/Services, the Revised Project only requires 57 non-residential stalls to satisfy the Zoning Ordinance. The Revised Project actually will include 131 non-residential parking stalls, which is 74 more than the required number. Of the 131 non-residential stalls:

- 20 will be reserved for 9,000 square feet of proposed Office space;
- 94 will be shared by the remaining 28,000 square feet of non-residential space;
- 12 will be reserved for loading;

- 5 will be reserved for public car-sharing services.

(Refer to MVE + Partners, Station Park Green Drawings, Nov. 20, 2014, Sheet A0-2.0 – Parking.)

In its shared parking study for the Revised Project, dated June 19, 2014, Nelson Nygaard assumed that no fewer than 15,000 square feet of the 37,000 square feet of non-residential space will be Restaurant space. Even so, Nelson Nygaard determined that actual parking demand for all 37,000 square feet of non-residential space will peak at 126 spaces, at noon on Saturdays. As noted above, the Project includes 131 non-residential parking stalls, which is five (5) more than this expected peak demand.

The Developer has provided all of the Public Benefits due to date under the Development Agreement. The “Timing of Public Benefits” is set out as Exhibit B to the Development Agreement. Specifically, ARJAX has already remitted the required \$200,000 in cash contributions. ARJAX and the City have also entered into a Grant of Multi-Use Path Easement and Agreement. Under that agreement ARJAX granted a surface easement for purposes of a Class I bike facility and landscaping strip along the southeasterly frontage of the Site and Concar Drive.

## F. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The following comparative analysis has been undertaken pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164, to provide the City with the factual basis for determining whether any changes in the Original Project, changes in circumstances, or new information since the MND was adopted require preparation of a Subsequent EIR or MND.

The refinements to the Original Project under the Revised Project are described in Section E (Project Description), above. The environmental analysis provided in the MND remains current and applicable to the Revised Project in areas unaffected by the refinements for the environmental topics, as listed below:

- **Aesthetics:** The proposed refinements would not result in additional impacts to aesthetic resources beyond those identified in the MND. The Revised Project would retain a similar block arrangement, street configuration, and building heights (up to 55 feet, except up to 35 feet along South Delaware Street) to the Original Project. Therefore the shadows that would be cast from the resulting buildings would be substantially the same as those under the Original Project. As with the Original Project, the Revised Project would not shadow the adjacent residential neighborhoods, nor would significant shadows be cast upon the open space provided as part of the project. Refer to MVE + Partners, Station Park Green Drawings, Nov. 20, 2014, Sheet A0-3.0– Sun/Shade Studies.)
- **Agriculture and Forestry Resources:** The proposed refinements would not result in additional impacts to agriculture beyond those identified in the MND because there are no prime, unique, or statewide important farmlands in the project study area. The MND did not identify any impacts to agricultural uses; therefore, mitigation was not required. No new mitigation measures are required for the Revised Project, either.
- **Air Quality:** The proposed refinements would not result in additional impacts to air quality beyond those identified in the MND. The background conditions, construction, equipment mix, and works hours identified in the MND have not changed significantly, and the proposed refinements would not result in any operational changes to the project once

constructed. Therefore, as described in the MND, the project would not exceed any Bay Area Air Quality Management District (“BAAQMD”) standards or contribute to air quality deterioration beyond BAAQMD projections. As was the case for the Original Project, impacts would be less than significant with the mitigation measures included as part of the Revised Project. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.

- **Biological Resources:** The proposed refinements would not result in additional impacts to biological resources beyond those identified in the MND would not increase impacts to biological resources, either directly or indirectly. Similarly to the Original Project, the Revised Project would remove the existing trees on the project site, but would replace a larger number of the trees on the site. As was the case for the Original Project, impacts would be less than significant with the mitigation measures included as part of the project. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.
- **Cultural Resources:** The Site is located in a “low-sensitivity” archaeology zone, and there are no known historic resources located at the Site. Although the probability of finding any cultural resources present at the Site is minimal, the mitigation measures prescribed in the MND as part of the Original Project would still be applicable and necessary to reduce any potential impacts under the Revised Project. As was the case for the Original Project, impacts would be less than significant with the mitigation measures included as part of the Revised Project. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.
- **Geology and Soils:** The proposed refinements would not result in substantially different geophysical impacts beyond those identified in the MND. While the Revised Project involves proposed refinements to the Original Project, these changes do not represent a substantial deviation from the project analyzed in the MND, and the conclusions of the MND remain valid. Compliance with applicable code standards and seismic requirements identified in the MND will continue to reduce geotechnical concerns to a less-than-significant level. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** The Revised Project would result in a similar (or potentially reduced) duration and intensity of construction activities relative to the Original Project, and the Original Project and Revised Project would be operationally identical to one another. Accordingly, the proposed refinements would not result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions or related impacts to global climate change or conflicts with applicable climate change plans, policies, or regulations. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements. The climate-change standards (the “GHG Thresholds”) promulgated in 2010 by BAAQMD do not constitute new information that was not known, and could not have been known, at the time the City adopted the MND. “In view of the trial court’s order which remains in place pending final resolution of the case, [BAAQMD] is no longer recommending that the [GHG] Thresholds be used as a generally applicable measure of a project’s significant air quality impacts. ... Lead agencies may continue to rely on [BAAQMD’s] 1999 Thresholds of Significance and they may continue to make determinations regarding the significance of an individual project’s air quality impacts based on the substantial evidence in the record for that project.” (<http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES.aspx>)

BAAQMD’s 1999 Thresholds of Significance were in place at the time that the MND was prepared and certified for the Original Project. The 1999 thresholds expressly addressed “global warming and stratospheric ozone depletion.” (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines:

Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans (Dec. 1999), pp. C-11 and C-12.) Mitigation measures were suggested as follows: “Greenhouse gas emissions can be reduced to some degree by improved coordination of land use and transportation planning on the city, county and subregional level and other measures to reduce auto use. Energy conservation measures also can contribute to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.”

Even if the GHG Thresholds were applicable to the Revised Project, which they are not, under the reasoning of *City of Dublin, supra*, 214 Cal.App.4th 1301, they cannot be construed as “new information” to trigger subsequent CEQA review. The court reasoned that the impact of GHG on climate change was known in 2002, and so new information about GHG emissions do *not* require supplemental CEQA review. (*Id.*, at pp. 1319-20, citing *CREED, supra*, 196 Cal.App.4th at p. 532 [information on the effect of GHG emissions on climate was known long before the lead agency approved 1994 FEIR].) Moreover, “[T]he adoption of guidelines for analyzing and evaluating the significance of data does not constitute new information if the underlying information was otherwise known or should have been known at the time the EIR was certified.”

- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** The Revised Project would not increase risks related to hazards or hazardous materials relative to the Original Project. The proposed refinements would still require mitigation to address potential hazards associated with removal of underground storage tanks as well as asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint residues, mercury and PCB-based materials, as applicable. As with the Original Project, and given the similarity in overall construction activities and identical operational characteristics, the Revised Project would not result in new or greater impacts in this regard. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality:** The Revised Project would be required, as under the Original Project, to comply with all applicable water-quality regulations during and following construction activities. As is the case with the Original Project, compliance with stormwater regulations would preclude the potential for significant impacts to receiving water bodies. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.

Since the Adoption of the MND, the project site has been removed from the 100-year floodplain. This is due to revision of the project area floodplain map as a result of levy construction. As a result, the Revised Project will not be required to obtain a floodproofing certificate. This is an improved environmental condition compared to the Original Project.

- **Land Use and Planning:** The Revised Project will meet the same land use and planning goals, objectives, and policies as the studied and approved Original Project, and still proposes to implement a Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”) Program that would meet the requirements of the Rail Corridor Plan, as well as the Original Project’s combined Conditions of Approval & Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which have been updated.
- **Mineral Resources:** The proposed refinements would not result in additional impacts to mineral resources beyond those identified in the MND, and because the Site is not located within an area of known mineral resources, either of regional or local value, the MND did not identify any impacts to mineral resources; therefore, mitigation was not required. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.

- **Noise/Vibration:** The Revised Project would not result in additional impacts due to noise or vibration beyond those identified in the MND. The proposed refinements to the Original Project would not result in design or operational changes to the project site or surrounding area from that analyzed in the MND. The overall intensity, equipment mix, duration, and proximity to sensitive receptors would not be significantly different than that assumed for the Original Project. Accordingly, while mitigation would still be necessary to address short-term noise increases in the project area and for expected operational impacts, no new mitigation measures are required for the Revised Project.
- **Population and Housing:** The Revised Project would not have any effect on population, housing, or employment in the City or region at large, as is the case for the Original Project. No adverse impacts would occur in this regard. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.
- **Public Services:** The proposed refinement to the Original Project would not result in additional impacts to public services/utilities beyond those identified in the MND, because they would not result in operational changes to the project beyond those evaluated in the MND for the Original Project. The MND did not identify any potentially significant impacts to public services; therefore, mitigation was not required. No new mitigation measures are required for the Revised Project.
- **Recreation:** The proposed refinements will not result in additional impacts to recreation beyond those identified in the MND. The MND did not identify any permanent impacts to recreational resources; therefore, mitigation was not required. Accordingly, no new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.
- **Transportation/Traffic:** The Original Project analysis relied on the Rail Corridor Plan and Bay Meadows Specific Plan Amendment EIR in its analysis of overall development within the Corridor Plan Area. The Revised Project is consistent with the development assumed for the Hayward Park Station Area Scenario Z development. The EIR identified several significant traffic impacts to State Route 92 and its off ramps as part of the analysis that included build out of the Rail Corridor Plan. Because improvements along State Route 92 are not under the control of the City of San Mateo, and therefore, their implementation cannot be assured, these were considered to be significant and unavoidable impacts. Accordingly, the City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for these impacts when it certified the EIR. That statement found that there are economic, social and other benefits of the Rail Corridor Plan that outweigh the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that had been identified.

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared for the Original Project in 2010 and was included in the MND. The MND did not identify any near-term project-specific impacts to transportation/traffic and only identified that the project would result in cumulative traffic. Like the Original Project, the Revised Project continues to include the payment of Traffic Impact Fees to address cumulative traffic generated by the project.

As outlined in a recent TIA prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants for the Revised Project, dated October 3, 2014, the Revised Project would not result in additional impacts to transportation/traffic beyond those identified in the MND. The TIA reviewed the existing project setting and the potential vehicle trips to be generated by the Revised

Project and compared those findings to the project analysis (Maximum Retail and Maximum Office Options) prepared for the Original Project in 2010.

The TIA found that the Revised Project is estimated to generate a net increase of 79 trips during the AM peak hour and a net decrease of 148 trips during the PM peak hour compared to the existing commercial uses present on the site at the time the recent TIA was prepared. In addition, the TIA determined that the Revised Project is expected to generate fewer net trips compared to either option studied in the 2010 report since the project includes a reduced amount of retail square footage. Compared to the previous options, the project would result in the following:

- 15 fewer AM and 57 fewer PM net trips than Option 1 (Maximum Retail), and
- 20 fewer AM and 13 fewer PM net trips than Option 2 (Maximum Office).

In addition, a signal warrant analysis was performed for the stop-controlled intersection of Delaware Street and Sunnybrae Boulevard. The existing traffic volume at this intersection is fairly low and does not meet the peak-hour signal warrant. The intersection is not expected to warrant signalization even with the traffic generated by the proposed Station Park Green development. Based on these findings, it has been determined that no new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.

- **Utilities and Service Systems:** The Revised Project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of any public utilities beyond those required for the Original Project. Temporary short-term and operational demands on public utilities or other infrastructure would not measurably change under the Revised Project, and, therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed refinements.
- **Mandatory Findings of Significance:** The potential impacts of the Revised Project with regard to biological resources, cultural resources, and direct and indirect effects on human beings would be essentially the same as under the Original Project. As impacts under the Revised Project would be similar to or reduced relative to the Original Project, impacts would be less than significant in this regard and no mitigation measures are required.

## F.1 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the information provided above, the proposed refinements to the Original Project would not result in a measurable increase in environmental impacts over what was previously analyzed in the MND. Although the Revised Project entails such refinements, no new significant impacts have been identified, nor is the severity of newly identified impacts substantially greater than the conclusions of the MND. Based upon this substantial evidence, the Revised Project would not result in a substantial change in the conclusions and analysis included in the MND.