

CITY OF SAN MATEO

Initial Study

1. Project Title and Number: 1400 & 1450 Fashion Island Blvd.
Century Centre Parking Structure
Planning Application (PA) 14-083
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: Tricia Schimpp, Senior Planner
Telephone: 650-522-7244
Email: tschimpp@cityofsanmateo.org
4. Project Location and APN: 1400 & 1450 Fashion Island Blvd.
San Mateo, CA 94404
APN(s): 035-440-690 & 035-440-700
5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address: Tom Wagner, Senior Partner
Harvest Properties
6425 Christie Avenue, Suite 220
Emeryville, CA 94608
Telephone: 510-808-5224
Email: twagner@harvestproperties.net
6. General Plan Designation: Executive Office
7. Zoning: E1-.62/R (Executive Park with Residential Overlay)
8. Description of Project:

The proposed project consists of the construction of a new 91,800 square foot, three-level (two elevated levels), 304 space open parking garage. The garage will be located in an existing at-grade parking lot currently serving the Century Centre Office Complex. 143 existing parking spaces and associated landscaping will be removed. There will be 161 net new spaces added to the overall parking count, bringing the overall new parking count to 1,013 spaces. See the Parking Stall Summation tables on page 2.

The parking structure will be naturally ventilated throughout all three parking levels, and circulated through the park-on-ramps on the south side of the structure. The main pedestrian circulation will be provided by the elevator and stair located on the northwest corner of the structure and the second stair access located at the northeast part of the structure. The main structural system of this parking garage will be a "hybrid system" which consists of precast concrete columns with long-span, post-tensioned precast concrete beams and post-tensioned

cast-in-place slabs. The structure will be supported on a deep foundation system of pre-cast, pre-stressed, reinforced concrete piles, as recommended by the geotechnical engineers for the project.

The architectural finishes of the parking structure will be textured coating with the color similar to the existing office complex buildings which the parking structure will serve.

There are 72 trees on the site. 3 existing heritage Coast Redwood trees will be preserved at the site. 29 Coast Redwood trees (of which 16 are heritage trees), 5 White Alder trees (of which 2 are heritage trees), and 35 Carob trees will be removed, for a total of 69 trees removed and 3 preserved.

PARKING STALL SUMMATION

EXISTING PARKING SUMMATION					
	Van Accessible	Accessible	Standard	Compact	Total
(E) Site	2	17	668	165(19.4%)	852
Displaced Stalls	0	0	-143	0	-143
(E) Site with Displacement	2	17	525	165 (19.4%)	709

NEW PARKING STRUCTURE SUMMATION							
Level	Van Accessible (9'x18')	Accessible (9'x18')	Standard (8.5'x18')	Compact (8.5'x17')	Total	Sq. Footage	Sq.Ft./Stall
Ground	2	3	43	48	96	28,500	297
Second	0	0	68	42	110	33,300	303
Third	0	0	66	32	98	30,000	306
TOTAL	2	3	177	122 (40.1%)	304	91,800	302

TOTAL					
	Van Accessible (9'x18')	Accessible (9'x18')	Standard (8.5'x18')	Compact (8/5'x17')	TOTAL
New (E) Site	2	17	525	165	709
Parking Structure	2	3	177	122	304
TOTAL	4*	20*	702	287 (28.3%)	1,013
Net New Stalls					161**

* Accessible Parking: Total 21 spaces required, including 4 van accessible, 24 provided, including 4 van accessible.

** 161 net new stalls = 304 (parking structure) – 143 (displaced stalls)

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is developed as the Century Centre Office Complex with two high rise office buildings situated in the middle of an at-grade parking lot. Surrounding land uses include; low density multi-family to the north, high density multi-family to the south, executive office to the east and Marina Lagoon to the west. The Century Centre Office Complex site is bounded by Fashion Island Boulevard to the north, Mariner's Island Boulevard to the east, SR 92 to the south

and Marina Lagoon to the west. The proposed garage footprint would occupy 32,700 square feet on a portion of the site that is approximately 51,400 square feet located in the southeast corner of the existing parking lot.

10. Requested Applications:

- A. Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new parking garage;
- B. Site Development Permit for grading and removal of sixty-nine (69) trees, including 19 heritage trees
- C. Amendment to the Mariner's Island Specific Plan

11. Other Public Agencies whose approval is Required: None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors indicted below by a "Yes" or "No" 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.

No	Aesthetics	No	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	No	Air Quality
Yes	Biological Resources	No	Cultural Resources	No	Geology /Soils
No	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	No	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	No	Hydrology / Water Quality
No	Land Use / Planning	No	Mineral Resources	No	Noise
No	Population / Housing	No	Public Services	No	Recreation
No	Transportation / Traffic	No	Utilities / Service Systems	No	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- X 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.

Tricia Schimpp, Senior Planner

Date

Ronald Munekawa, Chief of Planning

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:

Attachments with full appendices available online:

<http://www.cityofsanmateo.org/whats happening>

1. Project Plans: January 7, 2015
2. Arborist Report: September 29, 2014, December 15, 2014
3. Required Tree Planting Form: November 17, 2014
4. Design Review Report: November 21, 2014
5. Geotechnical Investigations: February 12, 2008, September 26, 2014
6. Hexagon Parking Study: November 11, 2014

Incorporated by Reference:

7. City of San Mateo General Plan and Land Use Map
8. City of San Mateo Municipal Code and Zoning Map
9. Mariner's Island Specific Plan
10. Site Visits and Analysis
11. State of California Hazardous Waste & Substances List
12. Uniform Building Code
13. Uniform Fire Code
14. Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines, December, 1999
15. USGS Map Showing Faults and Earthquake Epicenters in San Mateo County, CA
16. Citywide Archaeological Investigations, City of San Mateo, CA
17. San Mateo Historic Resources Inventory
18. City-Wide Sewer System Study, City of San Mateo, June 2005
19. County of San Mateo General Plan

The photos below show the existing office buildings from the project site located within the existing at-grade parking lot and the horizontal architectural style of the buildings.



View from Project Site to Existing Office Buildings



Existing Office Buildings

The photos below show the existing tree screen along the highway edge adjacent to the project site. While most of the existing trees will be removed at the project site, new trees and additional landscaping will be planted to provide a landscape screen along the highway edge and to soften the exterior shear walls of the proposed parking structure.



Current Highway Edge



View from Project Site Edge to Adjacent Highway

The architectural design of the parking structure was refined from the original preliminary design to follow specific design guidelines that were agreed upon by the applicant's design team and the City's Design Review consultant (see Attachment 4 for full Design Review report). The design recommendations include the following:

- Using precast concrete horizontal panels to more closely relate to the horizontal spandrels of the office buildings.
- Placing the concrete horizontal panels in front of the columns to emphasize the horizontality of the garage floors – much the same as those on the office buildings.
- Softening the exterior shear walls with additional landscaping.
- Designing the elevator element and primary stair in a contemporary manner with more visual interest.

The comparisons below show how the original design evolved to incorporate the above design guidelines to create a parking structure that is compatible with the established horizontal architectural style of the existing buildings and visually attractive with additional landscaping.



Original Design Sketch



Current Design Sketch

As illustrated in the Birds Eye View photomontages in the project plans (Attachment 1), the proposed parking structure would be located on the site at the rear of the existing office buildings and adjacent to the highway and would not conflict with views of the existing buildings. The project plan elevations illustrate that the proposed parking structure would complement the existing office buildings in mass, scale, form, design and materials. The overall project design incorporates the suggestions and recommendations of the City's Design Review Report by emphasizing the horizontal elements of the parking structure and using trees and vines to screen and soften the overall exterior appearance of the parking structure.

The existing lighting configuration for the site is to remain in that the surface parking areas, which are located in the interior of the site, will continue to be illuminated for safety and circulation and lighting for the proposed parking garage will be in conformance with the City's Security Ordinance.

Tree protection measures and monitoring during construction, and replacement trees and funds paid to the City's Tree Planting Fund, as conditions of project approval, will reduce impacts to less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

ISSUES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Supporting Information Sources
Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				x	7
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				x	8
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))?				x	8
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				x	7
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?				x	7
<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>					

Discussion

The project site is zoned Office Park and designated as Executive Office in the General Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the zoning and general plan designation and the existing use. Currently, the site is developed with two large scale office buildings and a surface parking lot. The project will have no impact on farmland, agricultural use, or forest land.

III. AIR QUALITY

ISSUES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Supporting Information Sources
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				x	7,14,19
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			x		7,12,14,19
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)?			x		6,7,14,19
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			x		7,12
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			x		7,12
<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>					

Discussion

The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently non-attainment for ozone (state and federal ambient standards) and particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) (state ambient standard). While an air quality plan exists for ozone, none currently exists for particulate matter. The *Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan*¹ is the current ozone air quality plan.

A project would be judged to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality plan if it would result in substantial new regional emissions not foreseen in the air quality planning process. Hexagon Transportation Consultants performed a Parking Study (Attachment 6) which concluded that the project would provide parking on site for existing vehicles that are stacked on site or parked on nearby local streets and would not result in additional vehicle miles traveled to or from the site. The project would not result in a substantial unplanned increase in population, employment, regional growth in vehicle miles traveled, or emissions, so it would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan.

Development projects in the Bay Area are most likely to violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation through generation of vehicle trips. New vehicle trips add to carbon monoxide concentrations near streets providing

¹ Bay Area Air Quality Management District et al., *Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan*, September 15, 2010.

access to the site. Carbon monoxide (CO) is an odorless, colorless poisonous gas whose primary source in the Bay Area is automobiles. Concentrations of this gas are highest near intersections of major roads. Because the project would not generate new vehicle miles traveled or new emissions, it would result in a less-than-significant impact to localized CO concentrations.

Construction Dust

Construction-related emissions are generally short-term in duration, but may still cause adverse air quality impacts. Fine particulate matter (PM₁₀) is the pollutant of greatest concern with respect to construction activities. PM₁₀ emissions can result from a variety of construction activities, including excavation, grading, demolition, vehicle travel on paved and unpaved surfaces, and vehicle and equipment exhaust. Construction-related emissions can cause substantial increases in localized concentrations of PM₁₀. Particulate emissions from construction activities can lead to adverse health effects as well as nuisance concerns such as reduced visibility and soiling of exposed surfaces.

Construction emissions of PM₁₀ can vary greatly depending on the level of activity, the specific operations taking place, the equipment being operated, local soils, weather conditions and other factors. Despite this variability in emissions, experience has shown that there are a number of feasible control measures that can be reasonably implemented to significantly reduce PM₁₀ emissions from construction. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) approach to CEQA analyses of construction impacts is to emphasize implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures rather than detailed quantification of emissions.

The BAAQMD threshold of significance for construction dust impacts is whether Best Management Practices (BMPs) are to be utilized. The project shall comply with the City's Building and Public Work's Departments' Construction Best Management Practices as standard Conditions of Approval for the planning application will be applied to minimize construction dust impacts of the project to less-than-significant.

Community Risks and Hazards- Construction Impacts to Off-Site Receptors

Construction of the project would occur at the southeast area of the site adjacent to State Route 92. A reconnaissance of the area surrounding the project site revealed no presence of sensitive receptors in proximity to construction activity.

The proposed project would not include uses that have been identified by BAAQMD as potential sources of objectionable odors. Sources of odors include restaurants, manufacturing plants, and agricultural operations and industrial operations such as wastewater treatment plants and solid waste transfer stations or landfills.

The project would not contain any of the above sources of odors, nor would it create a new sensitive receptor for odors. Therefore the proposed project would have a less than significant odor impact because it would not frequently create substantial objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Although not required to reduce project construction health hazards to below the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, the City’s standard Conditions of Approval will be applied to minimize the potential health risk resulting from project construction activities at the nearby offices.

Air quality measures and monitoring during construction, as planning application conditions of approval, will reduce impacts to less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				x	1,2,3,7, 10,19
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?				x	1,2,3,7, 10,19
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?				x	1,2,3,7, 10,19
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?				x	1,2,3,7, 10,19
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			x		1,2,3,7, 8,10,19
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?				x	1,2,3,7, 10,19

Discussion

The project site is developed and improved as an at-grade parking lot adjacent to a busy highway. No rare, threatened or endangered species habitat are identified on the project site.

A total of 3 Coast Redwood Heritage Trees will be preserved on site, and a total of 69 trees are proposed for removal. Of the 69 trees proposed for removal, 16 are Coast Redwood Heritage Trees and 2 White Alder Heritage Trees, as defined in Section 13.52 of the Municipal Code per San Mateo Municipal Code Chapter 23.40. The remaining 48 non-heritage trees proposed for removal qualify as Major Vegetation and consist of predominately parking lot trees such as 35 Carob Trees and highway edge trees such as 13 Coast Redwood Trees and 3 White Alder Trees.

A replacement value for the 69 trees proposed for removal has been assigned. As a result, a combination of 56 replacement trees ranging in size from 24-inch box to 36-inch box will be planted onsite. In addition, fees will be contributed toward the City’s Tree Planting Fund.

Tree protection measures and monitoring during construction, and replacement trees and funds paid to the City’s Tree Planting Fund, as conditions of project approval, will reduce impacts to less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				x	7,17,20
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				x	7,16,20
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				x	7,19,20
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				x	7,19,20

Discussion

The project site is already developed as an at-grade parking lot. The Environmental Impact Report for the original construction of the site did not identify historical, archaeological or paleontological resources at the site. Therefore, no archeological or paleontological resources, and no human remains are anticipated at the project site.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
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.			x		5,7,15
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			x		5,7,15
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				x	5,7,15
iv) Landslides?				x	5,7,15
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				x	5,7,15
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?				x	5,7,15
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?				x	5,7,15
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?				x	5,7,15, 18

Discussion

BAGG Engineers performed a geotechnical engineering investigation at the subject site in February, 2008, and updated that report in September, 2014, for purposes of developing foundation recommendations for the proposed parking structure and to update the seismic design parameters presented in the 2008 report. Based on borings taken at the site laboratory results, BAGG has concluded that the proposed project is feasible from a geotechnical engineering standpoint provided the recommendations presented in their report are incorporated into the project design and construction.

The September, 2014, geotechnical report recommends that the parking structure should be supported on a deep foundation system. If the proposed parking structure is supported on shallow foundations, it will undergo excessive post-construction settlements because the anticipated column loads are relatively high, and the underlying Bay Mud soils are soft and compressible. Because of the presence of groundwater at shallow depths, and the relatively thick layer of soft

Bay Mud, it is recommended that drilled, cast-in-place, reinforced concrete piers would be extremely cumbersome to construct. Therefore, BAGG recommended that the parking structure should be supported on pre-cast, pre-stressed, reinforced concrete piles or auger-cast piles.

The site could experience very strong ground shaking from future earthquakes during the anticipated lifetime of the project. The intensity of the ground shaking will depend on the magnitude of the earthquake, distance to the epicenter, and the response characteristics of the on-site soils and bedrock. While it is not possible to totally preclude damage to structures during major earthquakes, strict adherence to good engineering design and construction practices will help reduce the risk of damage. The latest Uniform Building Code defines the minimum acceptable engineering design and construction practices.

All recommendations of the geotechnical engineer will be incorporated into the project as conditions of project approval. According to the geotechnical report, there are no large active or dormant landslides in the area of the subject site. No known active or potentially active faults pass through the subject property. The Geotechnical Investigations report concludes the risk of seismically induced liquefaction, lateral spreading, or differential settlement is negligible.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				x	1,6,7,14
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				x	1,6,7,14

Discussion

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District identifies motor vehicles traveling to and from a facility as the principal source of air pollutants associated with the project for most land uses. The project will not generate additional operational greenhouse gas emission that will have a significant impact on the environment because the project will not increase vehicle miles traveled to or from the project site. The project will provide parking for vehicles that are already traveled to the site and parked in a stacked condition on site or parked on nearby local streets. The project is designed to service the existing two office buildings (Hexagon Parking Study, Attachment 6). Construction equipment emits carbon monoxide and ozone precursors. However, these emissions are included in the emission inventory that is the basis for regional air quality plans, and are not expected to impede attainment or maintenance of ozone and carbon monoxide standards in the Bay Area. Construction emissions are generally considered separately from operational emissions

because construction emissions are a one-time event, while operational emissions would be continuous over the life of the project. As a result, the greenhouse gas impacts are less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				x	1,8,11, 12
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?				x	1,8,11, 12
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				x	1,8,11, 12
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?				x	1,8,11, 12
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?				x	1,7,19
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?				x	1,7,19
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				x	1,7,19
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?				x	1,7,19

Discussion

The project site is zoned Executive Park which permits administrative, professional office land uses and other similar land uses that are not typically associated with hazardous materials and/or the transportation of such materials. The existing office buildings are occupied with administrative professional office land uses. The site is not designated as a hazardous site. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport. The site is located approximately 9 miles south of the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) and approximately 4.4 miles northwest of the San Carlos Airport. The site is not located in the typical traffic pattern area nor is it under the arrival and departure routes for the San Carlos Airport or SFO. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The Fire Department and Police Department have reviewed the proposed project to insure compliance with their respective divisions including but not limited to emergency response plans and the City's security ordinance.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				x	1,7,12,
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)?				x	1,7,12
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?				x	1,7,12
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?				x	1,7,12
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?				x	1,7,12
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				x	1,7,12
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as				x	1,7,12

ISSUES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Supporting Information Sources
mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?					
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				x	1,7,12
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?				x	1,7,12
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				x	1,7,12

Discussion

The project will require filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB) for discharges of stormwater associated with construction activity. Pollution control measures consistent with the State General Permit must be adhered to. In addition, the permit requires development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP includes Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to reduce potential impacts to surface water quality throughout construction and the life of the project. The project would not adversely impact drainage patterns within or around the project site and no water bodies will be altered as part of the proposed project. As a result, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in substantial erosion or siltation off-site. Drainage patterns are not expected to be substantially altered as a result of the project. The proposed project would not result in significant increases in stormwater runoff such that new sewer systems would be required. The project will include a number of water retention and treatment measures designed to reduce the volume and improve the quality of stormwater before it leaves the site. And the project will be in compliance with the C.3 storm water requirements under the municipal regional stormwater permit. For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

ISSUES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Supporting Information Sources
Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?				x	1,7, 9
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				x	1,7,8,9, 19

<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>
plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?					
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				x	1,7,9,19

Discussion

The construction of a parking garage at an existing office park complex will not divide an established community. The project requires an amendment to the Mariner’s Island Specific Plan to exclude covered parking in calculations of floor area for offices in Site III – Century Centre. This provision is compatible with the Land Use policies which provide an incentive for offices in Site I and Site II. The project is consistent with the City’s Zoning Ordinances and Districts, General Plan Policies and Land Use Designation. Furthermore, no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan exists for the project site.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				x	1,7,9,19
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?				x	1,7,9,19

Discussion

There are no mineral resources within the City of San Mateo. Construction of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			x		1,7, 8, 19
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			x		1,7, 8, 19
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				x	1, 7, 8
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			x		1,7,8,12
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?				x	1,7,8,12
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?				x	1,7,8,12

Discussion

The project includes construction of a parking structure on a site zoned Executive Park which allows administrative, professional office, and other similar land uses that are not typically associated with activity that would generate noise levels in excess of the standards and existing conditions.

The project would not result in significant noise impacts to adjacent land uses since the proposed parking structure use would be associated with the existing conditions of the project office use which currently consists of two large-scale office buildings. In addition, there are no new traffic trips generated by the proposed project would generate a perceptible noise increase (Attachment 6, Hexagon Parking Study).

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport. The site is located approximately 9 miles south of the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) and approximately 4.4 miles northwest of the San Carlos Airport. The site is not located in the

typical traffic pattern area nor is it under the arrival and departure routes for the San Carlos Airport or SFO. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Construction of the project would increase noise levels in the project area over the entirety of the construction period. Noise generated during construction would differ depending on the construction phase and the type and amount of equipment used at the construction site. Construction activities have the potential to result in short term significant noise impacts to nearby residences and other noise sensitive uses. This is a short-term adverse impact.

Noise measures and monitoring during construction, as standard Conditions of Approval for the planning application, will reduce noise impacts to less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
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)?				x	1,7,8,9
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				x	1,7,8,9
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				x	1,7,8,9

Discussion

The proposed project is the construction of a new parking structure to service the existing office development on property zoned for office use; therefore, it would not cause substantial population growth that is not otherwise already consistent with and analyzed in the General Plan. The proposed project would not displace significant numbers of people or housing units that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project would not displace any residential tenants since the project site currently contains two large scale office buildings and the proposed project would result in the construction of an additional parking garage to service these office building occupancies.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
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?				x	1,7,12, 13
Police protection?				x	1,7,12
Schools?				x	1,7,12
Parks?				x	1,7,12
Other public facilities?				x	1,7,12

Discussion

Construction of a new parking structure on a site currently developed with two large scale office buildings will result in a nominal increase in the demand for public services. The project will be subject to various impact fees due to anticipated incremental increase in demand on public services and will therefore be required to pay fees to meet its demand for services. The project is located in an urbanized area currently served by municipal services, therefore, it is not anticipated that an infill project of this type and size will significantly change or impact public services or require the construction of new or remodeled public service facilities.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>
Would the project:					
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?				x	1,7,8,9
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?				x	1,7,8,9

Discussion

The proposed project is not anticipated to have an impact on the demand for parks or park facilities, and would not result in deterioration of any facilities or cause this to be accelerated. The project does not propose the construction of any new public parks or recreational facilities that could have an adverse impact on the environment. There are no existing recreational or park facilities on the project site and the site is designated in the General Plan for Executive Office development.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

ISSUES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Supporting Information Sources
Would the project:					
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?				x	1,6,7
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				x	1,6,7
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?				x	1,6,7
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				x	1,6,7
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				x	1,6,7
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				x	1,6,7
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				x	1,6,7

Discussion

A Parking Study was prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. (Attachment 6. The Parking Study concluded that the project would not create any significant traffic impacts by itself because the project would provide additional on-site parking for existing tenants of the office buildings. No new traffic would be generated by the project. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

The proposed parking structure is within the height limits of the zone district and general plan; and will not impact air traffic patterns.

The Police and Fire Departments have reviewed the plans to insure emergency access is provided and the security ordinance will be met.

Although not required, the project will provide 8 long term bike lockers for 16 bikes.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ISSUES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Supporting Information Sources
Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				x	1,7,12
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?				x	1,7,12
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?				x	1,7,12
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				x	1,7,12
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?				x	1,7,12
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				x	1,7,12
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				x	1,7,12

Discussion

The project will require filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the SFRWQCB for discharges of stormwater associated with construction activity. Pollution control measures consistent with the State General Permit must be adhered to. In addition, the permit requires development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP will include Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to reduce potential impacts to surface water quality throughout construction and the life of the project. Furthermore, the project will be in compliance with the C.3 storm water requirements under the municipal regional stormwater permit.

The relatively small-scale of the increase in energy resource consumption that would occur from the development of the new structures on the project site would not result in excessive use of energy or non-renewable resources. The proposed project would result in a slight increase in utility usage and water consumption as well as generation of solid waste and storm water, however, the Public Works department has determined that there is adequate infrastructure capacity serving the site to adequately handle the increases.

Since this project proposes excavation and grading of a portion of the existing parking lot, and paving in order to construct the proposed structure, and construction and demolition waste will be generated. The project will conform to the City’s Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance, which requires recycling of construction and demolition waste.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

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>	
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?				x	1,2,3,7,9,10,19
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)?				x	1,7,9,19
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				x	1-19

Discussion

As discussed in the individual sections above, condition of approval measures to reduce air quality and noise impacts during construction are included in the project to ensure that project impacts associated with these topics would be reduced to a less-than-significant level or avoided.

No rare or endangered bird, reptile, insect and mammal species are present on the site. The landscape unit (LU) value of trees to be removed from the site will be offset with replacement trees and funds paid to the City’s Tree Planting Fund. Existing trees will be protected and monitored during construction. The project is consistent with General Plan Policies and the Land

Use designation and the Zoning Code and District within which the project site is located.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required