CITY OF SAN MATEO
Initial Study

1. Project Title and Number: Central Park South PA# 14-044

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: Lorraine Weiss, Contract Senior Planner
Telephone: (650) 522-7205
Email: lweiss@cityofsanmateo.org

4. Project Location and APN: 885 S. El Camino Real APN: 034-200-220

5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address: Julie Baigent, Jewel Property Advisors, LLC, for
Trans World Assurance Company
60 Buck Court
Woodside, CA 94062
Telephone: (650) 364-7800
Email: jbaigent@sbcglobal.net

6. General Plan Designation: Executive Office – corner parcel
High Density Multi-Family – parcels at 15, 25, and 31 9th Avenue

7. Zoning: E2-1 (Executive Offices) – corner parcel
R6-D (Multiple Family Dwellings Downtown) – parcels located at 15, 25, and 31 9th Avenue

8. Description of Project:

The proposed project consists of the demolition of all existing structures on the project site and construction of two four-story buildings consisting of an approximately 33,400 square foot office building at the corner of El Camino Real and 9th Avenue and an approximately 77,800 square foot apartment building with 60 new for-rent apartment units along 9th Avenue. The proposed residential project would consist of a mix of 45 one-bedroom units, 1 one-bedroom unit with study, and 14 two-bedroom units. The office building and multi-family residential building are proposed on separate lots, though, are being entitled as part of a single planning application.

The project requires Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR), a Vesting Tentative Parcel Map to merge the three parcels for the residential development, a Site Development Planning Application for tree removal and grading. A Density Bonus request for 6 additional units beyond the 54 units allowed by the San Mateo Zoning Code/General Plan for a total of 60 residential units is included with this project.

The office building is proposed to be close to El Camino Real and 9th Avenue to help create an urban edge/gateway to the City's downtown. A grove of mature redwood trees is proposed to remain along 9th Avenue. The buildings are proposed to have a modern "California Urban" look with strong base and building cornicing caps utilizing brick and cement plaster with metal elements at entry ways and balconies. Brick, glass and metal canopies define the main entries. Protruding balconies are proposed for the residential building above the ground floor to add further interest and variety to the elevations. The roof is proposed to be flat on the office building and primarily a pitched mansard style for the residential building. The colors will be earth tones with some lighter color anchored by a brick wainscoting for each building.

The project consists of 88 total parking spaces for the office building including 31 spaces at grade and 57 spaces located in one-level in an underground garage, and a total of 112 parking spaces for the residential building including 10 spaces at grade and 102 spaces located in two levels in an underground garage. Access to the garage and the upper stories is provided with stairs proposed at either ends of the building and a more centralized elevator. A two-way driveway is proposed east of the office building along 9th Avenue. The building is designed to allow for a single tenant or multiple tenants. Service delivery and truck access is proposed to be provided on-grade in the visitor parking area. Trash and recycling pickup is proposed at this time for an enclosed area at the northeast end of the office site in the on-grade parking lot.

Bicycle parking is provided for both the office and residential components with the following: For the office development, two (2) short-term racks located at the building frontage for four (4) bicycles and three (3) long-term lockers for six bicycles. The residential development includes two (2) short-term racks for bicycles and 64 long-term racks in secured rooms for 64 bicycles.

Open space for the project is provided primarily to the west and south of the proposed office building and to the northeast in a courtyard for the multi-family residential building. Existing mature landscaping is also proposed to remain at the east end of the residential project adjoining the existing multi-family project to the east. All of the residential units have individual patios or above the first floor have balconies to provide private usable open space. The courtyard proposed for the multi-family building provides some common open space and will contain a barbeque with tables and seating areas.

The office building height is 54 feet to top of plate line, which is within the maximum permitted height of 55 feet. The residential building height is 40 feet to top of plate line, which is under the permitted height of 55 feet.

Unit sizes range from 775 square feet up to 1,180 square feet. The residential density is approximately 56 units per acre, which exceeds the General Plan density of 50 units per acre. The applicant has indicated that they will request a density increase under the State Density Bonus and Other Incentives Law – State Government Code Section 65915, which allows for a density increase in exchange for the provision of affordable housing. By providing 15% low income rental units as required by the City's adopted BMR program, the applicant would be allowed a density bonus of up to 27.5 percent, the use of the Statewide Parking Standards, and one concession or incentive.

The removal of 23 heritage trees is proposed along with additional major vegetation (18 trees). A total of 51 replacement trees are proposed of which 23 trees will be a minimum 24-inch box size.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site consists of four parcels that total approximately 1.84 acres. The site is located on the northeastern corner of South El Camino Real and 9th Avenue. The site is currently developed with a two-story bank/office building at the corner of El Camino Real and 9th Avenue, a Project Ninety facility and multi-family units along 9th Avenue. The site borders El Camino Real on the west, the City's Central Park to the north and 9th Avenue to the south. There is extensive mature landscaping (primarily mature trees) located at the south and north ends of the project, between 25 and 31 9th Avenue and along the east end of 31 9th Avenue adjoining the adjacent multi-family complex.

10. Requested Applications:

A. Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR) for construction of an office building and a residential apartment building.
B. Site Development Planning Application for grading and removal of 23 heritage trees.
C. A Tentative Parcel Map to merge the three existing residential parcels into one parcel for the multi-family residential building development.
D. State Housing Density Bonus request for 6 additional units beyond the 54 units allowed by the San Mateo Zoning Ordinance for a total of 60 residential units.

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.

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	☐	Cultural Resources	☐	Geology /Soils
☐	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐	Hydrology / Water Quality
☐	Land Use / Planning	☐	Mineral Resources	☐	Noise
☐	Population / Housing	☐	Public Services	☐	Recreation
☐	Transportation / Traffic	☐	Utilities / Service Systems	☐	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.

X I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

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

Lorraine Weiss (KM) — 4/2/15

Lorraine Weiss, Contract Senior Planner — Date

4/2/15

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 and at the City of San Mateo Planning Division, 330 W. 20th Avenue, San Mateo:

http:/www.cityofsanmateo.org/whatshappening

1. Project Plans, Central Park South, prepared by DES Architects, date March 16, 2015
2. Arborist Report, prepared by Arborwell, dated January 23, 2015, Supplemental Memo, March 31 , 2015
3. Required Tree Planting Form, dated March 4, 2015
4. Design Review Report, prepared by Cannon Design Group, dated June 17, 2014 & September 2, 2014
5. Geotechnical Investigations, prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated June 2014
6. Hexagon Traffic Study, dated January 20, 2015 and Transportation Demand Management Measures, dated December 15, 2014
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Report, prepared by PMC, dated September 2014
8. Noise Study, prepared by Papadimos Group, dated August 1, 2014 & October 1, 2014
9. Wind Impact Analysis, prepared by Donald Ballanti, Consulting Meteorologist, dated August 21, 2014
10. Storm Water Management Plan, prepared by DES Architects & Engineers, dated January 29, 2015

Incorporated by reference:

11. City of San Mateo General Plan and Land Use Map
12. City of San Mateo Municipal Code and Zoning Map
13. Site Visits and Analysis
14. State of California Hazardous Waste & Substances List
15. Uniform Building Code
16. Uniform Fire Code
17. Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines, April 1996
18. USGS Map Showing Faults and Earthquake Epicenters in San Mateo County, CA
19. Citywide Archaeological Investigations, City of San Mateo, CA
20. San Mateo Historic Resources Inventory
21. County of San Mateo General Plan

I. AESTHETICS

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,2,3,4, 11,13,20
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,2,3,4, 11,13,20
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,2,3,4, 11,13
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,4,13

Discussion

The proposed commercial office building would be located at the northeast corner of El Camino Real and 9th Avenue and the residential building would be located to the east of the commercial office building along 9th Avenue. The removal of the existing buildings and placement of two new buildings and major trees on the perimeter of the site will alter the appearance of this corner (885 S. El Camino Real site and the three adjacent parcels located at 15, 25, and 31 9th Avenue) from a two-story bank/office building and surface parking lot at the corner of El Camino Real and 9th Avenue, and single-story residential treatment facility at 15 9th Avenue with surface parking in front of the building, a two-story ten-unit multi-family residential apartment building with parking to the rear at 25 9th Avenue, and a single family residence at 31 9th Avenue, to two four-story buildings (a commercial office building and a residential building) with some at grade parking and landscaping. The proposed office building is setback 17'-4" from curb edge along El Camino Real and 18'-7" from the curb edge on 9th Avenue; while the planned residential building is setback 31'-0" at its nearest point from the building to curb edge on 9th Avenue.

The overall project design of the proposed office building and multi-family residential apartment building, below-grade garages and site layout incorporate some of the suggestions and recommendations of the Design Review Report prepared by the City's consulting Architect which include the following:

- The dead-end drive aisle on the north side of the office building was modified to provide for a vehicle turn-around.
- The Central Park fence has been extended across the front of the parking lot on El Camino Real which relates to the sidewalk and landscaping of the project to the Central Park Street frontage.
- Benches have been provided along the El Camino Real frontage and at the plaza at the corner of El Camino Real and 9th Avenue.
- A clear pedestrian link has been provided between the northern office parking lot and the office entry on El Camino Real.

- The treatment of the auto forecourt at the residential building has been modified to provide a more visually unified paving solution.
- A low wall with brick pilasters and open wrought iron railings has been added along the 9th Avenue frontage of the residential building to relate the streetscape design to Central Park and existing residential frontages on Laurel Avenue.
- The landscaping between the office and residential buildings has been refined.

While these design recommendations were made, the design does not include several suggestions. First, the drop-off area at the east side of the office building appears shorter than the length of a car. Larger cars parked adjacent to the drop-off might overhang the space at the drive aisle. This could make it difficult for a passenger to be dropped off near the curb. Second, the view at the residential auto forecourt and garage entry is not best as it focuses on the ramp to the garage to the view of the residential garage entry and office building façade design. As almost everyone will enter the project via the driveway at the east end of the parcel frontage, either to access the garage or to drop-off a passenger at the building entry on the right side of the car, this view focuses on the garage entry. An element could be designed to mitigate this view such as a landscape trellis feature supported on brick columns to match the building base. Third, the balconies seem too ordinary and resident's possessions on the balconies might be seen. Fourth, add a well-designed entry canopy for both the El Camino Real and parking lot entries. Lastly, the exterior design of the office building is heavy and not best suited to its location adjacent to Central Park where it will serve as a significant entry landmark for Downtown San Mateo. A fresher design approach was advised to reduce the visual bulkiness of the building. The applicant desired to retain the architectural style and approach proposed. However, these issues do not pertain to items on the checklist that would potentially generate a significant adverse impact.

The change in the project site will also alter views from Central Park as park users look towards the south. Currently views towards the south consist of an important vegetative screen along the park's southern property line. Although this screen does not fully conceal buildings on the adjacent properties it does break up the views of them. Most of the vegetation that creates this screen exists on the park site; although additional vegetation located mostly on the eastern half of the project site also contributes to this vegetative screen. The height of this screen varies, though, a substantial portion of this height, created by four (4) existing large Heritage Pine trees located in the Central Park within twelve feet of the park's southern property boundary, reach to heights that in one case (tree #1) is close to the height of proposed four-story office building and the remaining three (3) trees (trees #13, 16 and 18) are above the proposed buildings. These mature trees provide valuable visual screening of the proposed buildings as viewed from the park, provide shade to park users, and contribute to the identification of Central Park as a peaceful and refuge for the public to enjoy.

There are 58 existing trees on the subject site of which 53 are heritage trees, as defined in Section 13.52 of the San Mateo Municipal Code. Of these trees, 23 heritage trees and 18 non-heritage trees are proposed for removal (a total of 41 trees). A tree replacement value has been determined. As a result, a variety of 51 replacement trees will be planted on-site, of which 23 will be a minimum of 24-inch box size to maintain a vegetative screen between the subject site and Central Park, and the adjacent parcel to the east on 9th Avenue. In addition, fees will be contributed toward the City's Tree Planting Fund.

Tree protection measures for trees on-site to be preserved and trees in Central Park adjacent to the subject site and monitoring during construction, replacement trees and funds paid to the City's Tree Planting Fund, as conditions of project approval, will reduce impacts to less than significant. In addition, a mitigation measure to mitigate any impacts to the existing heritage trees on-site and in close proximity to Central Park would reduce this impact to less than significant (see 'Biological Resources' section below).

Wind, Shadow and Reflection: The applicant submitted a Wind Impact Analysis prepared by, Donald Ballanti, Consulting Meteorologist, (Attachment #9) to examine how much, if any, discomfort will be caused to Central Park users from changing wind patterns and speeds that may be created from the two new buildings. The report concludes that wind accelerations generated from the proposed project for the most part will be self-contained within the project site and that no change in winds speeds would be expected within the adjacent Central Park picnic area. However, a small portion of the picnic area would experience accelerated winds from the southwest to a minor degree due the large continuous west face of the residential building.

Figure 1 of the Wind Impact Analysis identifies four locations of the expected wind accelerations, three of which are contained within the project site, and one accelerated wind location created from southwest winds at the northwest corner residential building that encroaches slightly into the picnic area of Central Park. Southwest winds are expected about 12 percent of the time on an annual basis between 11 am and 5pm in San Mateo. Seasonally, the frequency of southwest winds range from 7% of the time in the Winter to 17% of the time in the Spring. It is expected that the residential building would have the potential for generating minor wind accelerations (on the order of 10 to 20%) over a small portion of the picnic area when the wind is from the southwest. With the proposed dense plantings, within the 25' foot setback between Central Park and proposed residential building, the wind environment at the picnic area adjacent to the project would be essentially unchanged.

The shadow study graphics indicate that the shadow of the building line will be completely within the shadows that are cast from the trees. However, it should be noted that the shadows of the trees typically allow some light to penetrate through to a certain degree and that the areas where shadows are cast by the buildings will be totally in shade. The worst case for shadows being cast into Central Park is shown at 9am on December 21st where more than 50% of the picnic area will be covered in a solid shadow from the proposed buildings. By 12 noon, only about 10% of the picnic area will remain in shadow from the buildings. Since it is not likely that the picnic area would be used that much in the winter time particularly at 9am, staff concludes that the shadows cast from the buildings during this time would be a minor impact. The best case for the least shadow impact is during June 21st where hardly any shadows from the building would be cast into the picnic area at all. In both March 21st and October 21st shadows from the building would be cast onto about 10 to 15% of the picnic area at 9am and by noon, shadows cast from the building would be completely outside the park. Based on this information, staff concludes that shadows impacts from the building will not be significant.

In terms of reflection from the sun off of the buildings, because the portion of the building that faces the park is in a northwest direction, this side of the building will be in shadows during the late Fall, Winter and early Spring months. However during the late Spring, Summer and early Fall months, sun will reach this side of the building in the early to mid-afternoon hours. Shadows from tree #18 and, possibly, tree #16 in Central Park will cast some shadow on the rear of the

proposed residential building. In addition, the partial screening of the four heritage Pine trees designated to remain will reduce the impact of any glare from these buildings to a level that is not significant.

New lighting for the site is proposed in the surface parking areas and on the pathways. Lighting will be proposed in conformance with the City's Security Ordinance. Light spill is not anticipated due to the configuration of the lighted areas on the interior of the site which are buffered by the proposed buildings and perimeter vegetation and plantings.

MITIGATION MEASURE: 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***
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. **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	1,11,13
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11,12
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	1,11,12
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11,12
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	1,11,12

Discussion

The project site is zoned E2-1 (Executive Offices) for the corner parcel and R6-D (Multiple Family Dwellings Downtown) for the parcels located at 15, 25, and 31 9th Avenue. The general plan designation for the corner parcel located at 885 El Camino Real is Executive Office and High Density Multi-Family for the parcels located at 15, 25, and 31 9th Avenue. The proposed project is consistent with the zoning and general plan designation and the existing uses. Currently, the site is developed with a two-story bank/office building and surface parking lot at the corner of El Camino Real and 9th Avenue, and single-story residential treatment facility at 15 9th Avenue with surface parking in front of the building, a two-story ten-unit multi-family residential apartment building with parking to the rear at 25 9th Avenue, and a single family residence at 31 9th Avenue. The project will have no impact on farmland, agricultural use, or forest land.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

III. AIR QUALITY

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. **Would the project:**					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,7,11, 17
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,7,11, 17
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	☐	1,7,11, 17
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,7,11, 17
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,7,11, 17

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 PM_{10}) (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 all required parking on site for both the proposed commercial office building and residential apartment building. 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 access to the site. Carbon monoxide (CO) is an odorless, colorless poisonous gas whose primary

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

source in the Bay Area is automobiles. Concentrations of this gas are highest near intersections of major roads.

Based on the BAAQMD criteria, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant on carbon monoxide concentrations.

Construction Dust

Construction-related emissions are generally short-term in duration, but may still cause adverse air quality impacts. Fine particulate matter (PM_{10}) is the pollutant of greatest concern with respect to construction activities. PM_{10} 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 PM_{10}. 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 PM_{10} 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 PM_{10} 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 subject site adjacent to El Camino Real and 9th Avenue. 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 an 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.

As the residential development is setback from El Camino Real and associated traffic along this major arterial by approximately 177 feet, the project does not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. While the project is not required to reduce project construction health hazards to below the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, the following measures are recommended to minimize the potential health risk resulting from project construction activities at nearby sensitive receptors:

- Enforce an idling time limit for diesel powered construction equipment and vehicles of two minutes.
- Require all contractors to only use equipment that is Tier-4 compliant. The Tier 4 standards require that emissions of diesel exhaust particulate matter (DPM) be reduced by 90%. This mitigation measure would require use of late model engines or older engines using retrofit technology such as particulate filters.
- Prohibit use of diesel generators for electric power because on-site distribution of electricity is available.
- Require construction contractors to substitute electric powered devices for diesel powered devices, where feasible.

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

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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	1,2,11, 21
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	1,2,11, 21
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	1,11,21
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	1,2,11, 21
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,2,11, 21
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	1,2,11, 21

Discussion

The project site is developed and improved as a two-story bank/office building and surface parking lot at the corner of El Camino Real and 9th Avenue, a single-story residential treatment facility at 15 9th Avenue with surface parking in front of the building, a two-story ten-unit multi-family residential apartment building with parking to the rear at 25 9th Avenue, and a single family residence at 31 9th Avenue. No rare, threatened or endangered species habitats are identified on the project site.

A Tree Inventory, Valuation and Construction Guidelines, prepared by Arborwell, was submitted on November 17, 2014, and updated with a Preliminary Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan dated January 23, 2015, (Attachment 2), which was submitted for the project. The updated Arborist Report included all inventoried trees in addition to the Redwood Trees on the adjacent property to the east of the proposed residential development and Heritage trees adjacent to the project on Central Park. The Arborist Report identifies 58 existing trees on the subject site of which 53 are heritage trees, as defined in Section 13.52 of the San Mateo Municipal Code. Of these trees, 23 heritage trees and 18 non-heritage trees are proposed for removal (a total of 41 trees). Four (4) of the heritage trees proposed for removal are based on condition of trees while

nineteen (19) are based on design plans. The heritage trees consist of Coast Redwood, Bay Laurel, Coast Live Oak, Southern Magnolia, Mock Orange, Monterey Pine, Pittosporum, Cedar, and Black Acacia. The remaining 18 non-heritage trees proposed for removal qualify as Major Vegetation and consist of Dragon, Black Acacia, Bronze Loquat, Olive, Lemon Bottlebrush, Glossy Privet, Cherry Laurel, and Sirinam Cherry trees.

An additional 21 trees were identified in Central Park adjacent to the subject property and evaluated in this Arborist Report consisting of Monterey Pine, Mock Orange, Lemonwood, Bottle Tree, Southern Live Oak, Holly, and Coast Live Oak. All of these trees are proposed to be preserved.

Central Park Trees Adjacent to Project

A vegetative screen presently exists along Central Park's southern property line adjacent to the proposed project. A substantial portion of this height, created by four existing large Heritage Pine trees located in the Park within 12 feet of the Park's southern property) taller than the proposed office building.

A replacement value has been assigned for the 41 trees proposed for removal has been assigned, Attachment 3, Required Tree Planting Form. As a result, a variety of 51 replacement trees consisting of London Plane, Red Crape Myrtle, Indian Laurel Fig, Pittosporum, Flax Leaf, and Vine Maple will be planted on-site. Of these trees, 23 will be a minimum of 24-inch box size to maintain a vegetative screen between the subject site and Central Park, and the adjacent parcel to the east on 9th Avenue. In addition, fees will be contributed toward the City's Tree Planting Fund.

Tree protection measures for trees on-site to be preserved in Central Park adjacent to the subject site 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. In addition, the measure below will mitigate any impacts to the existing heritage trees on-site and in close proximity to Central Park would reduce this impact to less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURE:

PROTECTION OF HERITAGE TREES IN CENTRAL PARK - Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, the applicant shall protect and care for those Heritage Trees located on the Central Park property that have a Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) that extends onto the project site in the following manner:

1. Provide pre-construction tree care and protection measures per the Project Arborist's recommendations prior to the commencement of construction for such measures to take effect and prior to the issuance of the first permit.
2. Prior to commencing the pre-construction tree care and protection measures, a detailed schedule of treatments shall be submitted to the City's Managing Arborist for review and approval.
3. The applicant shall also update and submit the Arborist Report, prepared by Arborwell, dated January 23, 2015, describing the proper protection measures including monitoring, pruning and feeding provisions for these trees during the time of construction and for a

period of three (3) years following occupancy. Only upon the approval of such report by the City's Managing Arborist shall the first permit be issued.

4. Unless otherwise approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation, if during the construction period and during 3 years after occupancy the City Arborist observes that the health of any of the said trees have declined from their current condition, beyond a slight decline within the first year from the initial cutting of roots, the applicant shall remove and replace such tree(s) upon direction from the City's Managing Arborist with healthy tree(s) of a species and condition acceptable the City's Managing Arborist and shall maintain such trees in healthy condition for one year after approved planting. Such replacement tree(s) shall be at least 75% of the height of the existing tree(s) being replaced or a maximum of an 84 boxed size trees unless not available, in which case the closest smaller available boxed trees shall be provided.
5. The applicant shall also be responsible for removing and replacing any items damaged in Central Park caused by the tree replacement operations, including but not limited to damage to other vegetation, irrigation systems, utilities, hardscape and site amenities.
6. Prior to any tree replacement, the applicant shall, as expeditiously as possible but not more than 60 days following the direction from the City's Managing Arborist to replace such tree(s), unless otherwise approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation, prepare and submit plans for such tree replacement and include provisions for the replacement of other park features that are likely to become damaged during such operations along with provisions for the protection of existing park improvements to the Director of Parks and Recreation or designee for review and approval. Only upon such approval shall tree replacement work commence.
7. All tree replacement and park feature replacement work shall be completed as expeditiously as possible but shall not take longer than 9 months from the date of approval of the plans for tree and park amenity replacements by the Director of Parks and Recreation or designee unless otherwise approved by the same City authority.
8. To guarantee that the above measures will take place, no occupancy shall be granted without the submittal of a form of financial security acceptable to the City Attorney that guarantees that the applicant will perform with the proper licensed or certified professionals the above required tree and park amenity replacement work based on a detailed cost estimate that shall be first submitted for and approved by Director of Parks and Recreation or designee for such replacements.

Mitigation - These measures shall be incorporated on the project plans prior to the issuance of a demolition and building permit for the project and shall be monitored by the Parks and Recreation Division and Building Division during demolition and construction activities for the project through routine inspections (PARKS AND RECREATION, BUILDING)

<u>Redwood Trees on Adjacent Property to the East</u>

There are neighboring trees (trees #58 through 78) that are located adjacent to the fence line, east of the proposed residential development as identified in the arborist report dated January 23, 2015. Some of these trees are also shown on sheet 22 of the plans. Trees #59, 60, 61, 62, 63,

64, 65, and 66 are all located on the adjacent parcel to the east of the proposed residential development.

Page 6 of the Arborist Report, dated January 23, 2015, states that "Trees 59 through 66 have massive roots that encroach onto the project property but there is an existing building that is approximately 100 inches away from the trunk; there will not likely be roots of significance below the building."

A March 31, 2015 Supplemental Memo was prepared by Arborwell to address these trees. The memo indicates that the plans show three (3) visitor parking spaces within the tree protection zone of Tree #59. However, these parking spaces can be moved into the garage so they are no longer within Tree #59's TPZ.

The mitigation measure below will mitigate any impacts to the tree #59 to a less than significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURE:

***TREE 59.** The Coast Redwood tree, noted as tree 59 in the January 23, 2015 Arborist Report and March 31 Supplemental Memo by Arborwell Professional Tree Management, will be treated as follows:

1. No grading below 6 inches within 100 inches from the trunk of the tree will be permitted.
2. If grading below 6 inches within 100 inches from the trunk of the tree is needed to accommodate the 3 visitor parking spaces in the vicinity of Tree #59, such parking spaces in the surface lot adjacent to tree 59 shall be relocated within the parking garage or at an alternate location fully complying with all zoning code requirements and design guidelines, subject to the review and approval of the Zoning Administrator.
3. Applicant shall provide a signed statement from the owner of the neighboring property verifying that the owner has been informed of the construction work to be done within the dripline of the trees located on his/her property. If the owner of the adjacent property declines to sign such a statement, evidence that such statement has been delivered to the owner of the neighboring property shall be provided, which evidence is subject to review and approval of the City Attorney.

****Mitigation - These measures shall be incorporated on the project plans prior to the issuance of a demolition and building permit for the project and shall be monitored by the Parks and Recreation Division and Building Division during demolition and construction activities for the project through routine inspections. (PARKS AND RECREATION, BUILDING)***

The March 31, 2015 Supplemental Memo goes on to indicate that a sidewalk will be located within the tree protection zone (TPZ) of Trees #60 through #67. However, there will be no excavation below six (6) inches of existing grade for the sidewalk. There is to be no more than six (6) inches of grading or filling below or above the existing grade within the TPZ of any tree to be preserved throughout the project. No materials will be stored, stockpiled, dumped, or buried within the TPZ.

Some minor flagging and desiccated foliage may occur as a result of root pruning, which can be addressed by pruning any desiccated material from the crown. A single application of slow-release fertilizer and plant growth regulator prior to construction activities will aid in the development of fine-root growth and will help counter the effects of root pruning. Several trees may require minor clearance pruning to clear branches from proposed structures, scaffolding, or necessary equipment outside the TPZ and should be performed under the direction of the project arborist. At no time will more than twenty-five (25) percent of any subject tree's crown be removed.

Excavation adjacent to the TPZ will need to be performed by hand or with the assistance of a pneumatic airspade. Roots will need to be pruned by hand; any root that is two (2) inches or greater will need to be inspected and pruned under the direction of the project arborist. Roots two (2) inches in diameter or larger that are severed will have the stub end(s) of the root(s) cleanly cut using a sharp saw and sealed using a plastic bag tied on the end. Plastic bags will be removed at the time of backfill.

Lastly, because redwoods are water intensive trees and there will be pruning of small feeder roots, they will require irrigation during construction activities, a minimum of ten (10) gallons for each inch of trunk diameter every two (2) weeks. The TPZ will need to be mulch to a depth of six (6) inches minimum and maintain mulch throughout the project.

Elements that will be included in the plan for the post-construction monitoring and care will include monthly monitoring and treatment for up to one (1) year after the project ends. Treatment includes irrigation during the dry months (any month receiving less than 1 inch of rainfall) for one (1) year. Irrigate a minimum of ten (10) gallons for each inch of trunk diameter every two (2) weeks. A drip line is preferred for this purpose and should be adjusted monthly during the inspection. Treatments will be adjusted, if needed, during the monthly monitoring and will be reported to the property owner.

In order to mitigate the impact of construction on trees 60-67, the following mitigation measure will be imposed:

MITIGATION MEASURE:

***Trees 19, 60-67 T**he trees noted as #19, #60 – #67 in the January 23, 2015 Arborist Report and March 31, 2015 Supplemental Memo by Arborwell Professional Tree Management, shall be treated in a manner consistent with and adjacent construction activities performed in a manner consistent with the recommendations in the the January 23, 2015 Arborist Report and March 31, 2015 Supplemental Memo by Arborwell Professional Tree Management
****Mitigation - These measures shall be incorporated on the project plans prior to the issuance of a demolition and building permit for the project and shall be monitored by the Parks and Recreation Division and Building Division during demolition and construction activities for the project through routine inspections. (PARKS AND RECREATION, BUILDING)***

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11,20
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11,19
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11

Discussion

The project site is already developed as a two-story bank/office building and surface parking lot at the corner of El Camino Real and 9th Avenue, and single-story residential abuse treatment facility at 15 9th Avenue with surface parking in front of the building, a two-story ten-unit multi-family residential apartment building with parking to the rear at 25 9th Avenue, and a single family residence at 31 9th Avenue. The subject site is in a low sensitivity zone wherein archaeological resources are not generally expected to occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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	☐	1,5,11, 18
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,5,11, 18
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	X	X	1,5,11, 18
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,5,11, 18
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,5
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	1,5
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	1,5,14
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	1,5,11

Discussion

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.

A Geotechnical Investigation was prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group, dated June 3, 2014. All recommendations noted in the Geotechnical Investigation must be addressed in the project design and will be incorporated into the project as conditions of project approval. According to the Geotechnical Investigation, 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 Investigation report concludes the risk of seismically induced liquefaction, lateral spreading, or differential settlement is negligible.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,6,7,17

Discussion

A Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Report was prepared for the project by PMC, dated September 2014. The City is subject to compliance with the Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32). AB 32 is a legal mandate requiring that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. In adopting AB 32, the legislature determined the necessary GHG reductions for the state to make in order to sufficiently offset its contribution to the cumulative climate change problem to reach 1990 levels. As such, compliance with AB 32 is the adopted basis on which a lead agency can base its significance threshold for evaluating the project's GHG impacts.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) 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 is designed to service and park the proposed new office building and residential apartment building (Hexagon Parking Study, Attachment 6). The proposed project would not surpass the BAAQMD's GHG significance threshold which was developed with the purpose of complying with the requirements of AB 32. BAAQMD thresholds were developed based on the substantial evidence that such thresholds represent quantitative levels of GHG emissions, compliance with which means that the environmental impact of the GHG emissions will normally not be cumulatively considerable under CEQA (BAAQMD 2011). Compliance with such thresholds will be part of the solution to the cumulative GHG emission problem, rather than hinder the State's ability to meet its goals of reduced statewide GHG emissions under AB 32. As concluded in the Greenhouse Gas Emission Report prepared for the Central Park South project, the proposed project would not conflict with AB 32, and there is no significant impact.

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

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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	1,11,14
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	1,11,14
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	1,11,14
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, 11,13,14
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	1,11,21
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	1,11,21
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11,21
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	1,11,21

Discussion

The project site is zoned E2-1 (Executive Offices) on the corner parcel and R6-D (Multiple Family Dwellings Downtown) for parcels located at 15, 25, and 31 9th Avenue. These zoning designations permit administrative, professional office land uses and other similar land uses for the office use and multiple family residential for the residential use that are not typically associated with hazardous materials and/or the transportation of such materials. 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 8.3 miles southwest of the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) and approximately 5.8 miles southwest 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

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,10,11
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	1,10,11
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	1,10,11
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	1,10,11
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	1,10,11
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,10,11
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?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,10,11
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,10,11
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	1,10,11
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,10

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. According to the Safety Element of the General Plan, the site is not located in an area of potential flood hazards from storm water runoff or dam failure.

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	1,11,12
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?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,11,12
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11,12

Discussion

The construction of an office building at an existing commercial site and a residential apartment building on an existing site with housing will not divide an established community. The project is consistent with the City's Zoning Ordinances and Districts, General Plan Policies and Land Use Designation. However, the project includes a request for a Density Bonus to allow six (6) additional dwelling units beyond that allowed by the Zoning Code. The current San Mateo zoning permits 50 dwelling units to the acre on the residential apartment site for a total of 54 units for this project and the additional six (6) units would provide a total of 60 units for the residential development. The project complies with the regulations of the State Density Bonus Law and the City of San Mateo Density Bonus Ordinance in that of the 60 units, 10% of the units (prior to taking into account the density bonus units) would be made available to very-low income households or 5.4 units. Thus, the project would provide five (5) very low income units and pay the applicable in-lieu fee for the .4 fractional unit. Additionally, the applicant would ensure that the very-low income units continue to be affordable at the applicable very-low income rates for the life of the project as is the City's policy, though, not less than the 30 years required pursuant to the State Density Bonus Law.

No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan exists for the project site.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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	1,11,21
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	1,11,21

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

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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	☐	1,8, 11,12, 15
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,8, 11,12,15
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,8,11, 12,15
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,6,8,11, 12,14
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	1,8,11, 12,14
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	1,8, 11,12,14

Discussion

The project includes demolition of the existing structures and construction of a commercial office building and a multi-family residential apartment building on a site zoned for office and multiple-family residential which is a similar mix of uses to the existing commercial and residential uses.

Existing sensitive uses around the project site include multi-family housing, a city park and office buildings. The nearest residential uses that would have the most exposure to the noise levels during demolition and site preparation and building construction are three-story residential buildings along the eastern site boundary. 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. Normal construction activities would affect ambient conditions for a temporary period at surrounding areas. This is a short-term adverse impact.

As the proposed mix of land uses would be similar in nature to the existing commercial and residential uses, the traffic trips generated by the proposed project would not generate a perceptible noise increase (3 dBA Ldn) since it would require doubling of traffic volumes on adjacent streets to generate a noise increase of this type which the project does not create. The project would generate 1,060 daily new traffic trips with 55 trips (42 inbound and 13 outbound)

during the AM peak hour and 137 trips (39 inbound and 98 outbound) during PM peak hour (Attachment 6, Hexagon Traffic 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 8.3 miles southwest of the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) and approximately 5.8 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 no located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Noise measures and monitoring during construction, which are standard conditions of approval for the planning application, will reduce noise impacts to less than significant.

MITGATION MEASURES: None Required

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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	1,11,12, 13
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11,12, 13
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,11,12, 13

Discussion

The proposed project is the construction of a new office building and multi-family residential apartment building on property zoned for office use and housing; 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 because the project site currently contains a commercial office building, a Project Ninety facility and multi-family units along 9th Avenue. The Project 90 facility (a residential substance abuse treatment facility) will be relocated. In accordance with the City's Relocation Assistance requirements, the tenants of the existing multi-family units will be provided availability of housing vacancies in the area by the developer who will provide vacancy availability at properties he owns. The list will be provided prior to notice of relocation.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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	☐	1,11,16
Police protection?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,11,12
Schools?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,11,12
Parks?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,11,12
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,11

Discussion

Construction of a new office building on a site currently developed with a commercial office building and a multi-family residential apartment building 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

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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	☐	1,11,12, 13
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	1,11,12, 13

Discussion

While there would be some additional use of parks and park facilities, it would not have a significant impact on these facilities and it 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 is no existing recreational or are park facilities on the project site, though, is adjacent to Central Park to the north, and the site is designated in the General Plan for Executive Office and High Density Multi-Family development. The project will be subject to an impact fee due to anticipated incremental increase in demand on public services and will therefore be required to pay fees to meet its demand for services.

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) 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?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,6,11
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?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,6,11
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	1,6,11
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,6,11
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,6,11
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?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2,3,4,17

Discussion

A traffic impact analysis (TIA) was prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. The TIA concluded that the project would not create any significant traffic impacts by itself, in addition to "background" (approved but not yet constructed projects), or in combination with projects expected under cumulative (2030) conditions. Therefore, no mitigation is required. However, as a condition of approval, the project will be required to pay the San Mateo traffic impact fee. Payment of this fee will ensure that the project contributes its share toward funding improvements to accommodate cumulative traffic conditions.

The proposed office building and multi-family residential apartment building are 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 ensure emergency access is provided and the security ordinance will be met.

Vehicle parking for the proposed office building and multi-family residential apartment building are to be provided by a combination of surface parking and a below-grade parking garage for each building. An approximately 26,595 square foot (net) below-grade one-level parking garage is proposed with 57 spaces, and 31 additional surface parking spaces (including two accessible spaces

and three drop-off spaces) for the commercial office building. The residential apartment building will consist of a 48,349 square foot (net) below-grade two-level parking garage with 106 parking spaces, and six (6) additional surface parking spaces for visitors and including one (1) accessible space.

The project provides long and short term bike parking facilities as required by the zoning code. Existing and proposed bike parking is provided on site. Two (2) new short term racks and three (3) new long term double capacity bike lockers (for six bicycles) are proposed for the new office building and two (2) new short term racks for four (4) bicycles and 64 long term racks in secured rooms are proposed for the multi-family residential apartment building.

A trip reduction plan or transportation demand management (TDM) program will be implemented to further reduce the project's contribution to cumulative traffic conditions, although this is not required as mitigation for a significant impact (while not a mitigation measure, will this be a condition of approval?). Trip reduction measures include but are not limited to the following:

<u>Office Building</u>

- Join the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance which offers programs geared to employers including: emergency ride home program, vanpool incentive program, carpool incentive program, try transit program, bicycle parking incentive and safety program, and commuter benefits counseling
- Provide subsidized or free transit passes
- Provide secure bicycle storage
- Provide showers and changing rooms
- Subsidize pedestrians and bicyclists who commute to work
- Operate commuter assistance center
- Provide use of bicycles to employees who use alternate commute methods

<u>Multi-Family Residential Building</u>

- Join the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance
- Unbundle the cost of parking the unit cost
- Provide subsidized or free transit passes
- Provide secure bicycle storage
- Install a video conferencing center available for use by residents

As a condition of approval, the applicant will submit an annual report to the City to ensure on-going compliance with the trip reduction plan; and the project will be required to pay Traffic Impact Fees to offset the project's contribution to cumulative traffic increase:

- 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.

With the implementation of this fee, as a condition of approval, the project would result in a less than significant transportation/traffic impact.

As the project is within the Downtown, it will be conditioned to participate in the Downtown Transportation Management Association (TMA) including annual payment of membership dues, when it has been established by the City, and to pay $10,000 toward the formation of the TMA.

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	1,10,11, 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	22
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	1,10,11, 12
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,10,11, 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	X	22
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	X	11
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	X	11, 12,22

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. In addition, the project will be developed in accordance with LEED Silver Certification Standards and CalGreen. The LEED Silver certification standard is expected to reduce energy consumption below 15% below compliance with Title 24.

The City-Wide Sewer System Study, City of San Mateo, June 2005 is on file at the City of San Mateo's Public Works Department. Based upon this analysis, it has been determined that there is enough capacity in the system during dry weather flow conditions to accommodate the proposed development. During wet weather flow conditions, the proposed project will have an additional impact on the existing capacity of the South Trunk Sewer. 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.

Given the drought, should indicate something about water supply. Maybe note the small incremental increase in bldg. sq. ft. and dwelling units, also list some mandatory items from Cal Green Code that will result in water efficiency.

Since this project proposes the demolition of existing structures and paving in order to construct the proposed structures, 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. This can be accomplished by salvaging building materials for reuse prior demolition and sorting of construction waste after demolition in order to recycle these materials and thereby diverting these materials from landfills.

As a condition of approval, the City shall collect wastewater treatment plant impact fee(s) prior to the issuance of a building permit to defray the cost to construct improvements and upgrades to the waste water conveyance system:

- The applicant shall contribute fees toward the Waste Water Treatment 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 building permit.

- In order to meet the increased demands on the South Trunk Sewer system created by this project, the applicant shall contribute fees toward the construction cost to increase its capacity based upon the project's average projected sanitary flow. 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 building permit.

With the implementation of these two fees, as conditions of approval, the project would result in a less than significant impact to utilities and service systems.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ISSUES:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Supporting Information Sources*
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	1,2,3,10, 12,21
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	1,10,21
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	X	1-21

Discussion

As discussed in the individual sections above, condition of approval measures to reduce air quality and noise impacts during construction, as well as, fees to offset long range cumulative impacts to transportation and sewer systems 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