COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING DIVISION
(650) 330-6702

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. Project Title
   201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue Mixed Use Project
   File: PLN2018-00061

2. Lead Agency
   City of Menlo Park
   701 Laurel Street
   Menlo Park, CA 94025-3469

3. Contact Person
   Matthew Pruter, Associate Planner
   650-330-6703

4. Project Location
   201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue
   APNs: #071-413-200, 071-413-370, 071-413-380

5. Project Applicant/Owner
   Hu-Han Two, LLC
   86 Michaels Way
   Atherton, CA 94027

6. General Plan Designation
   El Camino Real Downtown Specific Plan/Medium Density Residential

7. Zoning
   SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) and R-3 (Apartment District)

8. Description of Project
   The project consists of adjacent properties located at 201 El Camino Real, 612 Cambridge Avenue and a portion of Alto Lane. The property located at 201 El Camino Real is located in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Specific Plan) area and is zoned within the Specific Plan as ECR-SW (El Camino Real South West). The property located at 612 Cambridge Avenue is not located in the Specific Plan area; it is located in the R-3 (Apartment District) zoning district.

   The property located at 201 El Camino Real is improved with an existing one-story, approximately 6,032-square-foot commercial building and seven parking spaces, and an open parking lot with 28 parking spaces. The property located at 612 Cambridge Avenue is

improved with an existing multi-family building with four rental units constructed in 1917. This residential building has no on-site parking and utilizes four of the 28 spaces in the adjacent parking lot associated with 201 El Camino Real pursuant to a parking agreement.

The proposed project would demolish all of the existing improvements and construct a new, approximately 25,283-square-foot, three-story, 38-foot tall, mixed-use development over two levels of subterranean parking on 201 El Camino Real and two detached townhouses on 612 Cambridge Avenue. The mixed-use building would include 12 residential units (totaling approximately 17,951 square feet, including allocated common area), two of which would be below market rate (BMR) units. The two detached townhouses would total approximately 3,564 square feet and would be market rate. The ground level of the mixed-use building would be developed with approximately 7,331 square feet of space dedicated to accommodating a mix of restaurant and retail uses. The ground level would also include a small residential lobby. A total of 59 parking spaces, including mechanical lift parking, would be provided in the two-level subterranean parking garage, accessible from Cambridge Avenue, which would satisfy the City's parking requirement of 59 spaces for the project.

To accommodate the project, the applicant is requesting abandonment of Alto Lane, the public right-of-way that currently serves as an alley that separates the two parcels comprising 201 El Camino Real and which dead ends into the property to the north, 239-251 El Camino Real. The parcels would be merged so that the proposed improvements would not cross any property lines.

The project site currently has three curb cuts on Cambridge Avenue, including Alto Lane, the parking lot entry, and the 612 Cambridge Avenue driveway. These would be replaced with a single curb cut providing access to the subsurface parking garage, located along Cambridge Avenue.

The project's mixed-use component complies with the Specific Plan's design standards and guidelines. The structure is oriented toward the northwest corner of El Camino Real and Cambridge Avenue, consistent with the goal of enhancing commercial vitality along El Camino Real. This design permits a number of features that are intended to both promote a sense of community and respect the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood, such as providing new retail and restaurant space, below grade parking, and native landscaping.

The proposed architectural style utilizes contemporary Monterey-Spanish forms. Details include metal standing seam roofing and barrel roof tiles, and wrought iron railings and fabric awnings rendered in clean, bright, modern, and eco-functional manners, which are compatible with, and sensitive to, the surrounding environment, solar orientation, neighboring residences, and adjacent El Camino Real businesses. A publicly accessible landscaped paseo would separate the townhouses from the mixed-use building to provide open space and help reinforce the transition from the commercial and multi-family building to the surrounding Allied Arts neighborhood. The open space area includes tables, chairs, bicycle racks, and large planters.

The project requests a public benefit bonus for the mixed-use component in order to allow for a building with a floor area ratio (FAR) of approximately 1.46 (i.e., 25,283 square feet) instead of the maximum base FAR of 1.1 (i.e., 19,034 square feet) or an additional 6,249 square feet, and an increase in permitted residential density to allow approximately 31 units per acre (i.e., 12 units) instead of the base density of 25 units per acre (i.e., nine units), or an additional three units.

The project requires approval of a lot merger to combine the lots and abandon a portion of Alto Lane, approval of a tentative map for a major subdivision to create residential condominiums, and architectural control. The proposed project also requires approval for the removal of two heritage trees (which has already been granted) and approval of a BMR housing agreement for compliance with the City's BMR housing program. The City's BMR housing program requires the project to provide 10 percent of the proposed 14 housing units or 1.4 units as affordable. Because the proposed project is providing two BMR housing units on site, the additional 0.6 (difference between 2 units and the required 1.4 units) is proposed as the public benefit for the project. This public benefit bonus is proposed to allow for increases in development maximums per the Specific Plan.

Construction is estimated to span 15 months, which is typical for a project of this size. Demolition is likely to commence in approximately mid-2021. The remaining time would include construction of buildings, excavation for a subterranean parking garage, on-site improvements, and off-site improvements. Construction would include deep pile foundations, which would include the use of pile driving and jackhammers. The project would be subject to the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code requirements for allowable noise and hours of construction contained in Chapter 8.06 of the Municipal Code.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting

The site is bounded by El Camino Real to the east, Cambridge Avenue to the south, the Allied Arts neighborhood to the west, and the site of the former Oasis restaurant (at 241 El Camino Real) to the north. The surrounding area consists of one- and two-story structures, with commercial uses along El Camino Real and residential uses to the west. Stanford's Middle Plaza project is being developed on the opposite (eastern) side of El Camino Real from the project site. The site is relatively flat.

10. Other public agencies and entities whose approval is required

Menlo Park Fire Protection District
West Bay Sanitary District
Recology
Caltrans

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agricultural Resources	X Air Quality
X Biological Resources	X Cultural Resources	X Geology and Soils
X Greenhouse Gas Emissions	X Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology and Water Quality
☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	X Noise
☐ Population and Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
X Transportation and Traffic	☐ Utilities and Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

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

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

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

Signature Matthew Q. Pruter	For the City of Menlo Park
Matthew Pruter, Associate Planner	September 3, 2020

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

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The City of Menlo Park does not have any officially designated scenic vistas, although the Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (SP EIR) stated that view corridors could be affected by development. The property located at 201 El Camino Real was evaluated under the SP EIR and it was determined that changes to existing view corridors would not be substantially adverse, and the impact would be less than significant. The property located at 612 Cambridge Avenue is adjacent to the Specific Plan area, and due to the flat nature of the area and street trees, mid- and long-range views are already substantially obscured. Two heritage trees are proposed to be removed. The project proposes landscaping along the perimeter of the site and a publicly accessible paseo between the buildings. The project would be subject to the City's existing architectural control process, in accordance with Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance and would be required to comply with existing design standards outlined in the Zoning Ordinance, and identified in the Specific Plan. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas or views would be less than significant.

b) **No Impact.** No portions of the project site would be visible from the closest officially designated scenic highway, which is Interstate 280. Similarly, there are no rock outcroppings in the Specific Plan area or at 612 Cambridge Avenue. Therefore, there would be no impact as a result of this project.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The property located at 201 El Camino Real was evaluated under the SP EIR, and it was determined that changes to the visual character would not be substantially adverse, and the impact would be considered less than significant. The property

located at 612 Cambridge Avenue proposes the construction of two townhouses, which is a reduction from four units. The project, including both properties, would be subject to the Planning Commission architectural control review and approval, which includes public noticing and ensures aesthetic compatibility. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts to the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. Two heritage trees are proposed to be removed, and new landscaping is proposed along the perimeter and the interior of the site. Therefore, impacts on visual quality and character would be less than significant.

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The property located at 201 El Camino Real was evaluated under the SP EIR, and it was determined that increased sources of light and glare would not be substantially adverse, and the impact would be less than significant. The Specific Plan includes regulatory standards for nighttime lighting and nighttime and daytime glare. The property located at 612 Cambridge Avenue would also need to adequately address lighting and glare impacts as part of the Planning Commission architectural control review and approval process. Therefore, the project would be required to adhere to regulatory standards that would ensure that any impacts associated with substantial light or glare would be less than significant.

Sources:

City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan,* adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Impact Report* certified 2012.
City of Menlo Park, Municipal Code, Chapter 13.24 (“HERITAGE TREES”), current through Ordinance 1000, passed June 11, 2013.
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), *Officially Designated State Scenic Highways website*, https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways, 2020, accessed September 2, 2020.
City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
City of Menlo Park, Municipal Code, Zoning, Section 16.68.020.
Field Observation, February 22, 2019.
Project Plans, “*201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue*”, August 10, 2020, EID Architects.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effect, lead agencies may refer to information complied 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 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
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Conflict with the existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1220 (g)), timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland,	☐	☐	☐	X

to non-agricultural use?

DISCUSSION:

a-e) **No impact**. The proposed project, as with the majority of developed land in the City of Menlo Park, is designated by the California Department of Conservation's Important Farmland in California Map as Urban and Built-up Land. The proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use; would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses, or a Williamson Act contract; and would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. Likewise, the proposed project would not cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland-zoned Timberland Production. The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or convert forest land to a non-forest use. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to agricultural resources.

Sources:
California Department of Conservation, *Important Farmland in California Map, 2014.*
City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan,* adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Impact Report* certified 2012.

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

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation**. The Specific Plan allows for development of approximately 330,000 square feet of retail and commercial development and 680 residential units over a 30-year timeframe. The 2016 General Plan update reaffirmed the existing development potential in the City. The proposed project would allow for the construction of 10 net new residential units and nearly 1,300 net new square feet of retail and restaurant space. The proposed project is within the development parameters analyzed in the SP EIR, which was certified in 2011, and the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (GP EIR), which was certified in 2016. Therefore, no new or additional impacts beyond those identified in the SP EIR or GP EIR are anticipated.

Construction

The SP EIR indicated Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) screening thresholds would allow most of the projects constructed in the Specific Plan area to be deemed to have a less-than-significant impact without a detailed air quality analysis. The size of the proposed project does not meet the screening thresholds identified in Table 4.2-3 of the SP EIR and, therefore, would be deemed to have a less-than-significant impact. In addition, the SP EIR also provided that subsequent projects would also be required to comply with **Mitigation Measure AIR-1a** and implement standard fugitive dust control measures. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

The GP EIR concluded that development in the city would be consistent with the *2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan*, and the impacts would be less than significant. There are no new specific effects of the proposed project and, therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated.

Operational

The SP EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in increased long-term emissions of criteria pollutants from increased vehicle traffic and on-site area sources that would contribute substantially to an air quality violation. The impact was considered significant and unavoidable even with implementation of **Mitigation Measure AIR-2**, which implements **Mitigation Measure TR-2** and requires Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to be implemented. The proposed project's TDM strategies would include the following:

- Subsidize employee transit passes at a value of at least $20 per month per employee, for the first year of operation.
- Subsidize employees commuting on foot or by bicycling at a value of $20 per month for the first year of operation.
- Work with the City on participation in a future Downtown Transportation Management Association, for which the City is currently studying feasibility.
- Provide wayfinding signage.
- Promote SamTrans and Caltrain apps and explore the possibility of providing live transit signage in the lobby.
- Promote the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program operated by commute.org, the San Mateo County's TDM Agency.
- Provide secure bicycle parking for residents and employees.
- Survey employees and residents annually to examine travel behavior and to encourage transportation mode shift away from single-occupancy auto trips, and submit a brief annual report to the City summarizing the effectiveness of the TDM program.

With implementation of these TDM strategies, the proposed project would be consistent with the analysis in the SP EIR. There are no new or more severe air quality effects of the proposed project and, therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated.

As noted above, the GP EIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan would be

consistent with the *2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan*, and the impacts would be less than significant. There are no new effects of the proposed project and, therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated.

b,c) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation**. As stated earlier, the proposed project is within the development parameters analyzed in the SP EIR and the GP EIR and would not result in new or more severe significant impacts than are analyzed in those documents. In addition, there are no new or additional impacts that are peculiar to the site or project that are anticipated from the proposed project.

Construction

The SP EIR determined that overlapping construction of development projects could result in substantial pollutant emissions that would be significant and unavoidable. It is possible that construction of the proposed project could overlap with other construction projects in the Specific Plan area, resulting in substantial pollutant emissions that would contribute to an air quality violation and exceed BAAQMD's applicable significance thresholds. GP EIR **Mitigation Measure AQ-2b1** requires all projects to comply with the current BAAQMD basic control measures for reducing construction emissions. The project would implement **Mitigation Measure AQ-2b1** and, therefore, would ensure impacts from fugitive dust, along with other pollutants generated during construction, would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Operational

The proposed project would add less than 100 peak hour trips, with a total of two AM peak-hour trips and 17 PM peak-hour trips projected. The proposed project, as discussed above, would comply with SP EIR **Mitigation Measure TR-2** and implement a TDM plan. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or additional impacts beyond those disclosed in the SP EIR and would have a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated.

d) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** BAAQMD defines sensitive receptors as facilities where sensitive population groups (children, elderly, and/or acutely or chronically ill people) are likely to be located. These land uses include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and medical clinics. The proposed project is located on El Camino Real, and is also about 350 feet away from the Caltrain tracks, both areas of elevated concentrations of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and $PM_{2.5}$. The SP EIR evaluated health risks posed to sensitive receptors near El Camino Real, and found that residences within 200 feet of the roadway could be exposed to increased cancer risk, while non-cancer health risks were found to be below the BAAQMD significance thresholds. The applicant would be required to implement certain components of **Mitigation Measure AIR-5**, including a screening-level health risk assessment (HRA) and added air filtration systems based on the analysis, would reduce cancer risks to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would not increase traffic generation beyond the level analyzed in the SP EIR or GP EIR and would be below BAAQMD thresholds. Further, as discussed above implementation of the standard dust control measures would aid in minimizing construction emissions for the proposed project. Therefore, the air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in the area would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

e) **Less than Significant Impact.** Demolition and construction for the proposed project could result in objectionable odors from diesel exhaust emissions due to the use of on-site diesel

equipment. Diesel exhaust would be short-term in duration and only temporary during construction activities, and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance. The proposed project would not include the long-term odorous emission source as defined by BAAQMD Guidelines due to the proposed mixed-use development, which would not generate objectionable odors. During operation of the proposed project, some limited odors may be emitted by cooking products. However, BAAQMD has not identified these odors as objectionable, and no additional protections are necessary for these odors. Overall, odors related to the construction and operation of the proposed project would not affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, the proposed development would have a less-than-significant impact related to objectionable odors.

Sources:

Field Observation, February 22, 2019.
Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *2017 Clean Air Plan*, adopted April 19, 2010.
Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines-Assessing the Air Quality Impacts and Plans,* May 2017.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan,* adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report,* certified 2011.
City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
City of Menlo Park, *ConnectMenlo: General Plan Land Use & Circulation Elements and M-2 Area Zoning Update Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified November 2016.

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

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The project site is fully developed and within a highly urbanized/landscaped area. The project site provides little wildlife habitat and essentially no habitat for plants other than ruderal species adapted to the built environment or horticultural plants used in landscaping.

As stated earlier, the proposed project is within the development parameters analyzed in the SP EIR and the GP EIR, and no new or additional impacts are anticipated from the proposed project. The SP EIR determined that development projects could result in a loss of active nests, eggs, or young of special status species, which would be potentially significant. SP EIR **Mitigation Measure BIO-1a** requires pre-construction special-status avian surveys, and SP EIR **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b** requires any active nests that are found during the aforementioned survey to be avoided. To further mitigate against impacts to migratory birds or other special status species, **Mitigation Measures BIO-3a and BIO-3b** require a number of lighting reduction strategies from the interior and exterior of new development. These mitigations measures apply to the proposed project and would adequately document and protect any protected bird species, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. To protect against any potential impacts to bat populations, SP EIR **Mitigation Measures BIO-5a, BIO-5b, and BIO-5c** require a preconstruction survey, avoidance strategies during the construction process, and safe protocols for habitat evictions, respectively.

In addition, two heritage trees, both located on site, are proposed to be removed. The SP EIR determined that no mitigation would be required with implementation of the Heritage Tree Ordinance Chapter 13.24, which requires a planting replacement at a 2:1 basis for commercial projects. Additionally, the City of Menlo Park's Building Division provides "Tree Protection Specifications" and procedures to further ensure the protection of heritage trees during construction. Compliance with these existing code requirements, guidelines, and the Tree Protection Specifications and procedures, coupled with the additional tree planting resulting from implementation of the Specific Plan, would mitigate the impact of any loss of protected trees and would constitute consistency with local ordinances designed to protect existing tree resources.

b) **No Impact.** The SP EIR identified San Francisquito Creek, to the south of the Specific Plan area, and Atherton Channel, to the north, as the two riparian habitats near or within the Specific Plan area that need additional mitigation and protection. Atherton Channel is largely channelized and underground, and the SP EIR determined that no mitigation for that waterway is necessary. However, projects located within 100 feet of only San Francisquito Creek would be required to mitigate for potential impacts. The proposed project is located approximately 900 feet to the north of San Francisquito Creek and 1.37 miles to the south of Atherton Channel. Additionally, the property upon which the proposed project would be located does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat, nor does it contain a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdictional area, and is surrounded by suburban development. Therefore, there would be no impact as a result of this project.

c) **No Impact.** The project site itself does not contain any wetlands or federally protected waters. Therefore, there would be no impact to wetlands as a result of this project.

d) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The SP EIR determined that development could potentially result in new sources of light, which may act as an attractant for birds, resulting in collisions and avian mortality, particularly in areas prone to fog, areas proximate to migratory stopover points, and buildings with large expanses of reflective or transparent glass. SP EIR **Mitigation Measures BIO-3a and BIO-3b** would limit the amount of lighting and glare that the project generates by imposing specific requirements on the location and type of lighting applied throughout the development, as requiring time limits for on-site lighting. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The City of Menlo Park Heritage Tree Ordinance defines a heritage tree as: 1) a tree or group of trees of historical significance, special character or community benefit, specifically designated by resolution of the city council; 2) an oak tree (Quercus) which is native to California and has a trunk with a circumference of 31.4" (diameter of 10") or more, measured at 54" above the natural grade. Trees with more than one trunk shall be measured at the point where the trunks divide, with the exception of trees that are under 12' in height, which would be exempt from this section.

A total of 20 trees were surveyed on the site, with 10 trees being considered heritage trees. Two heritage trees are proposed to be removed for construction purposes, and the applicant has received heritage tree removal permits to remove these trees. Twenty-eight trees would be planted as part of the proposed project, including street trees. The project is subject to the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance and current Tree Replacement Policy. The arborist report has also identified tree preservation measures for the remaining trees, and compliance with the protection measures would be required with the building permit submittal. Therefore, the project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

f) **No Impact.** The proposed project is located in a suburban area and does not lie within the planning area for any adopted or proposed habitat conservation or natural community plans. Therefore, there would be no impact as a result of this project.

Sources:

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), 2006. Wildlife Habitat and Data Analysis Branch, California Natural Diversity Database.
California Native Plant Society (CNPS). *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants* (online edition, v6-05c). California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, CA.
City of Menlo Park, Municipal Code, *Heritage Tree Ordinance Chapter 13.24*.
Field Observation, February 22, 2019.
Project Plans, *"201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue*" dated August 10, 2020, prepared by EID Architects.
Arborist Report, Advanced Tree Care, July 18, 2020.
California Natural Diversity Database https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Plants-and-Animals, 2020. Accessed September 2, 2020.

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

DISCUSSION:

a) **No Impact**. In accordance with **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** of the SP EIR, Historic Resource Evaluations (HRE) were prepared for the project by Urban Programmers dated January 11, 2019 for 201 El Camino Real and dated January 30, 2019 for 612 Cambridge Avenue. The HRE evaluated 201 El Camino Real for criteria of the California Register of Historic Resources. The report concluded, the site does not have associations to significant people, events or important patterns. The architecture is not of artistic value, nor is it the work of a master architect. Therefore, the property is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, the National Register of Historic Places or under criteria adopted by the City of Menlo Park.

The HRE evaluated 612 Cambridge Avenue for criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and National Register. The report concluded that the apartment building at 612 Cambridge Avenue does not meet the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, nor are the buildings eligible for listing in the Menlo Park Historic Resources Inventory.

These buildings are not historic resources under CEQA. The properties do not have associations with significant people, events, or important patterns. As noted, the architecture of the buildings on these properties does not exhibit artistic value, nor is the work of a master architect. Therefore, there is no potential impact related to historic resources.

b) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation**. As stated earlier, the proposed project is within the development parameters analyzed in the SP EIR and the GP EIR and no new or additional impacts are anticipated from the proposed project. However, it is possible that

construction of the proposed project, specifically excavation, could adversely impact archaeological remains. SP EIR **Mitigation Measure CUL-2a** requires all projects involving ground disturbance to provide a cultural resources study by a qualified archaeologist. In addition, SP EIR **Mitigation Measure CUL-2b** requires all construction activities to halt when within 50 feet of any found archaeological artifact, and a qualified archaeologist would be required to inspect and take action regarding the finding. The project has implemented **Mitigation Measure CUL-2a**, as an *Archeological Resources Assessment Report* (ARAR) was prepared by Basin Research Associates for the project. The report suggests a low to moderate archeological sensitivity for exposing subsurface prehistoric and significant historic archeological materials during construction within or immediately adjacent to the site. The archeological sensitivity is based on the low density of previously recorded and/or reported archeological sites within or near the project site, the lack of known Native American cultural resources. Moderate sensitivity is suggested due to the presence of San Francisquito Creek, approximately 900 feet to the south of Creek Drive. The stream has been the subject of archeological surveys and investigations and is known for isolated prehistoric finds and a number of recorded sites.

The project would also incorporate **Mitigation Measure CUL-2a** of the GP EIR, which specifies if a resource is found the developers in the study area shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of the process. With the mitigation measures in the SP EIR and the GP EIR, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation**. The 201 El Camino Real property was analyzed in the SP EIR and the buildout of the Specific Plan was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-3**. The physical conditions, as they relate to paleontological resources, have not changed in the Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan mitigates potential impacts to paleontological resources through the SP EIR's **Mitigation Measure CUL-3**, which requires training of construction forepersons and field supervisors by a qualified professional paleontologist. The project would comply with these requirements and would provide the required training. No substantial new information has been presented that shows more significant effects than those originally analyzed in the SP EIR and, therefore, there would be no new specific effects as a result of the project. The proposed project would also adhere to **Mitigation Measure CUL-3** from the GP EIR, which requires all work to halt if fossils or fossil bearing deposits are discovered during ground disturbing activities over a 50-foot radius, until a trained paleontologist has assessed the remains and provided further direction. In incorporating these mitigation measures, the proposed project would therefore result in a less-than-significant impact to any paleontological resources, or any other unique geologic features.

d) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The 201 El Camino Real property was analyzed in the SP EIR and buildout of the Specific Plan was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-4.** The Specific Plan mitigates potential impacts to human remains through the SP EIR's **Mitigation Measure CUL-4** and GP EIR **Mitigation Measure CUL-4**, which both establish strict procedures to follow in the event that human remains are discovered during construction. The construction of the project would require soil excavation and grading for building foundation, garages, and utilities. This project activity has the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, resulting in potentially significant impacts. However, implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-4**, from both the SP EIR and GP EIR, would reduce the project's impact on

human remains to a less-than-significant level.

Sources:

State Historic Resources Database http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/?view=county. 2020. Accessed September 2, 2020.
Menlo Park Historical Association https://sites.google.com/site/mphistorical/. Updated August 21, 2020. Accessed September 2, 2020.
San Mateo County Historical Museum http://www.historysmc.org. 2020. Accessed September 2, 2020.
Archeological Resource Assessment-201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue, Basin Research, April 19, 2019.
Historic Resource Evaluation 612 Cambridge Avenue, Urban Programmers, January 30, 2019.
Historic Resource Evaluation 201 El Camino Real, Urban Programmers, January 11, 2019.
City of Menlo Park, *ConnectMenlo: General Plan Land Use & Circulation Elements and M-2 Area Zoning Update Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified November 2016.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. GEOLOGY & SOILS Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42)	☐	☐	X	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	X	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	X	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	X	☐	☐
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	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1 B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life of property.	☐	☐	X	☐
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

DISCUSSION:

a.i-ii) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as designated by the California Geological Society, and no known active faults exist on the site. The nearest active fault to the project area is the San Andreas fault, which is located approximately 4.7 miles southwest of the property. Although this is the case, the project is in a seismically active area, and, while unlikely, there is a possibility of future faulting and consequent secondary ground failure from unknown faults is considered low. Furthermore, the project would comply with requirements set in the California Building Code (CBC) to withstand settlement and forces associated with the maximum credible earthquake. The CBC provides standards intended to permit structures to withstand seismic hazards. Therefore, the CBC sets standards for excavation, grading, construction earthwork, fill embankments, expansive soils, foundation investigations, liquefaction potential, and soil strength loss. Geotechnical investigations were prepared for the project by Earth Systems Pacific, in a Geotechnical Engineering Study that was dated March 28, 2018. The report concluded that the site is suitable for the proposed mixed-use development provided the recommendations in the reports are followed during design and construction.

The project site is relatively flat, which reduces the potential for erosion and loss of topsoil during construction activities. The proposed project would adhere to all CBC requirements and geotechnical engineering study recommendations. Therefore, impacts related to seismic shaking and landslides would be considered less-than-significant with the project.

a.iii) **Less than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction refers to the sudden, temporary transformation of loose, saturated granular sediments from a solid state to a liquefied state as a result of seismic ground shaking. Liquefaction-related phenomena include seismically induced settlement, flow failure, and lateral spreading. While there would be considerable groundshaking, seismic ground failure, including liquefaction and subsidence of the land, is possible, but not likely at the site, based on the Earth Systems Pacific report prepared for the project. Geotechnical studies are typically required for projects involving excavation for underground spaces, but the applicant has provided this document in advance of the building permit stage. Loose, saturated, and silty sands are most susceptible to liquefaction, and were not encountered at this site. Therefore, impacts related to seismically-induced ground failure and liquefaction would be considered less than significant with the project.

a.iv) **No Impact.** Landslides occur when forces, such as excessive rainfall or earthquakes, loosen unstable materials from hillsides, causing the material to slide downhill. The project site and surrounding vicinity are relatively flat and is not susceptible to slope instability. Therefore, the potential for landslides to occur within the project vicinity would be low and result in no impact.

b) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The proposed construction would involve grading to prepare the building pads and excavation of the subterranean parking garage. This activity would expose areas of soil that have previously been covered. Exposed soil could be subject to erosion by wind and storm water runoff. The extent of erosion that could occur varies depending on soil type, vegetation/cover, and weather conditions. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant would be required to comply with the standard requirement to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs), per SP EIR **Mitigation Measure HAZ-3**, to reduce pollutants to storm water discharges. Compliance with the BMPs would reduce potential erosion of exposed soil and reduce potential erosion impacts. Therefore, erosion impacts resulting from construction would be considered less than significant with mitigation

incorporated.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** Direct impacts related to the potential for landslides are addressed in item 6a(iv) above. The project site would not be subject to landslides. Liquefaction is also addressed above in 6a(iii). Based on the available geologic information, less-than-significant impacts related to unstable geologic units or soils would be anticipated.

d) **Less than Significant Impact**. Due to the absence of expansive soils, along with the site's flat topography, relatively deep potentially liquefiable layer, and random nature of liquefaction, the risk of lateral spreading resulting from liquefaction is considered low. Therefore, based on the geologic information available, this impact would be considered to be less than significant.

e) **No Impact.** The project is served by the existing West Bay Sanitary District sewer system, which does not use septic tanks or an alternative wastewater disposal system. Therefore, there is no potential impact related to adequate support of such facilities.

Sources:

Earth Systems Pacific, *Geotechnical Report*, March 28, 2018.
California Geological Survey (CGS), 2006.
California Uniform Building Code, 2019.
City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan*, adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified 2012.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the proposal:				
a). Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	X	☐	☐
b). Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	X	☐	☐

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation**. The proposed project is within the land use projections analyzed as part of the SP EIR, which found that emissions associated with the buildout of the Specific Plan area would result in substantial greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from vehicle trips, natural gas and electricity consumption, solid waste generation, water and wastewater conveyance and treatment, and landscape maintenance. The emissions per service population for the Specific Plan were found to be greater than the applicable BAAQMD per capita threshold. The SP EIR concluded that these emissions would have a significant and unavoidable impact on the environment and adopted a statement of overriding considerations. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GHG-1**, which requires projects to implement feasible BAAQMD-identified mitigation measures and CALGreen amendments, would help reduce GHG emissions associated with the project.

In addition, the project would comply with guidelines and standards in the Specific Plan aimed at reducing GHG emissions. Guidelines implementing the LEED for Neighborhood Development 2009 rating systems credits are located in Section D.6 of the Specific Plan, as well as a number of other areas, including Specific Plan Guidelines D.2.47, D.4.09, D5.20, E.3.6.07, E3.8.14, and Standard E.3.8.01. These measures would contribute to lessening GHG impacts in the Specific Plan area.

The proposed project conforms to the General Plan and is zoned for mixed use and residential development. Greenhouse gases would be emitted during construction and during the occupation of the mixed-use and residential development. Two existing buildings are being demolished and replaced with a total of 14 new multi-family dwelling units and 7,331 square feet of retail/restaurant and two levels of subterranean parking. As older construction is less energy efficient and the current building code requires greater efficiency, it is not anticipated that there would be an increase in GHG emissions during the operation of the new dwelling units. Additionally, as this project provides additional residential units in an area close to transit, jobs, and services, thereby improving the jobs-housing balance in Menlo Park, it may reduce the vehicle commute miles traveled by the future occupant(s). With the mitigation measures incorporated, the project would have a less-than-significant impact to greenhouse gas emissions.

The proposed project would not result in new or more significant impacts relating to GHG emissions than were analyzed in the SP EIR, nor would the proposed project result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the site or project.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The development of the project (including demolition, excavation, construction, and operation) would generate GHG emissions. The project would include the basic BMPs identified by BAAQMD. According to the BAAQMD threshold of significance for construction impacts, construction dust impacts of the project would be less than significant.

201 El Camino Real is within the land use projections analyzed as part of the SP EIR, which found that the Specific Plan emissions would exceed the applicable BAAQMD per capita threshold. In addition, the SP EIR determined that the BAAQMD thresholds were derived using Assembly Bill (AB) 32 attainment goals, and an exceedance of the per capita threshold indicates that the project conflicts with AB 32. The SP EIR concluded that this impact is significant and unavoidable and adopted a statement of overriding considerations. The applicant would be required to implement SP EIR **Mitigation Measure GHG-2a**, which requires projects install one dedicated electric vehicle/plug-in hybrid electric vehicle recharging station for every 20 residential parking spaces provided to help reduce GHG emissions associated with the project. 201 El Camino Real includes the construction of 10 net new residential units and retail/restaurant space replacing an existing commercial building and, therefore, would not result in impacts more severe than what has been disclosed in the SP EIR. Although significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the SP EIR, the project would not result in new or more significant impacts relating to GHG emissions than were analyzed in the SP EIR, nor would the proposed project result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the site or project.

Sources:

City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
City of Menlo Park, *Climate Action Plan*, https://www.menlopark.org/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/11486, adopted June 2020. Accessed September 2, 2020.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan, adopted 2012*.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified 2012.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the proposal:				
a) . Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	X	☐	☐
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	☐	☐
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
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
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
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
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	X	☐
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to	☐	☐	☐	X

urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

DISCUSSION:

a,b) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Currently, two buildings and surface parking exist on the property. The proposed project is the construction of one mixed-use building and two townhouses. The proposed use of the site for mixed-use purposes would not involve the routine transport, use, emission, or disposal of hazardous materials.

The SP EIR evaluated potential impacts from excavation for the installation of utilities, building foundations, subterranean development, and regrading, and determined that disturbance of subsurface soils and groundwater at locations that may have been previously contaminated by prior uses could further disperse existing contamination into the environment and expose construction workers or the public to contaminants. **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1**, requires a Phase I site assessment to determine the presence of hazardous materials and whether additional assessment and soil remediation is necessary on site. If the assessment demonstrates potential for hazardous releases, then a Phase II site assessment would also be required. At this time, the applicant has not prepared a Phase I assessment, but the project would be required to complete this assessment prior to building permit issuance. With this mitigation implemented, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Proposed construction may involve the use and transport of materials, including fuels, oils, and other chemicals used during construction. In the SP EIR, **Mitigation Measure HAZ-3** also requires construction BMPs to control handling of hazardous materials (fuels, solvents, etc.) during construction to minimize the potential negative effects from accidental release to groundwater and soils. The project would implement BMPs and, therefore, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to the use or accidental release of hazardous materials.

c) **No impact**. The proposed project is the construction of one mixed-use building, two-townhouses, and two levels of subterranean parking. The 14 new multi-family dwelling units and 7,331 square feet of retail/restaurant would not generate or use hazardous materials beyond typical household and commercial chemicals and products, such as cleaning supplies, ammonia, and paint thinner. Therefore, the potential to affect existing or proposed schools in the project vicinity is low to none. Therefore, no impact would occur related to emissions or the handling of hazardous materials in close proximity to schools.

d) **No Impact.** The site is not on a hazardous materials sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e,f) **No Impact.** The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or within the vicinity of an airstrip. Therefore, the project does not have the potential to result in a safety hazard impact for people residing or working in the project area.

g) **Less than Significant Impact.** The construction of one mixed-use building, two townhouses, and two levels of subterranean parking requires the Menlo Park Fire Protection District's (MPFPD) review and approval for adequate emergency access. The subject site is currently developed and located in a suburban area. Given that the project has been reviewed and approved by the MPFPD

and construction at the site would not considerably impact thoroughfares, the impact of the project to emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant.

h) **No Impact.** The subject parcel is in a developed area, and is not intermixed with or adjacent to wildlands. Therefore, the project does not have the potential impact of exposing people to risk as a result of wildland fires.

Sources:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List).* Accessed September 2, 2020.
City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan*, adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified 2012.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	X	☐
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	☐
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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	X	☐
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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	X	☐
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	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	X	☐
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
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	X

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
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would result in the construction of one mixed-use building, two townhouses, and two levels of subterranean parking. Construction would likely involve shallow foundation and utility and below-grade excavation for the parking garage, creation of soil stockpiles, and surface grading. The potential at the proposed project site for erosion and sediment transport is low because the site is relatively flat, and sedimentation would be managed using standard construction and engineering BMPs. The BMPs would be a condition of project approval and are standard practices used to reduce erosion and sedimentation during construction activities. All on-site runoff must also comply with the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP). Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The mixed-use development would not rely on groundwater for its water supply. The site would be supplied by the California Water Service Company (Cal Water); as such, the proposed project would not have the potential to affect groundwater supplies. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The mixed-use development's drainage system has been designed in accordance with the City's grading and drainage guidelines. Additionally, construction is required to comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Nonpoint Discharge Permit, which prohibits surface grading between October 15 and April 15, unless an erosion control plan is prepared by the applicant and approved by the City Engineer. As part of this permit, standard erosion control measures and BMPs would be implemented to reduce sedimentation of waterways or loss of topsoil. The project incorporates landscaping to minimize stormwater runoff from paved surfaces. The project would not alter any of these requirements or introduce any new obstructions to drainage patterns. No upstream or downstream drainage patterns would be altered. Therefore, the proposed drainage patterns would have a less-than-significant impact on erosion or siltation, both on- and off-site.

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes grading and construction of the site improvements. The Engineering Division has reviewed and approved the preliminary grading and drainage plans, and would review and approve the final grading and drainage plans prior to building/grading permit issuance. The City's standard conditions of approval would ensure that potential impacts on local drainage remain the same. Therefore, impacts associated with alteration of existing drainage patterns would be less than significant.

e) **Less than Significant Impact.** Because much of the proposed site is currently paved, development of the project site would decrease the amount of surface runoff with the removal of hardscape and addition of landscaping. The proposed project would increase pervious surfaces and would incorporate low impact development (LID) facilities to decrease the total peak stormwater flows in the City storm drain system. In addition, the site meets the San Mateo County C.3 requirements with self-retaining and LID facilities to treat storm water flows from

impervious services. The proposed project would increase the landscape area of the lot, through the reduction in building coverage and impervious surface areas. Drought-resistant plants and landscaping would be implemented throughout the site. The Engineering Division has reviewed and approved the preliminary grading and drainage plans, and would review and approve the final grading and drainage plans prior to building/grading permit issuance. Additionally, adherence to the goals and objectives of the SMCPPP and City policies requires that storm water runoff rates remain the same or decrease. The proposed project would therefore have a less-than-significant impact on existing drainage systems.

f) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would consist 14 multi-family dwelling units (of which 10 net new units would be built), 7,331 square feet of retail/restaurant uses, and two levels of subterranean parking. There is no indication that the proposed project would degrade the City of Menlo Park's water quality through temporary construction activities or use of the site as a mixed-use development. Erosion control measures would be implemented during construction. Stormwater quality measures for the proposed project include the use of grassed swales, where possible, along with the filtration capability of the gravel basins. Standard project conditions of approval would be required to minimize the impacts to the existing hydrology and drainage of the property. Water quality degradation would be less than significant as a result of this project.

g,h) **No Impact.** The project site is not within a FEMA-designated flood zone; therefore, the project site is not subject to 100-year flood hazards. As such, the project would have no impact with regard to the placement of housing and commercial use in a 100-year flood zone.

i) **No Impact.** The project area is not located near a levee or dam. Therefore, the project would not result in any impacts with respect to exposure to the risks of flooding.

j) **No Impact.** The project would not expose people to a significant risk due to inundation by tsunami, mudflow, or seiche. Tsunamis, which are large ocean waves generated by seismic events are rare, and if generated would be expected to inundate lower-lying coastal areas east of the project site. Seiches are seismically induced waves that occur in an enclosed body of water such as a lake, and would not affect the project site. Additionally, areas in the vicinity of the subject site are flat and there is no risk of mudflows in these areas. Therefore, there would be no impact as a result of the project.

Sources:

Project Plans, "*201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue*", August 10, 2020, EID Architects.
City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
Federal Emergency Management Agency, *FEMA Map, 2012.*
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan*, adopted 2012
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified 2012.
Hydrology Report, Sherwood Design Engineers, November 13, 2019.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the proposal:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	X	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a) **No Impact.** The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a physical feature (such as an interstate highway or railroad tracks) or removal of a means of access (such as a local road or bridge) that would impair mobility within an existing community, or between a community and outlying areas. The project would not construct or remove any such physical feature and would therefore not physically divide a community. As a result of the proposed project, two new residential buildings would be created that are consistent with the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district and the mixed-use development would be consistent with the SP-ECR/D zoning district. Other residential and commercial uses would surround the proposed structures. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community and would have no impact related to such.

b**) Less than Significant Impact.** The 201 El Camino Real property was analyzed in the SP EIR. The SP-ECR/D zoning district establishes the Specific Plan as the primary source of development regulations and guidelines. The site's General Plan designation is El Camino Real Mixed Use (ECR MU), which likewise references the Specific Plan itself as the source of detailed regulations. The Specific Plan established an approach to land use that is based on the plan's overall objectives of preserving and enhancing community life, character, and vitality through public space improvements, mixed-use infill projects sensitive to the small-town character of Menlo Park, and improved connections across El Camino Real. The proposed project is an infill mixed-use development that meets the intent of the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan allows for a higher amount of FAR in exchange for public benefits. In accordance with the Specific Plan, the project is requesting a higher commercial and residential FAR in exchange for the provision of public benefits. The project is required to provide 1.4 BMR units, which would equate to one BMR unit plus payment of an in-lieu fee for the fractional 0.4 of a unit. As the public benefit, the project is providing the fractional 0.6 of a BMR unit and proposing to provide two full units on site. This public benefit package would be reviewed and approved by City Council and would have to achieve key standards as noted in the Specific Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with

any applicable land use plans or policies, and the impact would be less than significant.

c) **No Impact.** The proposed project is located in a suburban area and does not lie within the planning area for any adopted or proposed habitat conservation or natural community plans. Therefore, there would be no impact as a result of this project.

Sources:

Field Observations, February 22, 2019.
City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
City of Menlo Park, Municipal Code*,* Zoning*.*
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan*, adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report*, certified 2012.
Project Plans, "*201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue*", August 10, 2020, EID Architects.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the proposal result in:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a) **No Impact.** The project site does not contain any known mineral resources. Therefore, there would be no environmental impact associated with mineral resources as a result of this project.

b) **No Impact.** The City of Menlo Park General Plan does not discuss any locally important mineral resource recovery site in the vicinity of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no environmental impact associated with locally important mineral resources as a result of this project.

Source:
City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. NOISE Would the proposal result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	X	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	X	☐	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	X	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	X	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X
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

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The City's Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.06 of the Municipal Code) sets standards of 60 dBA for daytime noise, and 50 dBA for nighttime noise measured at the nearest residential property line. The 201 El Camino Real property was analyzed in the SP EIR and buildout of the Specific Plan was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1a, NOI-1c, and NOI-3**. These measures involve completing a construction noise control plan with noise control techniques (NOI-1a), adding a condition of approval for the project to amend noise control measures, if justified complaints are provided (NOI-1c), and assessing interior noise exposure from window and wall assemblies (NOI-3). The physical conditions, as they relate to noise levels, have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. The project would incorporate the SP EIR's **Mitigation Measures NOI-1a, NOI-1c, and NOI-3,** which are intended to minimize noise-related impacts, and GP EIR **Mitigation Measure NOI-1b**, which requires Noise Ordinance compliance for stationary noise impacts. Therefore, the noise exposure with the project would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporated.

Large equipment would be used for any construction and would create temporary construction noise impacts. Municipal Code Chapter 8.06 (Noise), however, provides an exception for construction activity between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday. Proposed construction at the project site would be required to comply with the following standard construction noise control measures:

Construction activity shall be allowed to exceed the noise limitations in Section 8.06.030 only between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday. Construction is prohibited to exceed the noise limitation on Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays.

All powered equipment shall comply with the limits set forth in Section 8.06.040 of the Municipal Code including powered equipment used on a temporary, occasional or infrequent basis operated between the hours of eight (8) a.m. and six (6) p.m. Monday through Friday. No piece of equipment shall generate noise in excess of eighty-five (85) dBA at fifty (50) feet.

Signs shall be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and a day and evening contact number for the City in the event of problems.

Contact information for an on-site complaint and enforcement manager shall be posted to allow for responses to and tracking of complaints.

In addition, the project would incorporate GP EIR **Mitigation Measure NOI-1a** to meet the requirements of Title 24 of the Building Code and General Plan Noise Program, the project applicant shall perform acoustical studies prior to issuance of building permits for development of new noise-sensitive uses which includes new residential developments.

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

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

The 201 El Camino Real property was analyzed for potential pile driving and blasting impacts in the SP EIR, and buildout of the Specific Plan was determined to be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-1b**. This measure involves predrilling holes (if soil conditions are feasible) for the proposed piles, to the maximum proposed depth, in order to minimize noise and vibration impacts. If pile driving does indeed occur, this mitigation measure also requires pile driving to be limited to result in the least disturbance to neighboring uses. Soil conditions have not changed substantially in the Specific Plan area since the preparation of the Specific Plan EIR. As a condition of approval, the project would be required to incorporate the **Mitigation Measure NOI-1b** from the SP EIR, which is intended to minimize noise and vibration-related impacts, and GP EIR **Mitigation Measure NOI-2a**, to require a noise and vibration analysis to assess and more precisely mitigate against potential impacts during construction. Therefore, the noise and vibration exposure associated with the project would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporated.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not result in the construction or operation of a facility that would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. While the proposed mixed-use development would generate project-related traffic, the number of trips in comparison to the existing vehicle traffic in the area would be relatively small, and, therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project and less-than-significant impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would result in the construction of one mixed-use building, two townhouses, and two levels of subterranean parking. The use of construction equipment, necessary to complete the construction, would generate a substantial increase in the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project. However, construction-related noise would be short-term and temporary. By adhering to the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, Chapter 8.06 (Noise), the construction-related noise impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

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

Sources:

City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
ConnectMenlo: *General Plan Land Use & Circulation Elements and M-2 Area Zoning Update Environmental Impact Report*, certified November 2016.
City of Menlo Park, Municipal Code, Chapter 8.06, Noise Ordinance.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan,* adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified 2012.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the proposal:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	X	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project includes the construction of 14 new multi-family dwelling units (or 10 net new units when considering the existing four residential units), 7,331 square feet of retail/restaurant, and two levels of subterranean parking. These 10 net new units would also result in an increase of about 26 residents. Construction of the project, including site preparation, building demolition, and excavation would temporarily increase construction employment. Given the relatively common nature and relatively small scale of the construction associated with the project, the demand for construction employment would likely be met within the existing and future labor market in the City and the County. The size of the construction workforce would vary during the different stages of construction, but a substantial quantity of workers from outside the City or County would not be expected to relocate permanently. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly, and there would be a less-than-significant impact related to population growth as a result of this project.

b) **No Impact.** The proposed project would result in the construction of 14 new multi-family dwelling units, inclusive of the two townhouses, for a net increase of 10 units. Since more units would be built than would be demolished, construction of replacement housing would not be required. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any impacts in displacing housing units or persons.

c) **No Impact.** See the discussion of b) above.

Sources:
City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
Applicant's Revised Project Description, November 20, 2019.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan*, adopted 2012.

City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified 2012.
Project Plans, "*201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue*", August 10, 2020, EID Architects.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	☐	☐	X	☐
ii. Police protection?	☐	☐	X	☐
iii. Schools?	☐	☐	X	☐
iv. Parks?	☐	☐	X	☐
v.) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	X	☐

DISCUSSION:

a.i,ii) **Less than Significant Impact.** The MPFPD and Menlo Park Police Department currently serve the site. The fire station in closest proximity to the subject site is MPFPD Station #6 at 700 Oak Grove Avenue, Menlo Park, CA 94025. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in population growth or employment and, therefore, the demand for new services would be minimal. The MPFPD has accepted the current proposal, and would review the building plans before building permits are issued to ensure compliance with all applicable fire code standards, and to ensure that adequate fire and life safety measures are incorporated into the project in compliance with all applicable State and City fire safety regulations. Because the proposed project would not result in the need for new or expanded public services, the project's potential impact on fire and police protection services would be less than significant.

a.iii,iv) **Less than Significant Impact.** 612 Cambridge Avenue currently has a multi-family building with four rental units, which would be demolished as part of the project. The proposed project would construct 14 new multi-family dwelling units, resulting in the addition of 10 residential dwelling units; therefore, the project would not result in a substantial increase in population growth. Based on an average household size in Menlo Park of 2.60 persons (this is smaller than the state and county average), the residential population of the site is expected to

increase by 26 people. There are sufficient neighborhood and regional parks near the project site to satisfy the expected resident demand. Nealon Park and Burgess Park are located less than one mile from the project site. In addition, the GP EIR indicates that projected growth in the City would be such that adequate park capacity would be met, maintaining a ratio of five acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Because of the modest population growth anticipated as part of the project, increased use of existing parks and recreational facilities would not result in the physical deterioration of these facilities. Increased use of parks by project residents would occur in small amounts over time and over several different facilities.

The project includes the net new development of 10 multi-family residential units. The Menlo Park City School District (kindergarten through eighth grade) uses a student yield factor of 0.5 students per dwelling unit and 0.357 students per dwelling unit for high school students. Based on these rates, the proposed project would generate approximately five elementary and middle school students and four high school students. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate significant demand for increased school services or park facilities, and a less-than-significant impact to schools and parks would occur with the proposed development.

a.v) **Less than Significant Impact.** As discussed earlier, the proposed project would add 14 new multi-family dwelling units, resulting in the addition of 10 net new residential units and 7,331 square feet of retail/restaurant uses. As described in the above discussion, the proposed project would have a negligible increase in population or employment and would likely not result in significantly increased demand for other governmental services (e.g., libraries and community centers). Therefore, a less-than-significant impact to other public facilities would occur with the project.

Sources:

City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
Applicant's Revised Project Description, November 20, 2019.
California Department of Finance, http://www.dof.ca.gov/, accessed February 29, 2019.
Menlo Park School District, *2009 Enrollment Forecast Study*, October 12, 2009.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan*, adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Impact Report*, certified 2012.
Travel Demand Management Plan, CHS Consulting Group, December 2, 2019.
Project Plans, "*201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue*", August 10, 2020, EID Architects.

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

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would construct 14 new multi-family dwelling units, resulting in the addition of 10 net new residential units. As discussed in the Public Services section, the project would not result in a substantial increase in population growth. Therefore, the project would have a negligible increase in population and employment, and would likely not result in significant demand for recreational facilities. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact to recreational facilities would occur with the project.

b) **No Impact.** The project does not propose recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, there would be no adverse physical effect on the environment from the construction or expansion of recreational facilities on-site or off-site.

Sources:

City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
Applicant's Project Description dated.
Project Plans, *201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue,* August 10, 2020, EID Architects.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan*, adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Impact Report*, certified 2012.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:				
a) Conflict with 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	☐	☐
b) Conflict with applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measur4es, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	X	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	X	☐
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Assuming full occupancy, the number of trips for the project is estimated to increase by approximately two additional vehicle trips during the AM peak hour and 17 new PM peak-hour trips compared to the existing uses, respectively. The project would be required to implement a series of TDM measures selected from C/CAG's Guidelines for Implementing the Land Use Component of the Congestion Management Program. The proposed project's TDM strategies would include the following:

- Subsidize employee transit passes at a value of at least $20 per month per employee, for the first year of operation.
- Subsidize employees commuting on foot or by bicycling at a value of $20 per month for the first year of operation.
- Work with the City on participation in a future Downtown Transportation Management Association, for which the City is currently studying feasibility.
- Provide wayfinding signage.
- Promote SamTrans and Caltrain apps and explore the possibility of providing live transit signage in the lobby.
- Promote the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program operated by commute.org, the San Mateo County's TDM Agency.
- Provide secure bicycle parking for residents and employees.
- Survey employees and residents annually to examine travel behavior and to encourage transportation mode shift away from single-occupancy auto trips, and submit a brief annual report to the City summarizing the effectiveness of the TDM program.

Based on this level of vehicle traffic, a detailed traffic study is not required, as the land use assumptions on site are consistent with those outlined in the SP EIR. The project is consistent with the Specific Plan land uses.

In addition, **Mitigation Measure TR-1b** would require the project to pay a fair share contribution towards infrastructure required to mitigate transportation impacts as identified in both the SP EIR and the GP EIR. The fair share contribution is assessed through the City's Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) that the applicant would be required to pay prior to building permit issuance, and it is updated every fiscal year to account for transportation impacts due to changes in land use.

With these mitigations in place, the proposed project would generate a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated.

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The San Mateo County Congestion Management Program (CMP) Land Use Analysis Program guidelines require that Routes of Regional Significance be evaluated to determine the impact of added project-generated trips for projects that create more than 100 PM peak-hour trips. Since the proposed project is projected to generate fewer than 100 peak-hour trips, a CMP analysis was not conducted. Therefore, the project would not cause an exceedance, either individually or cumulatively, of a level of service standard established by the San Mateo County Congestion Management Agency, and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

c) **No Impact.** No uses or structures are proposed that could affect air traffic patterns, nor is an airport located in proximity to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial safety risks related to air traffic and would have no impact.

d) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in new design features, nor would it create hazardous conditions by introducing incompatible uses. The proposed project would result in the construction of 14 new multi-family residential units (10 net new) in a residential/commercial area. The new curb cut for the proposed driveway would meet City design requirements. Therefore, no impact would occur with the project.

e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not have a substantial effect on emergency access to the area. Access to the site and the below-grade garage would be accessible from a two-way driveway from Cambridge Avenue. Fire suppression and emergency response would continue to be provided by the MPFPD. The project would require review and approval of building permit applications for adequate access to emergency services. Therefore, the project would have less-than-significant impacts related to emergency access.

f) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in any permanent features that would substantially affect or alter existing facilities nor interfere with construction of any future planned facilities, such as bike lanes, for alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies or plans supporting alternative transportation and no impact would result from the project. The abandonment of a portion of Alto Lane, a public street, would preclude its use for alternative modes of transportation, such as biking and walking, along this portion of Alto Lane. However, Alto Lane currently terminates into another property (239-251 El Camino Real), located north of the subject property, and therefore existing public access along Alto Lane does not continue to another public road from Cambridge Avenue. The proposed project includes the installation of a paved, multi-use pathway within the project site. In addition, the proposed project would provide widened sidewalks on El Camino Real and Cambridge Avenue to improve pedestrian access.

Sources:

City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
City of Menlo Park, Municipal Code, Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 16.72, Parking.
Project Description from Applicant dated November 20, 2019.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan*, adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified 2012.
Travel Demand Management Plan, CHS Consulting Group, December 2, 2019.
Project Plans, "*201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue*", August 10, 2020, EID Architects.
City of Menlo Park, *ConnectMenlo: General Plan Land Use & Circulation Elements and M-2 Area Zoning Update Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified November 2016.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	X	☐
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	☐
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	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	X	☐
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	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	X	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	X	☐

DISCUSSION:

a,b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Wastewater generated on-site would be conveyed to the West Bay Sanitary District and transported via main line trunk sewers to the Menlo Park Pumping Station. From the pumping station, the wastewater goes to the South Bayside System Authority Regional Treatment Plant in San Carlos. The amount of wastewater that is anticipated from the proposed project is incremental and would not be expected to exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. There is capacity within the system to treat the wastewater generated by the proposed multi-family dwelling units and retail/restaurant uses. No expansion in wastewater treatment facilities is expected to be necessary as a result of the proposed project. The anticipated impact is less than significant.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** Surface runoff associated with the proposed project would be retained onsite, flowing into grassy swales and then into new gravel basins to infiltrate the soil, resulting in no substantial increase in offsite drainage. Therefore, the project would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the project would not significantly affect the environment and this impact would be less than significant.

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** As stated earlier, the proposed project is within the development parameters analyzed in the SP EIR and the GP EIR and no new or additional impacts are anticipated from the proposed project. In particular, the GP EIR and SP EIR have indicated that development within the City, while implementing water conservation strategies through General Plan and Zoning requirements, would continue to provide adequate water supplies systems during single- and multiple-dry years. The proposed project would occur on an infill site, and it is anticipated that there would continue to be sufficient water supplies available to serve the site as neighboring properties have water supplied to them. Therefore, this project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

e) **Less than Significant Impact.** Currently, two buildings and surface parking exist on the property. The proposed project is the construction of one mixed-use building and two-townhouses, which could result in the generation of a small amount of waste that would not be expected to exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. The existing facilities would be used for the proposed project, and no additional wastewater treatment facilities would need to be constructed to accommodate the proposed project. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact to wastewater services would occur with the project.

f) **Less than Significant Impact.** Currently, two buildings and surface parking exist on the property. The proposed project is the construction of one mixed-use building and two townhouses that would generate a small amount of solid waste. The proposed project would have to comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance to reduce the amount of waste deposited in the landfill. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact on solid waste would occur with the project.

g) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would need to comply with all federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the project's impact on solid waste would be less than significant.

Sources:

City of Menlo Park, *General Plan*, adopted 2016.
Applicant's Revised Project Description, November 20, 2019.
Project plans, "*201 El Camino Real and 612 Cambridge Avenue*", November 20, 2019, EID Architects.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan*, adopted 2012.
City of Menlo Park, *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report*, certified 2012.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or 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	☐
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	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	X	☐

DISCUSSION:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** Based on background research and site visits, the proposed project does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the proposed project results in a less-than-significant impact as it relates to these criteria.

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would create 14 new multi-family dwelling units and retail/restaurant uses (10 net new units and about 1,300 sf of net new commercial space), which would be surrounded by other commercial and residential units in a suburban area, and would not result in significant cumulative environmental impacts. Therefore, the proposed project results in less-than-significant impacts that are both individually and cumulatively limited.

c) **Less than Significant Impact**. The proposed project would have less-than-significant impact effects on human beings during construction activities since the project would adhere to standard requirements and procedures.

Appendices

A. Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program

APPENDIX A

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
AIR QUALITY				
IMPACT BEING ADDRESSED: Specific Plan EIR Impact AIR-1: Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in increased long-term emissions of criteria pollutants associated with construction activities that could contribute substantially to an air quality violation. (Significant)				
Mitigation Measure AIR-1a: During construction of individual projects under the Specific Plan, project applicants shall require the construction contractor(s) to implement the following measures required as part of Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) basic dust control procedures required for construction sites. For projects for which construction emissions exceed one or more of the applicable BAAQMD thresholds, additional measures shall be required as indicated in the list following the Basic Controls.		Measures shown on plans, construction documents and on-going during demolition, excavation and construction.	Project sponsor(s) and contractor(s)	PW/CDD
Basic Controls that Apply to All Construction Sites				
1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.	Exposed surfaces shall be watered twice daily.			
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.	Trucks carrying demolition debris shall be covered.			
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.	Dirt carried from construction areas shall be cleaned daily.			
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.	Speed limit on unpaved roads shall be 15 mph.			
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.	Roadways, driveways, sidewalks and building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading.			
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.	Idling times shall be minimized to 5 minutes or less; Signage posted at all access points.			

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.	Construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained.			
8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.	Signage will be posted with the appropriate contact information regarding dust complaints.			
Additional Measures for Development Projects that Exceed Significance Criteria				
1. All exposed surfaces shall be watered at a frequency adequate to maintain minimum soil moisture of 12 percent. Moisture content can be verified by lab samples or moisture probe.	Water exposed surfaces to maintain minimum soil moisture of 12 percent.			
2. All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.	Halt excavation, grading and demolition when wind is over 20 mph.			
3. Wind breaks (e.g., trees, fences) shall be installed on the windward side(s) of actively disturbed areas of construction. Wind breaks should have at maximum 50 percent air porosity.	Install wind breaks on the windward side(s) of disturbed construction areas.			
4. Vegetative ground cover (e.g., fast-germinating native grass seed) shall be planted in disturbed areas as soon as possible and watered appropriately until vegetation is established.	Vegetative ground cover shall be planted in disturbed areas as soon as possible.			
5. The simultaneous occurrence of excavation, grading, and ground-disturbing construction activities on the same area at any one time shall be limited. Activities shall be phased to reduce the amount of disturbed surfaces at any one time.	Ground-disturbing construction activities shall not occur simultaneously.			
6. All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site.	Trucks and equipment shall be washed before exiting the site.			
7. Site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road shall be treated with a 6- to 12-inch compacted layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel.	Cover site access roads.			

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
8. Sandbags or other erosion control measures shall be installed to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.	Erosion control measures shall be used.			
9. Minimizing the idling time of diesel powered construction equipment to two minutes.	Idling time of diesel powered equipment will not exceed two minutes.			
10. The project shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent nitrogen oxides reduction and 45 percent particulate matter reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available.	Plan developed that demonstrates emissions from use of off-road equipment during construction will be reduced as specified.			
11. Use low volatile organic compound (VOC) (i.e., reactive organic gases) coatings beyond the local requirements (i.e., Regulation 8, Rule 3: Architectural Coatings).	Low VOC coatings shall be used.			
12. Requiring that all construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of nitrogen oxides and particulate matter.	Require Best Available Control Technology for all construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators.			
13. Requiring all contractors use equipment that meets the California Air Resources Board's most recent certification standard for off-road heavy duty diesel engines.	Equipment shall meet standards for off-road heavy duty diesel engines.			
Specific Plan EIR Impact AIR-2: Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in increased long-term emissions of criteria pollutants from increased vehicle traffic and on-site area sources that would contribute substantially to an air quality violation. (Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure AIR-2: Mitigation Measure TR-2 of Section 4.13, Transportation, Circulation and Parking, identifies Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to be implemented by individual project applicants, although the precise effectiveness of a TDM program cannot be guaranteed. As the transportation demand management strategies included in Mitigation Measure TR-2 represent the majority of available measures with which to reduce VMT, no further mitigation measures are available and this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.	See Mitigation Measure TR-2.			
Specific Plan EIR Impact AIR-5: Implementation of the Specific Plan would locate sensitive receptors in an area of elevated concentrations of toxic air contaminants associated with roadway traffic which may lead to considerable adverse health effects. (Potentially Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure AIR-5: The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall require that all developments that include sensitive receptors such as residential units that would be located within 200 feet of the edge of El Camino Real or within 100 feet of the edge of Ravenswood Avenue, Oak Grove Avenue east of El Camino Real, or Santa Cruz Avenue west of University Avenue shall undergo, prior to project approval, a screening-level health risk analysis to determine if cancer risk, hazard index, and/or $PM_{2.5}$ concentration would exceed BAAQMD thresholds. If one or more thresholds would be exceeded at the site of the subsequent project, the project (or portion of the project containing sensitive receptors, in the case of a mixed-use project) shall be equipped with filtration systems with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) rating of 14 or higher. The ventilation system shall be designed by an engineer certified by the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Engineers, who shall provide a written report documenting that the system reduces interior health risks to less than 10 in one million, or less than any other threshold of significance adopted by BAAQMD or the City for health risks. The project sponsor shall present a plan to ensure ongoing maintenance of ventilation and filtration systems and shall ensure the disclosure to buyers and/or renters regarding the findings of the analysis and inform occupants as to proper use of any installed air filtration. Alternatively, if the project applicant can prove at the time of development that health risks at new residences due to DPM (and other TACs, if applicable) would be less than 10 in one million, or less than any other threshold of significance adopted by BAAQMD for health risks, or that alternative mitigation measures reduce health risks below any other City-adopted threshold of significance, such filtration shall not be required.	A health risk analysis shall be prepared. If one or more thresholds are exceeded, a filtration system shall be installed; Certified engineer to provide report documenting that system reduces health risks	Simultaneous with a building permit submittal	Project sponsor(s)	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
	Plan developed for ongoing maintenance and disclosure to buyers and/renters.			
General Plan Impact AIR-2: Implementation of the proposed project could violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). (Significant)				
Mitigation Measure AIR-2b1: Prior to building permit issuance, the City shall require applicants for all development projects in the city to comply with the current Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) basic control measures for reducing construction emissions of PM10 (Table 8-1, Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for All Proposed Projects, of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines.	Demonstrate compliance with the current BAAQMD basic control measures for reducing construction emissions of PM10.	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance.	Project applicant	CDD
General Plan EIR Impact AIR-3: Implementation of the proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of air pollutions). (Potentially Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure AIR-3a: As part of the discretionary review process for development applications, applicants for all non-residential projects within the City that: 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered TRUs, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of a proposed project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City's Planning Division. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds 10 in one million (10E-06), PM2.5 concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Mitigation measures may include but are not limited to: -Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible. -Electrifying warehousing docks. -Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. -Restricting off-site truck travel through the creation of truck routes. Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific HRA shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of a proposed project, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.	A health risk analysis shall be prepared. If one or more thresholds are exceeded, a filtration system shall be installed; Certified engineer to provide report documenting that system reduces health risks.	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	Project applicant	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
	Plan developed for ongoing maintenance and disclosure to buyers and/renters.			
Mitigation Measure AIR-3b: As part of the discretionary review process, applicants for all residential and other sensitive land use projects (e.g., hospitals, nursing homes, day care centers) anywhere in the City within 1,000 feet of a major sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs) (e.g., warehouses, industrial areas, freeways, and roadways with traffic volumes over 10,000 vehicle per day), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the source/edge of the nearest travel lane, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City's Planning Division. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children ages 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), PM2.5 concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to: -Air intakes located away from high volume roadways and/or truck loading zones. -Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized maximum efficiency rating value (MERV) filters.	A health risk analysis shall be prepared.	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	Project applicant	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Measures identified in the HRA shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.				
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Specific Plan EIR Impact BIO-1: The Specific Plan could result in the take of special-status birds or their nests. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Pre-Construction Special-Status Avian Surveys. No more than two weeks in advance of any tree or shrub pruning, removal, or ground-disturbing activity that will commence during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified wildlife biologist will conduct pre-construction surveys of all potential special-status bird nesting habitat in the vicinity of the planned activity. Pre-construction surveys are not required for construction activities scheduled to occur during the non-breeding season (August 31 through January 31). Construction activities commencing during the non-breeding season and continuing into the breeding season do not require surveys (as it is assumed that any breeding birds taking up nests would be acclimated to project-related activities already under way). Nests initiated during construction activities would be presumed to be unaffected by the activity, and a buffer zone around such nests would not be necessary. However, a nest initiated during construction cannot be moved or altered. ***If pre-construction surveys indicate that no nests of special-status birds are present or that nests are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied:*** no further mitigation is required. ***If active nests of special-status birds are found during the surveys:*** implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1b.	A nesting bird survey shall be prepared if tree or shrub pruning, removal or ground-disturbing activity will commence between February 1 through August 31.	Prior to tree or shrub pruning or removal, any ground disturbing activity and/or issuance of demolition, grading or building permits.	Qualified wildlife biologist retained by project sponsor(s)	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Avoidance of active nests. If active nests of special-status birds or other birds are found during surveys, the results of the surveys would be discussed with the California Department of Fish and Game and avoidance procedures will be adopted, if necessary, on a case-by- case basis. In the event that a special-status bird or protected nest is found, construction would be stopped until either the bird leaves the area or avoidance measures are adopted. Avoidance measures can include construction buffer areas (up to several hundred feet in the case of raptors), relocation of birds, or seasonal avoidance. If buffers are created, a no disturbance zone will be created around active nests during the breeding season or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged. The size of the buffer zones and types of construction activities restricted will take into account factors such as the following: 1. Noise and human disturbance levels at the Plan area and the nesting site at the time of the survey and the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity; 2. Distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the Plan area and the nest; and 3. Sensitivity of individual nesting species and behaviors of the nesting birds.	If active nests are found during survey, the results will be discussed with the California Department of Fish and Game and avoidance procedures adopted. Halt construction if a special-status bird or protected nest is found until the bird leaves the area or avoidance measures are adopted.	Prior to tree or shrub pruning or removal, any ground-disturbing activities and/or issuance of demolition, grading or building permits.	Project sponsor(s) and contractor(s)	CDD
Specific Plan EIR Impact BIO-3: Impacts to migratory or breeding special-status birds and other special-status species due to lighting conditions. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Reduce building lighting from exterior sources. a. Minimize amount and visual impact of perimeter lighting and façade up-lighting and avoid uplighting of rooftop antennae and other tall equipment, as well as of any decorative features; b. Installing motion-sensor lighting, or lighting controlled by timers set to turn off at the earliest practicable hour; c. Utilize minimum wattage fixtures to achieve required lighting levels;	Reduce building lighting from exterior sources.	Prior to building permit issuance and ongoing.	Project sponsor(s) and contractor(s)	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
d. Comply with federal aviation safety regulations for large buildings by installing minimum intensity white strobe lighting with a three-second flash interval instead of continuous flood lighting, rotating lights, or red lighting; e. Use cutoff shields on streetlight and external lights to prevent upwards lighting.				
Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Reduce building lighting from interior sources. a. Dim lights in lobbies, perimeter circulation areas, and atria; b. Turn off all unnecessary lighting by 11pm thorough sunrise, especially during peak migration periods (mid-March to early June and late August through late October); c. Use gradual or staggered switching to progressively turn on building lights at sunrise. d. Utilize automatic controls (motion sensors, photosensors, etc.) to shut off lights in the evening when no one is present; e. Encourage the use of localized task lighting to reduce the need for more extensive overhead lighting; f. Schedule nightly maintenance to conclude by 11 p.m.; g. Educate building users about the dangers of night lighting to birds.	Reduce building lighting from interior sources.	Prior to building permit issuance and ongoing.	Project sponsor(s) and contractor(s)	CDD
Specific Plan EIR Impact BIO-5: The Specific Plan could result in the take of special-status bat species. (Potentially Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Preconstruction surveys. Potential direct and indirect disturbances to special-status bats will be identified by locating colonies and instituting protective measures prior to construction of any subsequent development project. No more than two weeks in advance of tree removal or structural alterations to buildings with closed areas such as attics, a qualified bat biologist (e.g., a biologist holding a California Department of Fish and Game collection permit and a Memorandum of Understanding with the California Department of Fish and Game allowing the biologist to handle and collect bats) shall conduct pre-construction surveys for potential bats in the vicinity of the planned activity. A qualified biologist will survey buildings and trees (over 12 inches in diameter at 4.5-foot height) scheduled for demolition to assess whether these structures are occupied by bats. No activities that would result in disturbance to active roosts will proceed prior to the completed surveys. If bats are discovered during construction, any and all construction activities that threaten individuals, roosts, or hibernacula will be stopped until surveys can be completed by a qualified bat biologist and proper mitigation measures implemented. ***If no active roosts present:*** no further action is warranted. ***If roosts or hibernacula are present:*** implement Mitigation Measures BIO-5b and 5c.	Retain a qualified bat biologist to conduct pre-construction survey for bats and potential roosting sites in vicinity of planned activity. Halt construction if bats are discovered during construction until surveys can be completed and proper mitigation measures implemented.	Prior to tree pruning or removal or issuance of demolition, grading or building permits.	Qualified bat biologist retained by project sponsor(s)	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure BIO-5b: Avoidance. If any active nursery or maternity roosts or hibernacula of special-status bats are located, the subsequent development project may be redesigned to avoid impacts. Demolition of that tree or structure will commence after young are flying (i.e., after July 31, confirmed by a qualified bat biologist) or before maternity colonies forms the following year (i.e., prior to March 1). For hibernacula, any subsequent development project shall only commence after bats have left the hibernacula. No-disturbance buffer zones acceptable to the California Department of Fish and Game will be observed during the maternity roost season (March 1 through July 31) and during the winter for hibernacula (October 15 through February 15). Also, a no-disturbance buffer acceptable in size to the California Department of Fish and Game will be created around any roosts in the Project vicinity (roosts that will not be destroyed by the Project but are within the Plan area) during the breeding season (April 15 through August 15), and around hibernacula during winter (October 15 through February 15). Bat roosts initiated during construction are presumed to be unaffected, and no buffer is necessary. However, the “take” of individuals is prohibited.	If any active nursery or maternity roosts or hibernacula are located, no disturbance buffer zones shall be established during the maternity roost and breeding seasons and hibernacula.	Prior to tree removal or pruning or issuance of demolition, grading or building permits	Qualified bat biologist retained by project sponsor(s)	CDD
Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Safely evict non-breeding roosts. Non-breeding roosts of special-status bats shall be evicted under the direction of a qualified bat biologist. This will be done by opening the roosting area to allow airflow through the cavity. Demolition will then follow no sooner or later than the following day. There should not be less than one night between initial disturbance with airflow and demolition. This action should allow bats to leave during dark hours, thus increasing their chance of finding new roosts with a minimum of potential predation during daylight. Trees with roosts that need to be removed should first be disturbed at dusk, just prior to removal that same evening, to allow bats to escape during the darker hours. However, the “take” of individuals is prohibited.	A qualified bat biologist shall direct the eviction of non-breeding roosts.	Prior to tree removal or pruning or issuance of demolition, grading or building permits.	Qualified bat biologist retained by project sponsor(s)	CDD
CULTURAL RESOURCES				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Specific Plan EIR Impact CUL-1: The proposed Specific Plan could have a significant impact on historic architectural resources. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Site Specific Evaluations and Treatment in Accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards: ***Site-Specific Evaluations:*** In order to adequately address the level of potential impacts for an individual project and thereby design appropriate mitigation measures, the City shall require project sponsors to complete site-specific evaluations at the time that individual projects are proposed at or adjacent to buildings that are at least 50 years old. The project sponsor shall be required to complete a site-specific historic resources study performed by a qualified architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architecture or Architectural History. At a minimum, the evaluation shall consist of a records search, an intensive-level pedestrian field survey, an evaluation of significance using standard National Register Historic Preservation and California Register Historic Preservation evaluation criteria, and recordation of all identified historic buildings and structures on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 Site Record forms. The evaluation shall describe the historic context and setting, methods used in the investigation, results of the evaluation, and recommendations for management of identified resources. If federal or state funds are involved, certain agencies, such as the Federal Highway Administration and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), have specific requirements for inventory areas and documentation format.	A qualified architectural historian shall complete a site-specific historic resources study. For structures found to be historic, specify treating conforming to Secretary of the Interior's standards, as applicable.	Simultaneously with a project application submittal.	Qualified architectural historian retained by the Project sponsor(s).	CDD STATUS COMPLETE: The historic resource evaluations, prepared by Urban Programmers and dated January 11, 2019 for 201 El Camino Real, and dated January 30, 2019 for 612 Cambridge Avenue, conclude the commercial buildings were found not to be historically significant.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Treatment in Accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Any future proposed project in the Plan Area that would affect previously recorded historic resources, or those identified as a result of site-specific surveys and evaluations, shall conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (1995). The Standards require the preservation of character defining features which convey a building's historical significance, and offers guidance about appropriate and compatible alterations to such structures.				
Specific Plan EIR Impact CUL-2: The proposed Specific Plan could impact currently unknown archaeological resources. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure CUL-2a: When specific projects are proposed that involve ground disturbing activity, a site-specific cultural resources study shall be performed by a qualified archaeologist or equivalent cultural resources professional that will include an updated records search, pedestrian survey of the project area, development of a historic context, sensitivity assessment for buried prehistoric and historic-period deposits, and preparation of a technical report that meets federal and state requirements. If historic or unique resources are identified and cannot be avoided, treatment plans will be developed in consultation with the City and Native American representatives to mitigate potential impacts to less than significant based on either the Secretary of the Interior's Standards described in Mitigation Measure CUL-1 (if the site is historic) or the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 (if a unique archaeological site).	A qualified archeologist shall complete a site-specific cultural resources study. If resources are identified and cannot be avoided, treatment plans will be developed to mitigate impacts to less than significant, as specified.	Simultaneously with a project application submittal.	Qualified archaeologist retained by the project sponsor(s).	CDD STATUS COMPLETE: The archeological resource evaluaton, prepared by Basin Research Associates, dated April 19, 2019, concludes that the proposed project will have a low to moderate impact on cultural resources.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure CUL-2b: Should any archaeological artifacts be found during construction, all construction activities within 50 feet shall immediately halt and the City must be notified. A qualified archaeologist shall inspect the findings within 24 hours of the discovery. If the resource is determined to be a historical resource or unique resource, the archaeologist shall prepare a plan to identify, record, report, evaluate, and recover the resources as necessary, which shall be implemented by the developer. Construction within the area of the find shall not recommence until impacts on the historical or unique archaeological resource are mitigated as described in Mitigation Measure CUL-2a above. Additionally, Public Resources Code Section 5097.993 stipulates that a project sponsor must inform project personnel that collection of any Native American artifact is prohibited by law.	If any archaeological artifacts are discovered during demolition/construction, all ground disturbing activity within 50 feet shall be halted immediately, and the City of Menlo Park Community Development Department shall be notified within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist shall inspect any archaeological artifacts found during construction and if determined to be a resource shall prepare a plan meeting the specified standards which shall be implemented by the project sponsor(s).	Ongoing during construction.	Qualified archaeologist retained by the project sponsor(s).	CDD
Specific Plan EIR Impact CUL-3: The proposed Specific Plan may adversely affect unidentifiable paleontological resources. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Prior to the start of any subsurface excavations that would extend beyond previously disturbed soils, all construction forepersons and field supervisors shall receive training by a qualified professional paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP), who is experienced in teaching non-specialists, to ensure they can recognize fossil materials and will follow proper notification procedures in the event any are uncovered during construction. Procedures to be conveyed to workers include halting construction within 50 feet of any potential fossil find and notifying a qualified paleontologist, who will evaluate its significance. Training on paleontological resources will also be provided to all other construction workers, but may involve using a videotape of the initial training and/or written materials rather than in-person training by a paleontologist. If a fossil is determined to be significant and avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist will develop and implement an excavation and salvage plan in accordance with SVP standards. (SVP, 1996)	A qualified paleontologist shall conduct training for all construction personnel and field supervisors. If a fossil is determined to be significant and avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist will develop and implement an excavation and salvage plan in accordance with SVP standards.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permits that include subsurface excavations and ongoing through subsurface excavation.	Qualified archaeologist retained by the project sponsor(s).	CDD
Specific Plan EIR Impact CUL-4: Implementation of the Plan may cause disturbance of human remains including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Potentially Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure CUL-4: If human remains are discovered during construction, CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(e)(1) shall be followed, which is as follows: * In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps should be taken: 1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: a) The San Mateo County coroner must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and b) If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American: 1. The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours; 2. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American; 3. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98; or 2) Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.	If human remains are discovered during any construction activities, all ground-disturbing activity within the site or any nearby area shall be halted immediately, and the County coroner must be contacted immediately and other specified procedures must be followed as applicable.	On-going during construction	Qualified archeologist retained by the project sponsor(s)	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
a) The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the Commission. b) The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation; or c) The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.				
General Plan EIR Impact CUL-2: The proposed Specific Plan could impact currently unknown archaeological resources. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure CUL-2a: If a potentially significant subsurface cultural resource is encountered during ground disturbing activities on any parcel in the city, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until a qualified archeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. All developers in the study area shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction activities shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) criteria by a qualified archeologist. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses; prepare a comprehensive report complete with methods, results, and recommendations; and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered resources. The report shall be submitted to the City of Menlo Park, Northwest Information Center (NWIC), and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), if required.	If any archaeological artifacts are discovered during demolition/construction, all ground disturbing activity within 100 feet shall be halted immediately. A qualified archaeologist shall inspect any archaeological artifacts found during construction and if determined to be a resource shall prepare a plan meeting the specified standards which shall be implemented by the project sponsor(s).	Ongoing during construction	Qualified archaeologist retained by the project sponsor(s)	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
General Plan EIR Impact CUL-3: The proposed Specific Plan may adversely affect unidentifiable paleontological resources. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure CUL-3: In the event that fossils or fossil bearing deposits are discovered during ground disturbing activities anywhere in the city, excavations within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. Ground disturbance work shall cease until a City-approved qualified paleontologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed (in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards [Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995]), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction activities are allowed to resume at the location of the find. If avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of construction activities on the discovery. The excavation plan shall be submitted to the City of Menlo Park for review and approval prior to implementation, and all construction activity shall adhere to the recommendations in the excavation plan.	If any fossils or fossil bearing deposits are discovered during demolition/construction, all ground disturbing activity within 50 feet shall be halted immediately. A qualified paleontologist shall inspect any paleontological artifacts found during construction and if determined to be a resource shall prepare an excavation plan meeting the specified standards which shall be implemented by the project sponsor(s). If a fossil is determined to be significant and avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist will develop and implement an excavation and salvage plan in accordance with SVP standards.	Ongoing during construction	Qualified paleontologist retained by the project sponsor(s).	CDD
General Plan EIR Impact CUL-4: Implementation of the Plan may cause disturbance of human remains including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Potentially Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Procedures of conduct following the discovery of human remains citywide have been mandated by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA). According to the provisions in CEQA, if human remains are encountered at the site, all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease and necessary steps to ensure the integrity of the immediate area shall be taken. The San Mateo County Coroner shall be notified immediately. The Coroner shall then determine whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC within 24 hours, who will, in turn, notify the person the NAHC identifies as the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of any human remains. Further actions shall be determined, in part, by the desires of the MLD. The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations regarding the disposition of the remains following notification from the NAHC of the discovery. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the owner shall, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. Alternatively, if the owner does not accept the MLD's recommendations, the owner or the descendent may request mediation by the NAHC.	If human remains are discovered during any construction activities, all ground-disturbing activity within the site or any nearby area shall be halted immediately, and the County coroner must be contacted immediately and other specified procedures must be followed as applicable.	Ongoing during construction	Qualified archaeologist retained by the project sponsor(s)	CDD
GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE				
Specific Plan EIR Impact GHG-1: The Specific Plan would generate GHG emissions, both directly and indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment. (Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure GHG-1: Implement feasible BAAQMD-identified GHG Mitigation Measures and Proposed City CALGreen Amendments. BAAQMD has identified a menu of over 100 available mitigation measures for the purposes of addressing significant air quality impacts, including GHG impacts that arise from implementation of plans including Specific Plans. Many of the GHG reduction measures are already part of the proposed Specific Plan and discussed in the Project Description. Several BAAQMD identified mitigation measures are not applicable to a Specific Plan as they are correlated to specific elements of a general plan. As an example, Table 4.6-5 presents the mitigation measures contained in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines related to Land Use elements and either correlates each to a specific element of the project, explains why it is inapplicable to the proposed project or identifies it as a mitigation measure to be implemented by the proposed project. This method was used in consideration of all BAAQMD identified GHG mitigation measures for plans to develop the following list of available mitigation measures (with BAAQMD-identified category) for the proposed Specific Plan: * Facilitate lot consolidation that promotes integrated development with improved pedestrian and vehicular access (Land Use Element: Compact Development). The Specific Plan's increased intensities encourage lot consolidation for developers wishing to maximize efficiencies and new standards and guidelines will result in improved pedestrian (Section E.5) and vehicular (Section E.3.7) access. * Ensure that new development finances the full cost of expanding public infrastructure and services to provide an economic incentive for incremental expansion (Land Use Element: Compact Development). Specific Plan Section E.3.1 describes a process for public benefit negotiation to obtain additional financing for public infrastructure beyond required payments for impact fees such as park dedication and Transportation Fees.	For project-specific actions: Implement feasible BAAQMD-identified GHG Mitigation Measures. Measures relating to City policies have been incorporated into Specific Plan or otherwise adopted by City (see explanation below regarding applicable measures).	Simultaneous with project application submittal and/or on-going during construction Adopt as part of Specific Plan; verify project compliance simultaneously with project application.	Project sponsor(s) City Council (Plan adoption)	PW/CDD CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
* Ensure new construction complies with California Green Building Code Standards and local green building ordinances (Land Use Element: Sustainable Development). The City currently requires compliance with both California Green Building Code Standards and locally-adopted amendments citywide. Standard E.3.8.01 states that all citywide sustainability codes or requirements shall apply to the Plan area, unless the Plan area is explicitly exempted, which it is not. * Provide permitting incentives for energy efficient and solar building projects (Land Use Element: Sustainable Development). Section E.3.8 of the Specific Plan provides specific standards and guidelines for sustainable practices. Section E.3.1 would allow for the consideration of public benefit bonus intensity or height if a project were to exceed the standards stated Section E.3.8. * Support the use of electric vehicles; where appropriate. Provide electric recharging facilities (Circulation Element: Local Circulation; see also Mitigation Measure GHG-2 below). Mitigation Measure GHG-2a (below) has been incorporated into the Specific Plan. * Allow developers to reach agreements with auto-oriented shopping center owners to use commercial parking lots as park-and-ride lots and multi-modal transfer sites (Circulation Element: Regional Circulation). The intent of the Specific Plan is to preserve and enhance community life, character and vitality through public space improvements, mixed use infill projects sensitive to the small town character of Menlo Park and improved connectivity. Auto oriented shopping centers are not envisioned in the Plan area.				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
* Eliminate [or reduce] parking requirements for new development in the Specific Plan area (Circulation Element: Parking). The Final Specific Plan has been modified to provide for lower parking rates in the station area and station area sphere of influence. ? Encourage developers to agree to parking sharing between different land uses (Circulation Element: Parking). This is permitted by existing City policies and reinforced in the Specific Plan through allowed shared parking reductions (Section F.8).				
* Require developers to provide preferential parking for low emissions and carpool vehicles (Circulation Element: Parking). These are included as strategies that may be included in a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program (Section F.10).				
* Minimize impervious surfaces in new development and reuse project in the Specific Plan area (Conservation Element: Water Conservation). Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this EIR includes a discussion of existing grading, drainage and hydrology requirements and Specific Plan guidelines to limit impervious surfaces in the Plan area.				
* Require fireplaces installed in residential development to be energy efficient in lieu of open hearth. Prohibit the installation of wood burning devices (Conservation Element: Energy Conservation). The City of Menlo Park Municipal Code includes Section 12.52, Wood Burning Appliances, to control the use of wood burning devises.				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
* Sealing of HVAC ducts. This is a project level BAAQMD measure that requires the developer to obtain third party HVAC commissioning to ensure proper sealing of ducts and optimal heating and cooling efficiencies. BAAQMD estimated that this measure reduces air conditioning electrical demand by 30 percent. The California Energy commission estimates that air conditioning electrical demand represents approximately 20 percent of total demand for a single family residence and this measure would reduce electrical-related GHG emissions by approximately 100 metric tons/year of CO2e. The City currently requires testing of heating and cooling ducts for all newly constructed buildings.				
Specific Plan EIR Impact GHG-2: The Specific Plan could conflict with applicable plans, policies or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the Specific Plan adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. (Significant)				
Mitigation Measure GHG-2a: All residential and/or mixed use developments of sufficient size to require LEED certification under the Specific Plan shall install one dedicated electric vehicle/plug-in hybrid electric vehicle recharging station for every 20 residential parking spaces provided. Per the Climate Action Plan the complying applicant could receive incentives, such as streamlined permit processing, fee discounts, or design templates.	Install one dedicated electric vehicle/plug-in hybrid electric vehicle recharging station for every 20 residential parking spaces	Simultaneous with project application submittal	Project sponsor(s)	CDD
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
Specific Plan EIR Impact HAZ-1: Disturbance and release of contaminated soil during demolition and construction phases of the project, or transportation of excavated material, or contaminated groundwater could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to adverse conditions related to hazardous materials handling. (Potentially Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Prior to issuance of any building permit for sites where ground breaking activities would occur, all proposed development sites shall have a Phase I site assessment performed by a qualified environmental consulting firm in accordance with the industry required standard known as ASTM E 1527-05. The City may waive the requirement for a Phase I site assessment for sites under current and recent regulatory oversight with respect to hazardous materials contamination. If the Phase I assessment shows the potential for hazardous releases, then Phase II site assessments or other appropriate analyses shall be conducted to determine the extent of the contamination and the process for remediation. All proposed development in the Plan area where previous hazardous materials releases have occurred shall require remediation and cleanup to levels established by the overseeing regulatory agency (San Mateo County Environmental Health (SMCEH), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) appropriate for the proposed new use of the site. All proposed groundbreaking activities within areas of identified or suspected contamination shall be conducted according to a site specific health and safety plan, prepared by a licensed professional in accordance with Cal/OHSA regulations (contained in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations) and approved by SMCEH prior to the commencement of groundbreaking.	Prepare a Phase I site assessment. If assessment shows potential for hazardous releases, then a Phase II site assessment shall be conducted. Remediation shall be conducted according to standards of overseeing regulatory agency where previous hazardous releases have occurred. Groundbreaking activities where there is identified or suspected contamination shall be conducted according to a site-specific health and safety plan.	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permit for sites with groundbreaking activity.	Qualified environmental consulting firm and licensed professionals hired by project sponsor(s)	CDD
Specific Plan EIR Impact HAZ-3: Hazardous materials used on any individual site during construction activities (i.e., fuels, lubricants, solvents) could be released to the environment through improper handling or storage. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: All development and redevelopment shall require the use of construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control handling of hazardous materials during construction to minimize the potential negative effects from accidental release to groundwater and soils. For projects that disturb less than one acre, a list of BMPs to be implemented shall be part of building specifications and approved of by the City Building Department prior to issuance of a building permit.	Implement best management practices to reduce the release of hazardous materials during construction.	Prior to building permit issuance for sites disturbing less than one acre and on-going during construction for all project sites	Project sponsor(s) and contractor(s)	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
NOISE				
Specific Plan EIR Impact NOI-1: Construction activities associated with implementation of the Specific Plan would result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the Specific Plan area above levels existing without the Specific Plan and in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure NOI-1a: Construction contractors for subsequent development projects within the Specific Plan area shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, etc.) when within 400 feet of sensitive receptor locations. Prior to demolition, grading or building permit issuance, a construction noise control plan that identifies the best available noise control techniques to be implemented, shall be prepared by the construction contractor and submitted to the City for review and approval. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following noise control elements: * Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler shall achieve lower noise levels from the exhaust by approximately 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible in order to achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible; * Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible; and	A construction noise control plan shall be prepared and submitted to the City for review. Implement noise control techniques to reduce ambient noise levels.	Prior to demolition, grading or building permit issuance Measures shown on plans, construction documents and specification and ongoing through construction	Project sponsor(s) and contractor(s)	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
* When construction occurs near residents, affected parties within 400 feet of the construction area shall be notified of the construction schedule prior to demolition, grading or building permit issuance. Notices sent to residents shall include a project hotline where residents would be able to call and issue complaints. A Project Construction Complaint and Enforcement Manager shall be designated to receive complaints and notify the appropriate City staff of such complaints. Signs shall be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and day and evening contact numbers, both for the construction contractor and City representative(s), in the event of problems.				
Mitigation Measure NOI-1b: Noise Control Measures for Pile Driving: Should pile-driving be necessary for a subsequently proposed development project, the project sponsor would require that the project contractor predrill holes (if feasible based on soils) for piles to the maximum feasible depth to minimize noise and vibration from pile driving. Should pile-driving be necessary for the proposed project, the project sponsor would require that the construction contractor limit pile driving activity to result in the least disturbance to neighboring uses.	If pile-driving is necessary for project, predrill holes to minimize noise and vibration and limit activity to result in the least disturbance to neighboring uses.	Measures shown on plans, construction documents and specifications and ongoing during construction	Project sponsor(s) and contractor(s)	CDD
Mitigation Measure NOI-1c: The City shall condition approval of projects near receptors sensitive to construction noise, such as residences and schools, such that, in the event of a justified complaint regarding construction noise, the City would have the ability to require changes in the construction control noise plan to address complaints.	Condition projects such that if justified complaints from adjacent sensitive receptors are received, City may require changes in construction noise control plan.	Condition shown on plans, construction documents and specifications. When justified complaint received by City.	Project sponsor(s) and contractor(s) for revisions to construction noise control plan.	CDD
Specific Plan EIR Impact NOI-3: The Specific Plan would introduce sensitive receptors to a noise environment with noise levels in excess of standards considered acceptable under the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code. (Potentially Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure NOI-3: Interior noise exposure within homes proposed for the Specific Plan area shall be assessed by a qualified acoustical engineer to determine if sound rated walls and windows would be required to meet the Title 24 interior noise level standard of 45 dBA, Ldn. The results of each study shall be submitted to the City showing conceptual window and wall assemblies with Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings necessary to achieve the noise reductions for the project to satisfy the interior noise criteria within the noise environment of the Plan area.	Interior noise exposure assessed by qualified acoustical engineer and results submitted to City showing conceptual window and wall assemblies necessary to meet City standards.	Simultaneous with submittal for a building permit.	Project sponsors(s) and contractor(s)	CDD
General Plan EIR Impact NOI-1: Construction activities associated with implementation of the Specific Plan would result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the Specific Plan area above levels existing without the Specific Plan and in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. (Potentially Significant)				
Mitigation Measure NOI-1a: To meet the requirements of Title 24 and General Plan Program N1.A, project applicants shall perform acoustical studies prior to issuance of building permits for citywide development of new noise-sensitive uses. New residential dwellings, hotels, motels, dormitories, and school classrooms must meet an interior noise limit of 45 dBA CNEL or Ldn. Developments in areas exposed to more than 60 dBA CNEL must demonstrate that the structure has been designed to limit interior noise in habitable rooms to acceptable noise levels. Where exterior noise levels are projected to exceed 60 dBA CNEL or Ldn at the façade of a building, a report must be submitted with the building plans describing the noise control measures that have been incorporated into the design of the project to meet the 45 dBA noise limit. Project applicants for all new multi-family residential projects subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department, prior to building permit issuance, must perform acoustical studies within the projected Ldn 60 dB noise contours, so that noise mitigation measures can be incorporated into project design and site planning, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.	Interior noise exposure assessed by qualified acoustical engineer and results submitted to City showing conceptual window and wall assemblies necessary to meet City standards.	Prior to the issuance of construction permits	Project sponsors(s) and contractor(s)	CDD

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure NOI-1b: Stationary noise sources and landscaping and maintenance activities citywide shall comply with Chapter 8.06, Noise, of the Menlo Park Municipal Code.	Comply with Chapter 8.06, Noise, of the Menlo Park Municipal Code.	Prior to the issuance of construction permits	Project sponsors(s) and contractor(s)	CDD
General Plan EIR Impact NOI-2: Future projects in Menlo Park could cause exposure of people to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. (Potentially Significant)				
NOISE-2a: To prevent architectural damage citywide as a result of construction-generated vibration: -Prior to issuance of a building permit for any development project requiring pile driving or blasting, the project applicant/developer shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. The maximum levels shall not exceed 0.2 inch/second, which is the level that can cause architectural damage for typical residential construction. If maximum levels would exceed these thresholds, alternative methods such static rollers, non-explosive blasting, and drilling piles as opposed to pile driving shall be used.	A noise and vibration analysis shall be prepared to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts. A vibration study shall also be required for vibration-intensive activities occurring within 200 feet of sensitive receptors, to further evaluate vibration-related impacts. All vibration activities shall be required to not exceed specified vibration annoyance levels.	Prior to the issuance of construction permits	Project sponsors(s) and contractor(s)	CDD
To prevent vibration induced annoyance as a result of construction generated vibration: -Individual projects that involve vibration intensive construction activities, such as blasting, pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, within 200 feet of sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. A vibration study shall be conducted for individual projects where vibration intensive impacts may occur. The study shall be prepared during the project's approval process and by an acoustical or vibration engineer holding a degree in engineering, physics, or allied discipline and who is able to demonstrate a minimum of two years of experience in preparing technical assessments in acoustics and/or groundborne vibrations. The study shall be submitted to and approved by the City prior to issuance of building permits.				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Vibration impacts to nearby receptors shall not exceed the vibration annoyance levels (in RMS inches/second) as follows: -Workshop = 0.126 -Office = 0.063 -Residential Daytime (7AM–10PM)= 0.032 -Residential Nighttime (10PM to 7 AM) = 0.016 If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses, additional requirements, such as use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques, shall be implemented during construction (e.g., nonexplosive blasting methods, drilled piles as opposed to pile driving, preclusion for using vibratory rollers, use of small- or mediumsized bulldozers, etc.). Vibration reduction measures shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the project and applicable building plans, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.				
Mitigation Measure NOI-1b: Stationary noise sources and landscaping and maintenance activities citywide shall comply with Chapter 8.06, Noise, of the Menlo Park Municipal Code.	Comply with Chapter 8.06, Noise, of the Menlo Park Municipal Code.	Prior to the issuance of construction permits	Project sponsors(s) and contractor(s)	CDD
TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION AND PARKING				
Specific Plan EIR Impact TR-1: Traffic from future development in the Plan area would adversely affect operation of area intersections. (Significant)				
Mitigation Measures TR-1a through TR-1d: (see EIR for details)	Payment of fair share funding.	Prior to building permit issuance.	Project sponsor(s)	PW/CDD
Specific Plan EIR Impact TR-2: Traffic from future development in the Plan area would adversely affect operation of local roadway segments. (Significant)				

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Mitigation Measure	**Action**	**Timing**	**Implementing Party**	**Monitoring Party**
Mitigation Measure TR-2: New developments within the Specific Plan area, regardless of the amount of new traffic they would generate, are required to have in-place a City-approved Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program prior to project occupancy to mitigate impacts on roadway segments and intersections. TDM programs could include the following measures for site users (taken from the C/CAG CMP), as applicable: * Commute alternative information; * Bicycle storage facilities; * Showers and changing rooms; * Pedestrian and bicycle subsidies; * Operating dedicated shuttle service (or buying into a shuttle consortium); * Subsidizing transit tickets; * Preferential parking for carpoolers; * Provide child care services and convenience shopping within * Van pool programs; * Guaranteed ride home program for those who use alternative * Parking cashout programs and discounts for persons who carpool, vanpool, bicycle or use public transit; * Imposing charges for parking rather than providing free parking; * Providing shuttles for customers and visitors; and/or * Car share programs.	Develop a Transportation Demand Management program.	Submit draft TDM program with building permit. City approval required before permit issuance. Implementation prior to project occupancy.	Project sponsor(s)	PW/CDD - STATUS: IN PROGRESS - An intial draft TDM plan has been submitted, but needs to be revised concurrent with the building permit.