Corte Madera Town Hall Remodel and Addition

Initial Study/*Proposed* Mitigated Negative Declaration

Town of Corte Madera

THE TOWN OF CORTE MADERA
MARIN COUNTY CALIFORNIA

September 14,, 2020

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

Town of Corte Madera

Corte Madera Town Hall Remodel and Addition Project

Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)

Prepared for:

Town of Corte Madera

300 Tamalpais Drive

Corte Madera, CA 94925

(415)-927-5050

Prepared by:

Circlepoint

200 Webster Street, #200

Oakland, CA 94607

September 2020

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

Corte Madera Town Hall Remodel and Addition Project

Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Division 13, Public Resources Code

Town of Corte Madera

300 Tamalpais Drive

Corte Madera, CA 94925

(415)-927-5050

1. Project Description

The project site consists of three parcels which contain the existing Town Hall, portions of the parking lot, and the Central Marin Fire Station, totaling 15,700 square-feet located along Tamalpais Drive between Pixley Avenue and Willow Avenue. Surrounding development includes a United States Postal Service office and sorting facility, and single and multi-family housing to the north, the Corte Madera Town Park to the east, single-family houses to the south, and a convenience retail store to the west. The project site is a down-sloping lot from both Tamalpais Drive and Willow Avenue; the most notable elevation changes are from west-to-east as the site slopes downward approximately 15 feet toward the adjacent Fire Station from Willow Avenue.

According to the *Town of Corte Madera General Plan*, the project site's land use designation is Public and Semi-Public Facilities. This designation includes uses that service a public or semi-public function, including public and private schools, places of religious assembly, and public buildings. It also allows areas necessary for public service installations, including public and private drainage ways, retention ponds and flood control facilities, and other sites necessary for public facilities and services. According to the Corte Madera Municipal Code, the project site's zoning designation is also Public and Semi-Public Facilities District. This designation applies to all public facilities, semipublic facilities, and public service installations not designated as flood control and drainage facilities, or parks, open space and natural habitat. This zoning district allows for facilities, including buildings and grounds that are owned, leased, or operated by the Town, with an approved Conditional Use Permit.

The existing Town Hall building would be remodeled and would remain in its current location; remodeling activities would not extend beyond the physical envelope of the existing Town Hall. The upper and lower levels of the existing Town Hall building would be remodeled and improved to current building and accessibility standards. The current council chambers would be converted into a public permitting center and offices, and the basement area would be

remodeled to create a small conference room, storage area, a server room, and other flexible spaces.

.

The purpose of the Project is to create a more resilient, functional, and inviting Town Hall that will be a community asset for the next 50-100 years. The project is intended to provide adequate facilities to meet the existing demand for Town services, hold public hearings, and conduct Town business. It is expected that the project will allow the flexibility to minimally increase staffing (approximately five additional employees) if the need should arise in the future. The Project would be constructed to the latest building, seismic, and fire standards, while upgrades to the existing Town Hall facility would also be made. Sustainability and durability will be an integral part of the design, construction and operation of the new facility. The Town Hall will also be designed and built to serve as a resource in times of emergencies by providing backup power, communications and other vital services.

2. Determination

A Mitigated Negative Declaration is proposed by the Town of Corte Madera for the project. An Initial Study and supporting documents have been prepared to determine if the project would result in a potentially significant or significant impact to the environment (**Exhibit A, Initial Study**). The eight mitigation measures that have been identified are listed in **Table 1** below.

Table 1
Summary of Mitigation Measures

Environmental Factor	Mitigation Measures	Level of Environmental Impact
Aesthetics	**Mitigation Measure AES-1:** In compliance with General Plan Policy CD-1.5, the project's exterior lighting shall be designed to comply with "Dark Sky" requirements including the use of energy-efficient lighting and shielded fixtures. Only fixtures with International Dark-Sky Association Seal of Approval shall be used. Direct light would not be allowed to trespass onto neighboring properties.	Less than Significant with Mitigation
Biological Resources	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1:** If construction activities commence during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting near the site (typically February through August 31 in the project region), a pre-construction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities. If active nests are found in the areas that could be directly affected by construction and would be subject to prolonged construction-related noise, a no-disturbance buffer zone shall be create around active nests during the	Less than Significant with Mitigation

Table 1 Summary of Mitigation Measures		
Environmental Factor	**Mitigation Measures**	**Level of Environmental Impact**
	breeding season or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged. The avoidance buffer size shall be 300 feet for raptor species and 150 feet for all other bird species. The size of the buffer zones and types of construction activities restricted within buffers would be determined by a qualified biologist by taking into account factors such as: ▪ Noise and human disturbance levels at the construction site at the time of the survey and the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity; ▪ Distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the construction site and the nest; and ▪ Sensitivity of individual species and behaviors of the nesting birds.	
Biological Resources	**Mitigation Measure BIO-2:** If construction activities commence during the roosting/breeding season of native bat species potentially roosting near the site (typically October 15 through August 15 in the project region), a Bat Habitat Assessment survey for roosting bats shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and submitted to the Town prior to the commencement of construction activities. If the project site is found to support roosting bats, then the Bat Habitat Assessment shall identify suitable performance measures for avoiding impacts to roosts, which may include, but would not be limited to: ▪ Consultation with CDFW to determine appropriate measures for protecting bats with young if present, and for implementing measures to exclude and/or evict non-breeding bat colonies during project construction ▪ Phased removal of trees	Less than Significant with Mitigation
Cultural Resources	**Mitigation Measure CUL-1:** If potential archaeological resources are uncovered, the Town shall halt work and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context. Project personnel shall not collect cultural materials. A qualified professional archaeologist shall evaluate the find and provide appropriate recommendations. If the archaeologist determines that the find potentially qualifies as a historic resource or unique archaeological resource for purposes of CEQA (per CEQA	Less than Significant with Mitigation

Table 1 Summary of Mitigation Measures		
Environmental Factor	**Mitigation Measures**	**Level of Environmental Impact**
	Guidelines Section 15064.5), all work must remain stopped in the immediate vicinity to allow the archaeologist to evaluate any materials and recommend appropriate treatment. A Native American monitor shall be present for the investigation, if the local Native American tribe requests. In considering any suggested measures proposed by the consulting archaeologist in order to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the Town shall determine whether avoidance is feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures as recommended by the archaeologist (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project while mitigation for historic resources or unique archaeological resources is being carried out.	
Cultural Resources	**Mitigation Measure CUL-2:** If human remains, associated grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony are encountered during construction, the Town shall halt work in the vicinity of the find and notify the County Coroner immediately. The Town shall follow the procedures in Public Resources Code Section 5097.9 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of the determination. The Native American Heritage Commission shall then notify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who has 48 hours to make recommendations to the landowner for the disposition of the remains. A qualified archaeologist, the Town, and the MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment, with appropriate dignity, of any human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. The agreement would take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.	Less than Significant with Mitigation
Geology and Soils	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** A discovery of a paleontological specimen during any phase of the project shall result in a work stoppage in the vicinity of the find until it can be evaluated by a professional paleontologist.	Less than Significant with Mitigation

Table 1 Summary of Mitigation Measures		
Environmental Factor	**Mitigation Measures**	**Level of Environmental Impact**
	Should loss or damage be detected, additional protective measures or further action (e.g., resource removal), as determined by a professional paleontologist, shall be implemented to mitigate the impact.	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	**Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: T**he project proponent shall create a Traffic Control Plan to outline circulation routes and schedules for construction-period traffic. The Traffic Control Plan will include measures to avoid encroachment and disruption at emergency vehicle ingress/egress at the adjacent Fire Station and will be reviewed by the Fire Department staff prior to the onset of construction.	Less than Significant with Mitigation
Noise	**Mitigation Measure NOI-1:** The generator shall be installed with implementation of one or more of the following options to reduce noise during maintenance and testing: ▪ Install a sound attenuation enclosure around the generator. Depending on the design and materials used, sound attenuation enclosures can reduce the generator noise from 10 dBA to 40 dBA. The sound attenuation enclosure shall provide at minimum a 10 dBA noise reduction; or ▪ Include an exhaust silencer on the emergency generator. Depending on the design, silencers can reduce generator noise from 10 dBA to 40 dBA. The silencer shall provide at minimum a 10 dBA noise reduction; or ▪ The generator shall be positioned on the project site at least 105 feet from nearby noise sensitive receivers.	Less than Significant with Mitigation

Phil Boyle
Senior Planner

Date

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

EXHIBIT A

Town of Corte Madera

Corte Madera Town Hall Remodel and Addition Project

Initial Study

Prepared for:

Town of Corte Madera

300 Tamalpais Drive

Corte Madera, CA 94925

(415)-927-5050

Prepared by:

Circlepoint

200 Webster Street, #200

Oakland, CA 94607

September 2020

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

Table of Contents

List of Appendices

List of Figures

List of Tables

1. PROJECT INFORMATION

The Town Hall Remodel and Addition Project (project) proposed by the Town of Corte Madera (Town) consists of: 1) a remodel of the existing Corte Madera Town Hall (Town Hall) structure; 2) physical expansion of the existing Town Hall structure through the construction of a new building addition (Town Hall Addition); and 3) modifications to the existing Town Hall parking lot. The Town is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Project Location and Setting

The project site is located at 300 Tamalpais Drive, Corte Madera within Marin County, California. The project site consists of three parcels which contain the existing Town Hall, portions of the parking lot, and the Central Marin Fire Station (Fire Station), totaling 15,700 square-feet located along Tamalpais Drive between Pixley Avenue and Willow Avenue, as shown in **Figure 1**. Surrounding development includes a United States Postal Service office and sorting facility, and single and multi-family housing to the north, the Corte Madera Town Park to the east, single-family houses to the south, and a convenience retail store to the west. The project site is a down-sloping lot from both Tamalpais Drive and Willow Avenue; the most notable elevation changes are from west-to-east as the site slopes downward approximately 15 feet toward the adjacent Fire Station from Willow Avenue.

Project Background

The Town Hall was constructed in 1931 and originally served as the Town's firehouse. In 1966, the Town purchased the building from the fire department and converted it to the Town Hall. Since 1966, there have been renovations to the building's interior and exterior, the most recent being in 2015 when the arched western entrance was enclosed as part of an interior remodel of the Administration and Finance Offices.

The existing Town Hall is a 4,826 square-foot, two-story building comprised of offices and workspaces, council chambers, a public permitting counter, a staff kitchen, storage areas, restrooms, and other miscellaneous spaces. There are currently 19 full- and part-time employees working within the existing Town Hall. There are also five additional employees located in a 627 square-foot temporary trailer located in the parking lot between the Town Hall and the Fire Station. The current Town Hall facilities are too small to adequately provide necessary public services and meet the day-to-day needs of professional staff. In addition, the Town Hall structure does not meet all current building codes, including Americans with Disability Act (ADA) requirements, and the plumbing and air conditioning systems require a comprehensive overhaul. Over the years the Town has made modifications to meet basic ADA standards such as ADA parking, ADA compliant entry ways and an ADA bathroom on the upper level.

General Plan and Zoning Ordinance

According to the *Town of Corte Madera General Plan* (General Plan), the project site's land use designation is Public and Semi-Public (P/SP) Facilities. This designation includes uses that service

a public or semi-public function, including public and private schools, places of religious assembly, and public buildings. It also allows areas necessary for public service installations, including public and private drainage ways, retention ponds and flood control facilities, and other sites necessary for public facilities and services.

The General Plan includes the following policy and implementation program outlining the future of Town Hall:

> ***Policy LU-6.7.*** *Create a Town Commons Plan that provides for improvements to the Town Hall area.*
>
> ***Implementation Program LU-6.7.a: Town Commons Planning.*** *Identify short- and long-range needs for Town facilities, including the Town Hall, Fire Department, Post Office, Town Park, Community Center and Teen Center. Designate the area as the "Town Commons" to recognize its identity as the geographic heart of the community. Include, relative to joint use facilities, Neil Cummins School in the planning process. Among the possible projects to be considered:*
>
> - *Upgrade and expansion of the Town Hall and Council Chambers*
> - *Improvement of parking facilities at Town Hall and provision of bicycle parking*
> - *Upgrade to or construction of a new Community Center*
> - *Design, landscaping, and pathway ties between the Town commons facilities*
> - *Construction of a large public gathering plaza, designed as a primary community focal point*
> - *Posting of informational and decorative "Town Commons"-themed signage*
> - *New Town sign-board or informational kiosk*
> - *Necessary parking facilities.*

According to the Corte Madera Municipal Code (CMMC), the project site's zoning designation is P/SP Facilities District. This designation applies to all public facilities, semipublic facilities, and public service installations not designated as flood control and drainage facilities, or parks, open space and natural habitat. This zoning district allows for facilities, including buildings and grounds that are owned, leased, or operated by the Town, with an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

Project Purpose

The purpose of the Town Hall Remodel and Addition Project is to create a more resilient, functional, and inviting Town Hall. The project is intended to provide adequate facilities to meet the existing demand for Town services, hold public hearings, and conduct Town business. The project will allow the flexibility to increase Town staffing by approximately six additional employees, for a total of 30 employees hosted at the project site. The Town Hall Addition would be constructed to the latest building, seismic, and fire standards, while upgrades to the existing Town Hall would also occur within the existing Town Hall structure. Sustainability and durability will be an integral part of the design, construction, and operation of the new facility. The project will also be designed and built to serve as a resource in times of emergencies by providing backup power, communications, and other vital services.

In 2019, the Town, in consultation with our community, developed a vision for a new Town Hall facility, intended to meet the Town's current and future needs. This collaboration produced the following set of goals to guide project development:

1. Reflect the surrounding neighborhood's architectural styles, composition, and character.
2. Improve and upgrade the Town's ability to provide excellent public services while minimizing impacts to the nearby residential, commercial, and office uses.
3. Combine Administration, Finance, Public Works, and Planning/Building offices into one location.
4. Improve pedestrian and vehicular site access, including ADA improvements, electric vehicle charging stations, and bicycle parking.
5. Create a building which is designed and operates in a sustainable manner.
6. Build within the Town's financial means.

Project Description

The existing Town Hall building would be remodeled and would remain in its current location; remodeling activities would not extend beyond the physical envelope of the existing Town Hall. The upper and lower levels of the existing Town Hall building would be remodeled and improved to current building and accessibility standards. The current council chambers would be converted into a public permitting center and offices, and the basement area would be remodeled to create a small conference room, storage area, a server room, and other flexible spaces.

The purpose of the Project is to create a more resilient, functional, and inviting Town Hall that will be a community asset for the next 50-100 years. The project is intended to provide adequate facilities to meet the existing demand for Town services, hold public hearings, and conduct Town business. It is expected that the project will allow the flexibility to minimally increase staffing (approximately five additional employees) if the need should arise in the future. The Project would be constructed to the latest building, seismic, and fire standards, while upgrades to the existing Town Hall facility would also be made. Sustainability and durability will be an integral part of the design, construction and operation of the new facility. The Town Hall will also be designed and built to serve as a resource in times of emergencies by providing backup power, communications and other vital services, as shown in **Figure 2** and **Figure 3.**

The parking lot would be reconfigured to maximize the number of standard, ADA, and electric vehicle charging spaces as well as improve vehicular and pedestrian circulation and safety. The new building and site plan would result in a minor change in the total number of off-street parking spaces and a parking variance would be required. Overall the existing project site layout and access points would not significantly change.

Utilities

The project would not significantly alter the existing utility infrastructure servicing the project site. Interconnections to Town water, sewer, electricity, and natural gas services would remain in their current configuration. New utility features associated with the project include

photovoltaic cells on the roof of the addition, electric vehicle charging stations in the parking lot, and a rainwater catchment system for landscaping irrigation.

Landscaping

A total of 8 trees of varying species ranging in size from 11 inches to 50 inches in diameter at 4.5 feet above grade are proposed for removal. Three existing redwood trees would remain and form a central organizing feature of the new public plaza and would be integral to the visual aesthetic of the new facility. New landscaping is proposed to provide a buffer along Tamalpais Drive.

Sustainability

The Town would pursue the following criteria for creating a sustainable project:

1. The project would meet California Green Building Standards.
2. The Town would collaborate with the Bay Area Regional Energy Network to design a building that would be built and operate in an energy efficient and sustainable manner.

Construction

Construction is anticipated to begin in early 2021 and would last approximately nine months. The existing Town Hall is expected to be open during the construction period. The Town would offer temporary parking at the nearby Town Park and the public parking lot located at the intersection of Montecito Drive and Tamalpais Drive. Staging for construction and equipment could occupy portions of the project site, paved areas around the adjacent Fire Station, and the following off-site locations depicted in **Figure 1**:

- Portions of the parking lot at Montecito Drive and Redwood Avenue
- Existing street parking adjacent to the project site along Tamalpais Drive
- At the edge of the Town Park parking lot entrance off Pixley Avenue

Entitlements

The following entitlements would likely be required for this project:

1. **Conditional Use Permit:** The CMMC specifies that all facilities within the P/SP Zoning District, including buildings and grounds, owned, leased or operated by the town are permitted with the approval of a CUP.
2. **Design Review:** Projects that are on parcels within the P/SP Zoning District required Design Review approval if any exterior modifications are proposed to the structure(s) or site.
3. **Variances:**
    - *Building Height:* The maximum height allowed for buildings in the P/SP District is 30 feet. The maximum height of the proposed building would be approximately 32 feet from the northeast corner down to the parking lot. Therefore a height variance of approximately 2 feet is required.
    - *Front Setback:* The front setback requirement in the P/SP District is a minimum of 20 feet from the front property line, which in this case is parallel to Tamalpais Drive. The current building is non-conforming at 8 feet and the proposed addition is 6 feet

from the front property line. Therefore, a 14-foot front setback variance is required given that the proposed project would increase the level of nonconformity from 12 feet to 14 feet.

- *Parking Variance:* Parking requirements are determined by area (square feet) of the use. The number of parking spaces for public buildings is 1 space per 200 square feet of gross floor area and the number of spaces for administrative offices is 1 space per 250 square feet of gross floor area. Using either of the two ratios, the project would require a parking variance because the code requires between 81 and 101 spaces and the project proposes approximately 32 spaces.

4. **Lot Merger:** The Town Hall is located on Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 024-136-015. The project would include a lot merger with two adjacent parcels - APNs (024-136-014 and 024-136-013), which encompass the adjacent Fire Station and parking areas. The project does not propose permanent changes to the Fire Station structure, although parking areas around the Fire Station could be used for temporary construction material storage.

Google Earth, 2020

Figure 1 Town Hall Project Site Map

Source: Kappe Architects, 2020. *Corte Madera Town Hall Addition Planning Proposal.* Prepared for the Town of Corte Madera.

Figure 2 Town Hall Addition South Elevation Looking North from Tamalpais Drive

Source: Kappe Architects. 2020. *Corte Madera Town Hall Addition Planning Proposal.* Prepared for the Town of Corte Madera.

Figure 3 Town Hall Addition North Elevation Looking South from Existing Town Hall Parking Lot

2. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- ☒ Aesthetics
- ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☒ Biological Resources
- ☒ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Energy
- ☒ Geology and Soils
- ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☒ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Hydrology and Water Quality
- ☐ Land Use and Planning
- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☒ Noise
- ☐ Population and Housing
- ☒ Public Services
- ☐ Recreation
- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
- ☐ Utilities and Service Systems
- ☐ Wildfire
- ☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

3. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Philip G Boyle | September 15, 2020

Phil Boyle
Senior Planner

Date

4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

4.1. Aesthetics

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Less than Significant)

The General Plan Chapter 3, *Resource Conservation and Sustainability,* identifies open ridgetops of Mount Tamalpais and the bayside wetlands of the San Francisco Bay that surround the Town as scenic viewsheds. Mount Tamalpais is visible west of the project site, but publicly-accessible views of the San Francisco Bay from the project site are obstructed by intervening topography. No other scenic vistas or viewsheds can be viewed from of the project site. The existing Town Hall, Fire Station, and mature trees obstruct views of Mount Tamalpais from the street level of Pixley Avenue, Tamalpais Drive, and Town Park. The Town Hall Addition would be two stories with a height of approximately 27 feet from Tamalpais Drive at its highest point, which is consistent with the height of surrounding development and vegetation. Thus, the project would not substantially degrade views of scenic viewsheds, and this impact would be less than significant.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Less than Significant)

According to the California Scenic Highway Mapping System, the project is not located along or in the vicinity of an officially designated scenic highway.[1] However, the project is located along Tamalpais Drive, which is defined in the General Plan as a scenic corridor. Project implementation would not damage or remove rock outcroppings or historic buildings (as discussed in **Section 4.5, Cultural Resources**). Landscaping activities proposed for the project would entail the removal of several relatively small trees at the project site. However, this visual impact is anticipated to be minimal, as additional landscaping is proposed to replace the removed trees.

Overall, the project's massing and height would resemble existing development along Tamalpais Drive, which is currently comprised of one- and two-story structures, trees, and ornamental landscaping. The proposed building is nestled between two existing buildings, providing continuity of the existing streetscape. The project would also reflect the surrounding neighborhood's architectural style, composition, landscaping, and character, and would be subject to the Town's Design Review approval requirements to integrate within the visual setting and avoid distracting from the scenic corridor. Given the above, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a scenic corridor, and this impact would be less than significant.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (Less than Significant)

The urbanized project site is not located within a designated Town Overlay District, including the Town's Scenic Resources Overlay District or the Hillside Land Capacity Overlay District. According to the General Plan, the project site is located within the Old Corte Madera Square Community Plan Study Area; however, the project does not face the square itself and is therefore exempt from policies relevant to the Old Corte Madera Square Community Plan.

The General Plan outlines several policies under Goal CD-4 and Goal CD-5 that are applicable to non-residential building design. Goal CD-4 includes policies to ensure incorporation of appropriate size and scale into design; Goal CD-5 describes policies pertaining to design of government facilities along Tamalpais Drive and the Old Corte Madera Square planning area.

The project would be consistent with the applicable P/SP Facilities District land use and zoning designations except for variances for front setback, height, and parking. These variances would be assessed during the Design Review and Variance entitlement processes, which requires affirmative findings to be made by the Town Council. For this project to be approved, the Planning Commission must determine that the project is in scale and harmonious with the area

[1] California Department of Transportation. 2020. *List of eligible and officially designated State Scenic Highways*. Available: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways. Accessed February 17, 2020.

and would not adversely affect views, sunlight, or privacy of nearby residences. Since the project would require approval through this Design Review and Variance process, it is not anticipated to conflict with applicable zoning or General Plan regulations related to scenic quality. Given the above, the project would not conflict with the applicable regulations regarding scenic quality, and this impact would be less than significant.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

The project area includes residential and mixed-use development and roadways that produce existing sources of nighttime light, including streetlights and intermittent car headlights. Project implementation would increase the overall size of the Town Hall, which would result in additional light sources and glare from the Town Hall building. Thus, implementation of the project would adversely affect day or nighttime views proximal to the project site. This represents a potentially significant impact, reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure AES-1**.

> **Mitigation Measure AES-1:** In compliance with General Plan Policy CD-1.5, the project's exterior lighting shall be designed to comply with "Dark Sky" requirements including the use of energy-efficient lighting and shielded fixtures. Only fixtures with International Dark-Sky Association Seal of Approval shall be used. Direct light would not be allowed to trespass onto neighboring properties.

4.2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land of conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

The California Department of Conservation's *2016 Important Farmland Finder Map* identifies the project site as Urban and Built-up land.[2] There are no agricultural or forest resources located at or near the project site, nor are there any active agricultural lands, lands under a Williamson Act contract, forest lands, or timberlands on or adjacent to the project site. The project site is not designated for agricultural or forest uses by the General Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural or forest uses, nor would it result in farmland or forest land conversion. No impact would occur.

4.3. Air Quality

	Would the project:	**Significant or Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less than Significant**	**No Impact**
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

Rincon Consultants prepared an Air Quality Analysis in 2020 (**Appendix A**) to analyze the project's potential air quality impacts. This study is incorporated by reference.

Regulatory Setting

As the local air quality management agency, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is required to monitor air pollutant levels for conformance with state and federal air

[2] California Department of Conservation. 2016. *Marin County Important Farmland Data Availability*. Available: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Marin.aspx. Accessed December 27, 2019.

quality standards and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards. Air quality studies generally focus on four pollutants, referred to as criteria pollutants, which are most commonly measured and regulated: carbon monoxide (CO), ground level ozone (O_3), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and suspended particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$).

Depending on whether the standards are met or exceeded, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB) is classified as being in "attainment" or "nonattainment." Under state law, air districts are required to prepare a plan for air quality improvement for pollutants for which the district is in non-compliance. The BAAQMD is in non-attainment for the federal and state O_3 standards, the federal and state $PM_{2.5}$ (particulate matter up to 2.5 microns in size) standards, and the state PM_{10} (particulate matter up to 10 microns in size) standards.[3] Additionally, the BAAQMD is responsible for developing a Clean Air Plan which guides the region's air quality planning efforts to attain state and federal air quality standards as discussed further below. [4]

Air Quality Management

The BAAQMD is responsible primarily for assuring the national and state ambient air quality standards are attained and maintained in the San Francisco Bay Area (Bay Area). It is also responsible for adopting and enforcing rules and regulations concerning air pollutant sources, issuing permits for stationary sources of air pollutants, inspecting stationary sources of air pollutants, responding to citizen complaints, monitoring ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, awarding grants to reduce motor vehicle emissions, conducting public education campaigns, and many other functions. The BAAQMD has jurisdiction over much of the nine-county Bay Area, including Marin County, and have adopted the *2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan* (2017 Clean Air Plan) as an update to the 2010 Clean Air Plan. The 2017 Clean Air Plan provides a regional strategy to protect public health and protect the climate in accordance with the requirements of the California Clean Air Act to implement "all feasible measures" to reduce O_3; provide a control strategy to reduce O_3, particulate matter, Toxic air contaminants (TACs), and greenhouse gases (GHGs) in a single, integrated plan; review progress in improving air quality in recent years; and establish emission control measures to be adopted or implemented in both the short term and through 2050.

BAAQMD Significance Thresholds

The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines quantify project-level air quality thresholds defined by numeric values and evaluation criteria for pollutant emissions. These project-level thresholds, shown in **Table 1**, represent the levels at which a project's individual emissions of criteria air pollutants or precursors would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the SFAAB's existing air quality conditions. The project would result in a significant impact if construction or operational emissions would exceed the thresholds shown in **Table 1**.

[3] One micron equals one-millionth of a meter; i.e. 10^{-6}

[4] Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status*. Available: http://www.baaqmd.gov/about-air-quality/research-and-data/air-quality-standards-and-attainment-status. Accessed March 2019

Table 1 Air Quality Thresholds of Significance

Pollutant/Precursor	Construction-Related Thresholds for Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	Operational-Related Thresholds for Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)
ROG	54	54
NOx	54	54
PM_{10}	82	82
$PM_{2.5}$	54	54

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines.*
Notes: lbs/day = pounds per day; ROG = reactive organic gases; NOx = nitrogen oxides; PM_{10} = respirable particulate matter with a diameter of 10 micrometers or less; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate patter with a diameter of 2.5 micrometers of less

Toxic Air Contaminants

The Air Toxic "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act of 1987 (AB 2588) seeks to identify and evaluate risk from air toxics sources but does not directly regulate air toxics emissions. Under Assembly Bill (AB) 2588, TAC emissions from individual facilities are quantified and prioritized. "High priority" facilities are required to perform a health risk assessment and are required to communicate the results to the public in the form of notices and public meetings if specific thresholds are violated. Although TACs and $PM_{2.5}$ tend to be localized and are found in relatively low concentrations in ambient air, exposure to low concentrations over long periods can result in increased risk of cancer and/or adverse health effects in local communities. BAAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* include risk and hazard thresholds that are intended to apply to projects that would site new permitted or non-permitted sources in proximity to receptors and for projects that would site new sensitive receptors in proximity to permitted or non-permitted sources of TACs or $PM_{2.5}$ emissions.[5]

Sensitive Receptors

BAAQMD defines sensitive receptors as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and the chronically ill. These facilities include residences, school playgrounds, child-care centers, retirement homes, and convalescent homes. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are multi-family residential units located directly adjacent to the project site to the north, and residential units south of the project site across Tamalpais Drive.

[5] Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines.* Available: https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en. Accessed September 2020.

Discussion

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Less than Significant)

A project would conflict with or potentially obstruct implementation of an air quality management plan if it would not support the primary goals of the plan, if it does not include applicable control measures from the plan, or if it would disrupt or hinder plan implementation. The 2017 Clean Air Plan includes goals and measures to increase the use of electric vehicles, promote the use of on-site renewable energy, and encourage energy efficiency. The project includes features that are consistent with these goals and measures, including the provision of electric vehicle charging spaces, meeting California Green Building Standards, and providing natural light and ventilation. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of an applicable air quality plan. This impact would be less than significant.

b) 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. (Less than Significant)

Construction Emissions

Project construction would generate temporary air pollutant emissions associated with equipment used on site and worker/vendor trips. **Table 2** summarizes the estimated maximum daily emissions of pollutants during project construction. As shown in **Table 2**, criteria pollutant emissions would not exceed BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guideline thresholds during construction, and would not conflict with applicable federal and state ambient air quality standards. Additionally, the General Plan includes Implementation Program RCS-10.3.c, which requires dust control measures consistent with the "Feasible Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM_{10}" of the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, or its successor document, as a condition of approval for discretionary projects. Thus, construction emissions associated with the project would result in a less-than-significant air quality impact.

Table 2 Construction Emissions

	Estimated Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	**NOx**	**CO**	**PM_{10} (exhaust)**	**$PM_{2.5}$ (exhaust)**	**SOx**
2021 Maximum Daily Emissions[1]	2.5	9.7	9.4	0.5	0.5	<0.1
BAAQMD Thresholds (average daily emissions)	54	54	N/A	82	54	N/A
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	N/A	No	No	N/A

Notes: lbs/day = pounds per day; ROG = reactive organic gases; NOx = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; PM_{10} = respirable particulate matter with a diameter of 10 micrometers or less; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate patter with a diameter of 2.5 micrometers of less; Sox = sulfur oxides; N/A = not applicable; no BAAQMD threshold for CO or SOx

[1] After the Air Quality Analysis was completed, the project site plans were revised to increase the size of the Town Hall by 810 square feet for a total of 11,310 square feet. Conservatively assuming that the approximately eight percent increase in square feet would increase daily construction emissions proportionately by eight percent, construction emissions would still not exceed or come close to BAAQMD construction emission thresholds.

Operational Emissions

Long-term emissions associated with project operation would include emissions from vehicle trips, landscape maintenance equipment, use of consumer products, and architectural coating associated with on-site development. Operational emissions shown in **Table 3** and **Table 4** assume 48 hours of annual operation for the emergency generator for testing and maintenance. As shown in **Table 3** and **Table 4**, total project emissions would not exceed BAAQMD daily or annual thresholds during operation. Thus, operations associated with the project would remain in attainment under the applicable federal and state ambient air quality standards, and this impact would be less than significant.

Table 3 Operational Average Daily Emissions

Sources[1]	Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	PM_{10} (exhaust)	$PM_{2.5}$ (exhaust)	SOx
Area	0.2	<0.1	<0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Mobile	<0.1	0.3	1.0	0.3	<0.1	<0.1
Individual Generator	N/R	4.9	0.5	<0.1	<0.1	N/R
Total Project Emissions	0.3	5.2	1.5	0.3	<0.1	<0.1
BAAQMD Thresholds	54	54	N/A	82	54	N/A
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	N/A	No	No	N/A

Notes: lbs/day = pounds per day; ROG = reactive organic gases; NOx = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; PM_{10} = respirable particulate matter with a diameter of 10 micrometers or less; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate patter with a diameter of 2.5 micrometers of less; SOx = sulfur oxides; N/A = not applicable; N/R = not reported; no BAAQMD threshold for CO or SOx

[1] After the Air Quality Analysis was completed, the project site plans were revised to increase the size of the Town Hall by 810 square feet for a total of 11,310 square feet. Furthermore, the final Transportation Assessment concluded that project operation would generate 45 daily vehicle trips, instead of the 12 daily vehicle trips modeled in the Air Quality Analysis. Conservatively assuming that an approximately 8 percent increase in square footage and a 73 percent increase in daily vehicle trips would increase area and energy emissions proportionately by 8 percent and mobile emissions proportionately by 73 percent, operational emissions would still not exceed or come close to the BAAQMD operational thresholds.

Table 4 Operational Maximum Annual Emissions

Sources	Maximum Annual Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	PM_{10} (exhaust)	$PM_{2.5}$ (exhaust)	SOx
Area[1]	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1

Sources	Maximum Annual Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	PM_{10} (exhaust)	$PM_{2.5}$ (exhaust)	SOx
Mobile	<0.1	<0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Individual Generator	N/R	0.9	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	N/R
Total Project Emissions	<0.1	0.9	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
BAAQMD Thresholds	10	10	N/A	15	10	N/A
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	N/A	No	No	N/A

Notes: lbs/day = pounds per day; ROG = reactive organic gases; NOx = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; PM10 = respirable particulate matter with a diameter of 10 micrometers or less; PM2.5 = fine particulate patter with a diameter of 2.5 micrometers of less; Sox = sulfur oxides; N/A = not applicable; N/R = not reported; no BAAQMD threshold for CO or SOx

[1] After the Air Quality Analysis was completed, the project site plans were revised to increase the size of the Town Hall by 810 square feet for a total of 11,310 square feet. Furthermore, the final Transportation Assessment concluded that project operation would generate 45 daily vehicle trips, instead of the 12 daily vehicle trips modeled in the Air Quality Analysis. Conservatively assuming that an approximately 8 percent increase in square footage and a 73 percent increase in daily vehicle trips would increase area and energy emissions proportionately by 8 percent and mobile emissions proportionately by 73 percent, operational emissions would still not exceed or come close to the BAAQMD operational thresholds.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Less than Significant)

Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

A project's CO emissions would be significant if they contribute to a violation of the state standards for CO (9.0 parts per million (ppm) averaged over 8 hours and 20 ppm over 1 hour). BAAQMD provides a preliminary screening methodology to conservatively determine whether a proposed project would exceed CO thresholds. If the following criteria are met, a project would not have a significant impact related to local CO concentrations:

1. Consistency with an applicable congestion management program established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, regional transportation plan, and local congestion management agency plans.
2. Traffic volumes at affected intersections would not exceed 44,000 vehicles per hour.
3. Project traffic would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited (e.g., tunnel, parking garage, bridge underpass, natural or urban street canyon, below-grade roadway).

The project would add approximately six new employees to the Town Hall and would generate approximately 45 additional daily trips relative to existing use of the project site as discussed in **Section 4.17, Transportation**. The additional daily trip generation would be consistent with the County Congestion Management Program, as it would not significantly affect peak hour travel, housing balance or mode of transportation. As a result, the project would not result in individually or cumulatively significant CO emissions, and this impact would be less than significant.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Health impacts associated with TACs are generally due to long-term exposure. Typical sources of TACs include industrial processes such as petroleum refining operations, commercial operations such as gasoline stations and dry cleaners, and diesel exhaust. BAAQMD recommends that lead agencies review risks from nearby roadways, freeways, and stationary sources[6] for new receptor projects. Project operation would not create new sensitive receptors. However, the project would include one emergency backup diesel generator, which is considered a typical stationary source of TAC emissions by BAAQMD.

Diesel generator emission estimates were based on manufacturer specifications, exhaust emission data for U.S. EPA Tier 2 emissions standards, and the estimated frequency and duration of operation of the generator (i.e., 48 hours per year). For the purposes of this analysis, the generator was conservatively assumed to be located adjacent to the Town Hall structure along the northern-facing edge of the building, approximately 35 feet from the nearest sensitive receptor. **Table 5** summarizes the health risks from operation of the emergency generator at the nearest sensitive receptor (identified as the 'maximum exposed individual'). As shown in **Table 5**, potential health risks associated with operation of the emergency generator would not exceed BAAQMD thresholds, and this impact would be less than significant

Table 5 Health Risks from Generator Operation

Scenario	Excess Cancer Risk (per million)	Chronic Health Risk	$PM_{2.5}$ µg/m^3 annual average
Maximum Exposed Individual	8.44	0.002	0.011
BAAQMD Significance Threshold	>10	>1	>0.3
Threshold Exceedance?	No	No	No

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (Less than Significant)

During construction, odors from the use of equipment during construction activities would be intermittent and temporary. Such odors generally dissipate rapidly from the source and decrease with distance. The project does not include facilities known to produce substantial odors during operation, such as landfills and wastewater treatment facilities. This impact would be less than significant.

[6] A stationary source is any fixed emitter of air pollutants, and include industrial facilities, power plants, and generators.

4.4. Biological Resources

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

The General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Biological Resources section determined the project site is located in urban habitat, defined by the presence of both native and exotic species maintained in a relatively static composition within a downtown, residential, or suburbia

setting. Vegetation in these areas consists primarily of introduced ornamental trees, shrubs, and manicured lawns and is generally not of high value for wildlife; birds and mammals that occur in these areas are typically introduced species adapted to human habitation. The General Plan EIR did not identify habitat types or natural environments that support sensitive biological resources on the project site.

The General Plan EIR identifies special-status species occurrences documented in the project area. Based on this evaluation, occurrences for both White-Rayed Pentachaeta (*Pentachaeta bellidiflora*) and Marsh Microseris (*Microseris paludosa*) were identified to be within one mile of the project site.[7] White-Rayed Pentachaeta is listed under both the Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act as an endangered species, and is designated as list 1B by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). Currently, the flower can only be found in San Mateo County west of Redwood City, and has not been spotted in the project site location since 1822.[8] Marsh Microseris is designated as list 1B by CNPS. Currently, Marsh Microseris has a scattered distribution between Southern Mendocino and northern San Luis Obispo counties, but has not been spotted in the project site location since 1886.[9] Due to age of the CNDDB listings and the highly developed nature of the project site, these plant species have a low likelihood to occur within the project area.

Trees on the project site may provide potential nesting habitat for protected bird species. The active nests of most native bird species are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 704) and California Fish and Game Code Section 3503. The proposed project requires the removal of approximately eight trees, which could result in the loss of active bird nests. Additionally, construction period noise has the potential to disturb nesting birds in the vicinity of the project site. The loss of an active bird nest protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code would be considered a potentially significant impact, reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1**.

> **Mitigation Measure BIO-1:** If construction activities commence during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting near the site (typically February through August 31 in the project region), a pre-construction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities.
>
> If active nests are found in the areas that could be directly affected by construction and would be subject to prolonged construction-related noise, a no-disturbance buffer zone shall be create around active nests during the breeding season or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged. The avoidance buffer size shall be 300 feet for raptor species and 150 feet for all other bird species. The size of the buffer zones and types

[7] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2020. *Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS) Viewer, ver. 5.86.13.* Available: https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/?tool=cnddbQuick. Accessed February 2020.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.

of construction activities restricted within buffers would be determined by a qualified biologist by taking into account factors such as:

- Noise and human disturbance levels at the construction site at the time of the survey and the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity;
- Distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the construction site and the nest; and
- Sensitivity of individual species and behaviors of the nesting birds.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (No Impact)

The project site is completely developed and does not include riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities, nor does it include wetlands and marshlands identified within the General Plan. Additionally, there are no state or federally protected wetlands within or adjacent to the project site that are regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)[10], or by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).[11] Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (No Impact)

No wetlands, marshes, vernal pools or other aquatic resources under state or federal jurisdiction occur within the project site. The nearest CDFW-protected wetland to the project site is the Corte Madera Marsh Ecological Reserve, located approximately 2 miles east from the project site.[10] The closest potential USFWS-protected aquatic feature is a permanently flooded palustrine wetland habitat located approximately 0.4 mile north-east of the project location.[11] Implementation of the project would not require the direct removal, fill, interruption, or other adverse effects to protected wetlands. No impact would occur.

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? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

The project area consists of developed areas and ornamental landscaping. Urbanized land uses provide limited connectivity to natural habitats and would not be expected to support migratory wildlife corridors. However, trees on the project site have the potential support wildlife nursery sites for breeding and roosting bats. The proposed project requires the removal of several trees, which could result in the loss of native wildlife nursery sites for bats. This represents a potentially significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-2** would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

[10] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. *CDFW Lands Viewer*. Available: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Lands/Viewer. Accessed February 17, 2020.
[11] U.S Fish and Wildlife Service. *National Wetlands Inventory; surface waters and wetlands.* Available: https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html. Accessed December 26, 2019.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: If construction activities commence during the roosting/breeding season of native bat species potentially roosting near the site (typically October 15 through August 15 in the project region), a Bat Habitat Assessment survey for roosting bats shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and submitted to the Town prior to the commencement of construction activities. If the project site is found to support roosting bats, then the Bat Habitat Assessment shall identify suitable performance measures for avoiding impacts to roosts, which may include, but would not be limited to:

- Consultation with CDFW to determine appropriate measures for protecting bats with young if present, and for implementing measures to exclude and/or evict non-breeding bat colonies during project construction
- Phased removal of trees

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Less than Significant)

Implementation of the project would entail the removal of eight trees located on the project site, which would therefore be subject to the Town's Tree Ordinance. Chapter 15.50 of the Town's Tree Ordinance requires that a permit be applied for and approved before removing, destroying, or altering any tree on private property that is covered by the ordinance. Trees that require a permit include any tree, excluding undesirable species, with a single trunk circumference of at least 50 inches measure four and one-half feet above grade. **Table 6** provides a consistency analysis regarding the project before mitigation, for policies from the General Plan applicable to biological resources.

Table 6 Consistency with General Plan Policies for Biological Resources

Policy	Consistency Analysis
Policy RCS-6.2 Protect wetlands, other waters of the United States, and essential habitat for special status species, including, but not limited to, other wetland habitat areas, habitat corridors, and sensitive natural communities.	As discussed under Impacts a) through d) above, implementation of the project would not impact wetlands, other waters of the U.S., or essential habitat for special status species, including wetland habitats, habitat corridors, and sensitive natural communities.
Policy RCS-6.7 Protect migratory corridors.	As discussed under Impact d) above, project implementation would not interfere with migratory wildlife corridors.
Policy RCS-7.1 Conserve, restore, and enhance areas containing important habitat, wetlands, and special-status species.	As described under Impact b) and Impact c) above, project implementation would not impact important habitat, wetlands, and special-status species.
Policy RCS-7.2 Retain sensitive habitat areas and restore their natural state, where feasible, and protect from inappropriate development and landscaping.	As discussed under Impacts a) through c) above, implementation of the project would not impact wetlands or essential habitat for special-status species.

Policy	Consistency Analysis
Policy RCS- 7.4 Protect woodland and tree resources.	The project would not affect woodland resources. However, project implementation would entail the removal of several trees. Removal of these trees would adhere to the Town's Tree Ordinance and permitting requirements such that the project would not conflict with Policy RCS-7.4.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (No Impact)

There are no habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other similar plans that govern activities on the project site according to the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan. No impact would occur.

4.5. Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Setting

Rincon Consultants prepared a Historic Resources Evaluation Report (HRER) in 2020 (**Appendix B**) to analyze the project's potential cultural resource impacts. This study is incorporated by reference.

Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? (No Impact)

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines a historical resource as: (1) a resource listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); (2) a resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or identified as

significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(g); or (3) any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.

The existing Town Hall building is more than 45 years old, which meets the minimum age criteria for a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility evaluation. As outlined in **Appendix B**, the existing Corte Madera Town Hall building was constructed as a fire station in 1931 but was substantially remodeled to serve as the Town Hall in 1965. This remodel affected the building's ability to convey its early history and significant association with the formation of the fire department and early municipal offices in the Town. The building no longer retains the original features from its original design, does not convey its historical significance as an early fire station, and does not meet the other criteria required for listing on the CRHR or NRHP. No impact would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

A non-confidential California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search from the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University was received in 2020 for the project area, included in **Appendix B**. This records search concluded that the project site does not contain previously recorded archaeological resources but has a moderate potential to contain Native American archaeological resources and a moderately high potential to contain historic-period archaeological resources. Redevelopment of the project site could result in the exposure or destruction of unrecorded archaeological resources. This represents a potentially significant impact, reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1.**

> **Mitigation Measure CUL-1**: If potential archaeological resources are uncovered, the Town shall halt work and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context. Project personnel shall not collect cultural materials. A qualified professional archaeologist shall evaluate the find and provide appropriate recommendations. If the archaeologist determines that the find potentially qualifies as a historic resource or unique archaeological resource for purposes of CEQA (per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5), all work must remain stopped in the immediate vicinity to allow the archaeologist to evaluate any materials and recommend appropriate treatment. A Native American monitor shall be present for the investigation, if the local Native American tribe requests. In considering any suggested measures proposed by the consulting archaeologist in order to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the Town shall determine whether avoidance is feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures as recommended by the archaeologist (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts

of the project while mitigation for historic resources or unique archaeological resources is being carried out.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Construction would involve ground-disturbing activities within the confines of the project site, which could uncover and disturb previously unrecorded human remains within the project site. This represents a potentially significant impact, reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-2.**

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: If human remains, associated grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony are encountered during construction, the Town shall halt work in the vicinity of the find and notify the County Coroner immediately. The Town shall follow the procedures in Public Resources Code Section 5097.9 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of the determination. The Native American Heritage Commission shall then notify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who has 48 hours to make recommendations to the landowner for the disposition of the remains. A qualified archaeologist, the Town, and the MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment, with appropriate dignity, of any human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. The agreement would take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

4.6. Energy

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (Less than Significant)

and

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (Less than Significant)

Construction equipment would require the temporary consumption of fuel and energy, but these minor energy demands would represent typical construction usage and would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. As stated in the Project Description, the Town has implemented sustainability goals which include meeting the California Green Building Standards and collaborating with Bay Area Regional Energy Network to design a building that would be built and operate in energy efficient and sustainable manner. With incorporation of these standards, project operation would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or conflict with a local plan for energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant.

4.7. Geology and Soils

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐

c)	Be located on 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion

a) Directly or indirectly cause 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. (No Impact)

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (1972) and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (1990) direct the State Geologist to delineate regulatory zones to assist cities and counties in preventing the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. According to the California Department of Conservation, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the Town is not affected by Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zones.[12] Additionally, no known surface expression of fault races crosses the site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Less than Significant)

The project site is located within the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area and therefore has the potential to experience future earthquakes. Numerous active Bay Area faults are capable of producing moderate to major earthquakes that could cause severe ground shaking at the project site. The intensity of earthquake ground motions would depend on the characteristics of the generating fault, distance to the fault and rupture zone, earthquake magnitude, earthquake duration, and site-specific geologic conditions. The General Plan includes Policy PSH-8.1, which requires all construction to comply with the California Building Code, including requirements for seismic design. Compliance with provisions of the most recent California Building Code, as

[12] California Department of Conservation 2018. *Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation*. Available: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/. Accessed December 26, 2019.

required by the Town, would ensure that the project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects associated with seismic ground shaking. This impact would be less than significant.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Less than Significant)

Liquefaction refers to the sudden, temporary loss of soil strength during strong ground shaking. The phenomenon can occur where there are saturated, loose, granular (sandy) deposits subjected to seismic shaking. According to the General Plan, the project site is at the intersection of soils with very low, low, and high liquefaction risks. Therefore, the project site could be at risk for liquefaction hazards. The General Plan includes the following policy pertaining to liquefaction hazards:

Policy PSH-8.2: New development and redevelopment projects with the potential for geological hazards, such as slope failures or soil subsidence, shall be subject to geotechnical evaluation prior to approval. The reports shall address potential for geologic hazards, including liquefaction risks, and recommend measures to minimize hazards.

- *Implementation Program PSH-8.2.b: Development Standards* requires that development in areas of geotechnical hazards shall conform to geotechnical report mitigation measures and/or project and site modifications to respond to site-specific hazards and conditions.

The project would require a geotechnical report prior to construction to evaluate and respond to site-specific geological hazards– including potential for slope failure, soil subsidence, and liquefaction – within the project site, and to recommend measures to minimize hazards. Geotechnical report mitigation often includes installation of deep foundation support piers (anchored to bedrock), installation of appropriate drainage and improvements, and seismic design provisions pursuant to the Uniform Building Code. With adherence to General Plan Policy PSH-8.2 and Implementation Program PSH-8.2.b, this impact would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides? (Less than Significant)

The existing Town Hall is located within on a sloped site. However, Marin County's Geohub classifies the project site as having a low chance of a landslide, and the General Plan also lists the project site as having a low risk for landslide hazards.[13,14] The project would be unlikely to exacerbate slope or landslide hazards such that substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death would occur. This impact would be less than significant.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Less than Significant)

Project construction activities would include grading and ground disturbance. Thus, the project would be subject the Town's Grading and Drainage Ordinance, outlined in CMMC Chapter 15.20, which requires issuance of an erosion control permit prior to grading activities. Application for an erosion control permit shall include an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) to address

[13] Marin County GeoHub. 2020. *Landslide Map.* Available: https://gisopendata.marincounty.org/. Accessed February 25, 2020.
[14] Town of Corte Madera. 2009. *Public Safety and Hazards*. Available: https://www.townofcortemadera.org/DocumentCenter/View/269/Chapter-8---Public-Safety-and-Hazards-PDF?bidId=. Accessed February 25, 2020.

erosion and sediment control, pollution prevention, and final stabilization measures during construction activities. Measures outlined in the ESCP are required to follow the Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan's (MCSTOPPP) "Construction Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Applicant Package" for projects subject to minor and major grading permits, or as directed by the director of public works. For all other projects, adherence to the MCSTOPPP "Minimum Erosion/Sediment Control Measures for Small Construction Projects" would be required. Compliance with the Town's Grading and Drainage Ordinance would minimize erosion and topsoil loss. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

c) Be located on 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? (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact b), implementation of the project has a potential for risk of liquefaction. However, General Plan Policy PSH-8.2 and Implementation Program PSH-8.2.b require a geotechnical report prior to construction to evaluate and respond to site-specific geological hazards– including potential for slope failure, soil subsidence, and liquefaction – within the project site, and to recommend measures to minimize hazards. Geotechnical report mitigation often includes installation of deep foundation support piers (anchored to bedrock), installation of appropriate drainage and improvements, and seismic design provisions pursuant to the Uniform Building Code. With adherence to General Plan Policy PSH-8.2 and Implementation Program PSH-8.2.b, this impact would be less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? (No Impact)

Expansive soils are defined as soils that are prone to large volume changes in correlation with changes in moisture content. These typically contain larger proportions of clay soils which expand under wet conditions and condense when dried. The Natural Resources Conservation Survey (NRCS) classifies soil within the project site as Xerorthents-Urban land complex.[15] Xerorthents comprises of 95 percent of the soil, and is classified as a fine loamy soil, which typically contains less than 35 percent clay content, with silt and sand making up the remainder.[16] Both Xerorthents and Urban land complex are well drained. Due to the nature of the Xerorthents, and the classification of being well drained, it is unlikely that they soil is expansive. Therefore, the impact would be less-than-significant.

[15] United States Department of Agriculture, 2020. *Soil Map*. Available here: https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed March 3, 2020.
[16] University of Georgia, 2014. *Textural Classes Used in the Soils Family.* Available here: https://bugwoodcloud.org/bugwood/productivity/pdfs/Textural_Classes_Used_in_the_Family2017-8-30.pdf. Accessed: March 3, 2020.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (No Impact)

The project site would dispose of wastewater using existing wastewater infrastructure operated by the Town, and the project would not require septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

No known paleontological resources have been recorded at the project site or within the vicinity. Furthermore, the project site is fully developed with the existing Town Hall and surface parking. Given this, the probability of encountering paleontological resources is low. However, construction activities and ground-distributing activities could potentially destroy unknown paleontological resources within the project site. This represents a potentially significant impact, which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1**.

> **Mitigation Measure GEO-1**: A discovery of a paleontological specimen during any phase of the project shall result in a work stoppage in the vicinity of the find until it can be evaluated by a professional paleontologist. Should loss or damage be detected, additional protective measures or further action (e.g., resource removal), as determined by a professional paleontologist, shall be implemented to mitigate the impact.

4.8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases

GHGs are gaseous compounds that absorb and re-emit infrared radiation in the atmosphere. Unlike emissions of criteria and toxic air pollutants which have local or regional impacts, emissions of GHGs have a much broader, global impact. Global warming associated with the greenhouse gas effect is a process whereby GHGs accumulating in the atmosphere contribute to an increase in the temperature of the earth's atmosphere.

Gases that are widely seen as the principal contributors to human-induced climate change include carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxides (N_2O), fluorinated gases such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). Water vapor is excluded from the list of GHGs because it is short-lived in the atmosphere, and its atmospheric concentrations are largely determined by natural processes, such as oceanic evaporation. CO_2 and CH_4 are produced in the greatest quantities from human activities. Emissions of CO_2 are largely caused by fossil fuel combustion, whereas CH_4 emissions largely result from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Measurements of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) are used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based on their global warming potential.

Regulatory Setting

The Town prepared a Climate Action Plan (CAP) in March 2016. The CAP includes a 2005 baseline GHG emissions inventory, community-wide emissions inventory (2005-2013), municipal operations emissions inventory, and inventory forecasts for years 2020 and 2030.[17] The CAP contains the six standard elements of a 'qualified' GHG reduction strategy, as identified by the BAAQMD and consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. However, the CAP has not been submitted to the BAAQMD for review and determined to be a 'qualified' GHG reduction plan. As stated in the CAP on page 1: "this document does not and is not intended to create specific and enforceable obligations by the Town. Rather it is intended as a reference tool for possible future actions." Therefore, the CAP is not applicable to the project.

The California 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) released by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) provided strategies for meeting the near-term 2020 GHG emission reduction goals in Assembly Bill (AB) 32.[18] The first update to the Scoping Plan, approved in 2014, provided recommendations for establishing a mid-term emissions limit that aligns with the long-term (2050) goals of Executive Order S-3-05, which consists of reducing GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels. In 2016, the Legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 32, which codifies a 2030 GHG emissions reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels. The Scoping Plan provides a strategy for achieving the 2030 greenhouse gas target and establishing a path to reach the 2050 target.

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Less than Significant)

BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*[19] utilizes the bright-line numeric threshold of 1,100 metric tons per year (MT/yr) of CO_2e for determining whether a land use development project's operational GHG emissions are significant. The *CEQA Air Quality* Guidelines do not provide a numeric threshold for determining whether a project's construction-period GHG emissions

[17] Town of Corte Madera. 2016. *Climate Action Plan*. Available: https://www.townofcortemadera.org/DocumentCenter/View/2556/Climate-Action-Plan-March-2016?bidId=. Accessed February 2020.
[18] California Air Resources Board. 2017. *California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan*. Available: https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf. Accessed February 2020.
[19] Ibid.

would result in a significant impact. Thus, the same bright-line numeric threshold of 1,100 MT/yr of CO_2e was utilized for the purposes of evaluating the project's construction-period GHG emissions.

Project construction would result in temporary GHG emissions associated with equipment and vehicle trips to and from the site during the nine-month construction period. As shown in the California Emissions Estimator Model Results in **Appendix A**, overall project construction emissions would equate to 1,550 lbs/day CO2e, or approximately 193 MT/yr of CO2e. GHG emissions associated with construction of the project would not exceed the bright-line threshold of 1,100 MT/yr of CO2e.

Operational GHG emissions would occur over the lifespan of the project and would primarily be associated with employee vehicle trips as well as waste, water, and energy consumption required by Town Hall employees. Based on the **Appendix A** California Emissions Estimator Model Results, overall project operations would amount to 374 lbs/day CO2e, or approximately 62 MT/yr of CO2e. Thus, GHG emissions associated with project operation of the project would not exceed the bright-line threshold of 1,100 MT/yr of CO2e. This impact would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (No Impact)

The recommended actions in the Scoping Plan are broad policy and regulatory initiatives that are being implemented at the State level, regional planning level, or land use decisions made at the local level, and are not directly implemented by individual projects such as this project. Although project construction and operation may benefit from some of the state-level regulations and policies that would be implemented, the project would not impede the state developing or implementing the greenhouse gas reduction policies identified in the Scoping Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with AB 32, SB 32, or the Climate Change Scoping Plan. No impact would occur.

4.9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Less than Significant)

Worker safety regulations cover hazards related to the prevention of exposure to hazardous materials and a release to the environment from hazardous materials use. The California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) also enforces hazard communication program regulations, which contain worker safety training and hazard information requirements, such as procedures for identifying and labelling hazardous substances, communicating hazard information related to hazardous substances and their handling, and preparation of health and safety plans to protect workers and employees. Because contractors would be required to comply with existing and future hazardous materials laws and regulations covering the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, the impacts related to hazardous materials used during project construction would be less than significant.

Project operation would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials such as paints, oils, absorbents, cleaners, and pesticides for landscaping. All potentially hazardous materials used on the project site would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturer's instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. In accordance with federal and state law, the project would be required to disclose hazardous materials handled at reportable amounts. Given the above, impacts related to hazardous materials used during project operation would be less than significant.

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? (Less than Significant)

Historical Hazardous Material Release Sites

California's Department of Toxic Substances Control's Envirostor program lists two cleanup sites within a five-mile radius of the project site.[20] Of those sites, one is listed as a voluntary cleanup site, and the other is under evaluation. Both cleanup sites are over a mile from the project site and are unlikely to be encountered by the project. However, the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) GeoTracker database identified three nearby Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) cleanup sites near the project site:[21]

- **Corte Madera Fire Department (150 feet east of the project site).** The Corte Madera Fire Department reported a gasoline leak that affected groundwater in 1993. This case was opened in 1993 and closed in 2001.
- **Corte Madera Pump Station (200 feet southeast of the project site).** This site reported possible diesel contamination in the soil. This case was opened in 1993 and closed in 1997.
- **Arco (230 feet south of the project site).** A gasoline station reported waste oil, hydraulic fluid, and motor oil leaking in the groundwater. This case was opened in 1991 and closed in 1996.

These three hazardous material release sites have been closed by the appropriate regulatory agency. However, in this context, a 'closed site' indicates a release site where potential contaminants no longer pose a risk to existing land uses. Construction activities, such as site grading and excavation, may still encounter or release contaminants that pose a public health risk or environmental hazards.

The General Plan includes Implementation Program PSH-2.10.d, which requires that properties that are suspected or known to contain hazardous materials and sites that are listed on or identified on any hazardous material or waste database search are required to be reviewed, tested, and remediated for potential hazardous materials in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations. Implementation Program PSH-2.10.d would require assessment and, if necessary, remediation of potential hazardous materials concerns at the project site. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.

Asbestos- and Lead-Based Building Materials

The existing Town Hall structure was constructed before the 1975 Toxic Substances and Control Act, and therefore has the potential to contain asbestos and lead-based paint. Health hazards associated with asbestos include increased risks of cancer and respiratory-related illnesses and diseases, while lead may cause a range of health effects, including behavioral problems, learning

[20] California Department of Toxic Substances Control. EnviroStor. Available: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/profile_report?global_id=60001667. Accessed February 7, 2020.
[21] State Water Resources Control Board. Geotracker. Available: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/. Accessed on February 7, 2020.

disabilities, seizures, and death. Any asbestos-containing material found on site must be removed prior to demolition or renovation activity in accordance with BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2, including specific requirements for surveying, notification, removal, and disposal of material containing asbestos. Furthermore, the General Plan includes Policy RCS-10.3.c, which requires applicants to demonstrate compliance with applicable BAAQMD standards and procedures for mitigation the risk of exposure to lead paint and asbestos as a condition of project approval. Compliance with applicable federal, state, and local standards would reduce potential hazards associated with asbestos- and lead-based building materials. This impact would be less than significant.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Less than Significant)

Neil Cummins Elementary School is located within one-quarter mile of the project site. Project construction and operation would entail the use of potentially hazardous materials, including paint, building material finishing products, and automotive fluids. As discussed in **Section 4.3, Air Quality**, analysis of hazardous emissions associated with project construction and operation did not identify any significant effects. All other potentially hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturer's instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. In accordance with federal and state law, the project would be required to disclose hazardous materials handled at reportable amounts. As hazardous materials would be properly stored and disposed of on site, this impact would be less than significant.

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? (Less than Significant)

The existing Town Hall parcel (APN 024-136-15) is not included in the list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, the adjacent Corte Madera Fire Department parcel (APNs 024-136-14 and 024-136-13) is listed as a 'closed site' on the SWRCB GeoTracker database. The project would merge the existing Town Hall parcel with the adjacent Fire Department parcel; however, no subsurface disturbance activities would occur within the Fire Department parcel that could mobilize in situ contamination and thus result in a significant hazard. Furthermore, as discussed above, Implementation Program PSH – 2.10.d would require assessment and remediation of potential hazardous materials concerns at the project site, which would further reduce potential effects associated with hazardous material sites listed on Government Code Section 65962.5. This impact would be less than significant.

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (No Impact)

The San Rafael Airport is approximately 10 miles from the project site, and the project is not located within airport land use plan. No impact would occur.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Upon operation, the project site would operate in its existing configuration and would not impair emergency response or evacuation. However, project construction and staging activities could encroach into local roadways that facilitate emergency response and operations at the adjacent Fire Station. Access to the project site would be maintained throughout the construction period, but construction access to these staging areas could temporarily affect traffic circulation and emergency response from the adjacent Fire Station. This represents a potentially significant impact, reduced to less-than-significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1**.

> **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1**: the project proponent shall create a Traffic Control Plan to outline circulation routes and schedules for construction-period traffic. The Traffic Control Plan will include measures to avoid encroachment and disruption at emergency vehicle ingress/egress at the adjacent Fire Station and will be reviewed by the Fire Department staff prior to the onset of construction.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (Less than Significant)

According to the General Plan, the Town faces an ongoing threat from urban and wildland fire, caused by human activity and natural conditions. Wildland fire is a persistent threat to the hillside residential neighborhoods in Corte Madera where the wildland and residential areas intermix. However, the project site is fully developed and surrounded by urbanized land uses. As stated in **Section 4.20, Wildfire**, the project site is at a low risk for wildland fires and is not located within a Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ). Thus, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No impact would occur.

4.10. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐

c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	☐	☐	☒	☐
	i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
	ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☒	☐
	iii) 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; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
	iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

The project site does not include surface water features. The nearest body of surface water is a canal that connects to Corte Madera Creek; the canal is located 0.4 miles northeast of the project site. Groundwater is present at an estimated 5 to 10 feet below ground surface.[22] According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps, the project site is located in an area classified as Zone X. Zone X is defined as an area outside the 1-percent annual chance floodplain, areas of 1-percent annual chance sheet flow flooding where average depths are less than 1 foot, areas of 1-percent annual chance stream flooding where the contributing drainage area is less than 1 square mile, or areas protected from 1-percent annual chance flood by levees.[23]

The project site is located at the edge of a Department of Water Resources (DWR) groundwater sub-basin 2-028, Ross Valley. The Ross Valley groundwater sub-basin has been designated as

[22] Town of Corte Madera. 2008. *Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Town of Corte Madera General Plan.* Available: https://www.townofcortemadera.org/DocumentCenter/View/267/Cover-through-Table-of-Contents-PDF?bidId=. Accessed February 2020.

[23] Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2019. *FEMA Flood Map Service Center. Panel No. 06081C0153F*. Available: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=Corte%20Madera#searchresultsanchor. Accessed February 2020.

very low priority under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).[24] Currently, there are no conditions present in this basin (i.e overdraft, population growth pressure, water quality problems) that could threaten sustainability of this basin aquifer. The status of the Ross Valley groundwater basin indicates that preparation of a groundwater sustainability plan is not required.

Discussion

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? (Less than Significant)

Construction

CMMC Chapter 15.20 is the Town's Grading and Drainage Ordinance, which establishes administrative procedures, minimum standards of review, and the implementation and enforcement procedures for controlling erosion, sedimentation, and other pollutant runoff. The intent of the ordinance is to minimize damage to surrounding properties and public rights-of-way, the degradation of the water quality of water courses, and the disruption of natural or Town-authorized drainage flows caused by construction activities, and to comply with the provisions of the Town's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit.

As discussed under Impact b) in **Section 4.7, Geology and Soils**, the project shall require an erosion control permit prior to the commencement of grading in accordance with CMMC Chapter 15.20. The standards for the ESCP required prior to erosion control permit approval are required to conform to the MCSTOPPP "Construction Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Applicant Package" for projects that are subject to minor and major grading permits or as directed by the director of public works. For all other projects, compliance with the MCSTOPPP "Minimum Erosion/Sediment Control Measures for Small Construction Projects" shall be required. Adherence to the Town's Grading and Drainage Ordinance would eliminate the risk for water quality degradation during project construction, and this impact would be less than significant.

Operation

The project site is covered with impervious surfaces and existing storm water runoff from the project site is directed to the Town's storm water collection system. Discharged water flows into Corte Madera Creek and ultimately drains into the San Francisco Bay. Project implementation may increase the amount of impervious surface at the project site by converting small areas of ornamental landscaping to hardscape. However, implementation of the project would be subject to CMMC Section 9.33.100(d), which requires the appliance of permanent storm water controls for both new and redevelopment. This would entail the project be subject to specific site design measures, source controls, and storm water treatment requirements outlined in the *Bay Area Storm-water Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) Post- Construction Manual*,

[24] California Department of Water Resources. 2019. *SGMA Basin Prioritization.* Available: https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Basin-Prioritization. Accessed: March 2020.

depending on the amount of impervious surface created or replaced by the project. [25] The project is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in impervious surfaces at the project site and would be designed in compliance with the necessary storm water control regulations. Thus, the project would not violate water quality standards or degrade water quality. This impact would be less than significant.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (Less than Significant)

The project site does not utilize groundwater resources and would continue to be served by the Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD), which administers the Town's water supply and conveyance system. MMWD obtains 75 percent of its water supply from 21,600 acres of protected watershed in seven reservoirs on Mt. Tamalpais, and the rest is imported from the Russian River in Sonoma County.[26] Operation of the project would not directly utilize groundwater; the paved project site is mostly impervious and does not directly contribute to the groundwater recharge in Marin County. Construction and operation of the project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge due to small amount of pervious area at the project site. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Less than Significant)

Project implementation would not alter the existing course of a stream river, or waterway, and would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns because no such resource exists within the project site. However, construction would include grading and other activities that would result in ground disturbance. As described in Impact a), project construction would comply with CMMC Chapter 15.20, which requires issuance of an erosion control permit prior to grading activities. The erosion control permit would require, at a minimum, compliance with MCSTOPPP "Minimum Erosion/Sediment Control Measures for Small Construction Projects", which would minimize potential erosion or siltation during construction. This impact would be less than significant.

[25] Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association Pahe II Committee. 2019. *BASMAA Post-Construction Manual*. Available: https://www.countyofnapa.org/DocumentCenter/View/3014/BASMAA-Post-Construction-Manual-PDF. Accessed March 2020.
[26] Marin Municipal Water District. *Where Your Water Comes From*. Available: https://www.marinwater.org/461/Where-Your-Water-Comes-From. Accessed December 24, 2019.

ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite

AND

iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Less than Significant)

Project implementation would involve installation of small areas of new impervious surfaces, and it is not anticipated that the project would substantially increase the amount of impervious surface at the project site. Therefore, the additional impervious surface would not cause significant increases in runoff, nor increase the rate of runoff such that the on-site or -off site would result in flooding or result in the exceedance in of stormwater drainage system capacity. Furthermore, as described in Impact a), the project would comply with CMMC Section 9.33.100(d) to implement permanent stormwater controls, as needed. This impact would be less than significant.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows? (Less than Significant)

The project site is categorized as Flood Zone X, which is defined as an area outside the 1-percent annual chance floodplain, and has a low risk of flooding due to elevation level; the potential for the project to impede or redirect flood flows would be low. This impact would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (Less than Significant)

The project site is approximately 11 miles away from the Pacific Coast, and 2 miles away from San Francisco Bay. The project site is not located within a tsunami inundation zone, and the risk of damage due to a tsunami at the project site is low.[27]

Large earthquakes have the potential to generate oscillating waves in enclosed bodies of water (seiche), such as bays, lakes, and reservoirs. The project site is not located in the immediate vicinity of San Francisco Bay, and therefore there is a low probability of a seiche affecting the project site.

The project site is located within a Flood Zone X, outside of the 1-percent annual chance floodplain. Thus, the risk for flood hazards at the project site is low.

Give the above, the project site would have a low likelihood to release pollutants due to inundation. These impacts would be less than significant.

[27] California Department of Conservation. *Tsunami Inundation Map San Rafael Quadrangle/ San Quentin Quadrangle*. Available: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Tsunami/Maps/Tsunami_Inundation_SanRafaelSanQuentin_Quads_Marin.pdf. Accessed December 30, 2019.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (Less than Significant)

The Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) *San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)* contains descriptions of the legal, technical, and programmatic bases of water quality regulation in the San Francisco Bay region.[28] As discussed in Impact a), the project would comply with CMMC Chapter 15.20, which would avoid potential water quality impacts during construction. All the groundwater basins within Marin County are designated as very low priority basins by the DWR, and thus a sustainable groundwater management plan does not exist for Marin County. Therefore, the project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. This impact would be less than significant.

4.11. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

The project site's General Plan land use designation, including the two adjacent parcels proposed for lot merging, is P/SP Facilities. P/SP Facilities applies to all public facilities, semipublic facilities, public service installations not designated as flood control and drainage facilities, or parks, open space and natural habitat.

According to the CMMC, the project site's zoning designation is P/SP Facilities District. This designation applies to all public facilities, semipublic facilities, and public service installations not designated as flood control and drainage facilities, or parks, open space and natural habitat. This zoning district allows for facilities, including buildings and grounds that are owned, leased, or operated by the Town, with an approved CUP.

The General Plan includes two policies relevant to the Town Hall: Policy LU-6.7 includes the creation of a Town Commons Plan that provides for improvements to the Town Hall area, and

[28] California Regional Water Quality Control Board – San Francisco Bay Region. 2007. *San Francisco Bay Basin (Region 2) Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan).* Available: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb2/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/basin_plan07.pdf. Accessed March 2020.

Goal LU-3 allows for redevelopment infill in the Town Commons Plan to ensure that infill projects meet the community's needs.

Discussion

a) Physically divide an established community? (No Impact)

The urbanized project site is surrounded by residential, commercial, and public facility land uses. The project would expand an existing public facility but would remain compatible with the pattern of surrounding land uses and would not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Less than Significant)

The project would be consistent with the P/SP Facilities General Plan land use designation and P/SP Facilities District zoning designation. The project includes a lot line adjustment and variances for building heights, setbacks, and the number of parking spaces. However, these entitlements would not conflict with Town policies adopted for the purpose of mitigating environmental impacts. In addition, the project would pursue a CUP, consistent with the requirements for development within P/SP Facilities District zoning designation. Project implementation would also adhere to Policy LU-6.7 related to Town Commons development, and policies described within Goal LU-3 pertaining to infill development. Given the above, this impact would be less than significant.

4.12. Mineral Resources

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

The California Geological Survey is responsible under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act for classifying land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) based on the known or inferred mineral resources potential of that land. The project site is classified as an MRZ-1 zone, which is defined as "areas where geological information indicates no significant mineral deposits

are present."[29] Therefore, the project would not impact mineral resources that would be of value to the region or residents of the state. No impact would occur.

4.13. Noise

Would the project result in:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

Rincon Consultants prepared a Noise and Vibration Study in 2020 (**Appendix C**) to analyze the project's potential noise and vibration impacts. This study is incorporated by reference.

Noise levels are commonly measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound pressure levels so that they are consistent with the human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (Hz) and less sensitive to frequencies around and below 100 Hz. [30] Decibels are measured on a logarithmic scale that quantifies sound intensity in a manner similar to the Richter scale used to measure earthquake magnitudes. A doubling of the energy of a noise source, such as a doubling of traffic volume, would increase the noise level by 3 dB; similarly, dividing the energy in half would result in a decrease of 3 dB.[31]

[29] California Department of Conservation. *Guidelines for Classification and Designation of Mineral Lands*. Available: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/mlc/. Accessed: December 24, 2019.
[30] Kinsler, Lawrence E. and R. Frey, Austin and B. Coppens, Alan and V. Sanders, James. 1999. *Fundamentals of Acoustics, 4th Edition*, ISBN 0-471-84789-5. Wiley-VCH, December 1999.
[31] Crocker, Malcolm J. Crocker (Editor). 2007. *Handbook of Noise and Vibration Control Book*, ISBN: 978-0-471-39599-7, Wiley-VCH, October.

Project Noise Setting

The most common source of noise in the project vicinity is vehicular traffic on Tamalpais Drive, which borders the project site to the south, and Willow Avenue, which is west of the project site. Ambient noise levels are generally highest during the daytime and peak hour, unless congestion substantially slows traffic speeds.

To characterize ambient sound levels at and near the project site, two 15-minute sound level measurements were conducted on Tuesday, February 4, 2020, between 11:07 a.m. and 11:45 a.m. The first noise measurement (NM 1) was taken at the project site adjacent to Tamalpais Drive, and the second noise measurement (NM 2) was taken at the project site adjacent to Willow Avenue. **Table 7** summarizes the results of the noise measurements.

Table 7 Project Vicinity Sound Level Monitoring Results

NM #	Measurement Location	Sample Times	L_{eq} (dBA)	L_{min} (dBA)	L_{max} (dBA)
NM 1	Tamalpais Drive	11:07 – 11:22 a.m.	70.6	52.8	84.6
NM 2	Willow Avenue	11:30 – 11:45 a.m.	60.8	42.7	87.4

Sensitive Receivers

Noise exposure goals for various types of land uses reflect the varying noise sensitivities associated with those uses. Noise-sensitive receivers generally include residences, schools, nursing homes, hospitals, and day care operations, as indicated in the General Plan. Vibration-sensitive receivers are similar to noise-sensitive receivers and include residences and institutional uses, such as schools, churches, and hospitals, as well as buildings where vibrations may interfere with vibration-sensitive equipment that may be affected by vibration well below those associated with human annoyance (e.g., recording studies or medical facilities with sensitive equipment). The nearest sensitive receivers in the project vicinity are single-family dwellings located adjacent to the project site to the north and south across Tamalpais Drive.

Regulatory Setting

Town of Corte Madera General Plan Public Safety and Hazards Element

The goals, policies, and actions contained in the General Plan Public Safety and Hazards Element focus on establishing and applying criteria for acceptable noise levels for different land uses in order to minimize the negative impacts of noise, especially at sensitive receivers. The General Plan includes maximum levels for traffic noise and non-transportation noise which are shown in **Appendix C**. The General Plan also includes the following policies and implementation programs related to the project:

Policy PSH-5.5: Emergency vehicle and similar noise sources shall be exempt from provisions of the General Plan noise standards.

- *Implementation Program PSH–5.5.a: Emergency Exemptions*: Noise from emergency vehicles, generators used in emergency periods (such as power outages), and similar short-

term noises are exempt from Town noise standards. Include provisions in updated Noise Ordinance.

Policy PSH – 5.7: Reduce noise impacts from construction activities.

- *Implementation Program PSH–5.7.a: Construction Time Restrictions.* Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays, and 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends, unless an exemption is first obtained from the Town in response to special circumstances. Include provisions in the Noise Ordinance.

Corte Madera Municipal Code

The Town implements and enforces construction and operational noise regulations through CMMC Chapter 9.36. CMMC Section 9.36.030 limits noise from mechanical devices (including pumps, fans, air conditioning units, or other devices) from emitting noise 25 dBA above the ambient noise level for more than 10 minutes per hour, 30 dBA above the ambient noise level for more than 3 minutes per hour, and 40 dBA above the ambient noise level for any amount of time in residential zoning districts. These standards are not applicable to construction and demolition activities performed on weekdays between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. and weekends 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., provided all powered construction equipment is equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers. The CMMC also requires pavement breakers and jackhammers to be equipped with acoustical attenuating shields or shrouds.

CMMC Section 9.36.040 restricts leaf blower usage on nonresidential properties to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays and between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. on Saturdays, with no usage allowed on Sundays and holidays.

Nighttime noise is limited by CMMC Section 9.36.050. Between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., excessive or offensive noise that disturbs the peace or quiet of any neighborhood or is unreasonably disturbing to a person of ordinary sensitivities residing in the area is unlawful. This includes mechanical noises that do not exceed the levels set forth in Section 9.36.030.

Discussion

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Temporary Construction Noise Impacts

Because the Town does not maintain a numeric construction noise threshold, construction noise would be considered significant if it exceeds construction noise standards provided by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). A significant impact would occur if the two noisiest pieces of construction equipment for each phase of construction exceed 90 dBA L_{eq} at residences, or 100 dBA L_{eq} at commercial or industrial buildings during daytime hours, and 80 dBA L_{eq} at residences or 100 dBA L_{eq} at commercial or industrial buildings during nighttime hours.

Construction activity would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an intermittent basis and, as such, would expose surrounding sensitive receivers to increased noise levels. Noise levels would fluctuate depending on the construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of noise attenuation barriers.

The nearest sensitive land use to the project site are residences located approximately 50 feet from the center of the project site. As described in **Appendix C**, at a distance of 50 feet, one dozer and one concrete saw would generate a noise level of approximately 83.8 dBA L_{eq}. Construction noise levels of 83.8 dBA L_{eq} would not exceed the FTA threshold of 90 dBA L_{eq} at residences during daytime hours but would exceed the FTA threshold of 80 dBA L_{eq} at residences during nighttime hours. There are no commercial or industrial land uses within 50 feet of the project site, and the 100 dBA daytime and nighttime threshold for commercial and industrial land uses during construction would not apply.

Construction will be limited to daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays and 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends, per CMMC Section 9.36.030(b). The limitation of construction hours to the daytime hours established in the CMMC would ensure that no construction noise would occur during the nighttime, and the FTA's nighttime construction noise threshold would not be exceeded. Therefore, impacts related to construction noise would be less than significant.

On-Site Operational Noise

On-site operational noise would include parking lot noise and people conversing noise on the site, nighttime noise, as well as noise from mechanical equipment, including HVAC units and the emergency generator.

Daytime Noise

Project operation would include conversational noise, parking lot noise, and noise associated with maintenance activities (e.g. leaf blowers) during the day. Although operational on-site noise would incrementally increase due to the increase in employees, the project would generally operate in the same configuration as the existing Town Hall. Thus, there would be no substantial noise increase from on-site sources. This impact would be less than significant.

Nighttime Noise

A significant nighttime noise impact would occur if excessive and offensive noise occurs between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. (CMMC Section 9.36.050). The project would not increase the nighttime usage of the project site, as the Town Hall generally operates during daytime hours. Nighttime meetings in the Town Hall for Town Council, special events, Planning Commission, and other meetings would continue to occur, with only minimal increases in frequency of nighttime use anticipated as a part of the project. Therefore, the project would not increase nighttime noise above existing conditions, and impacts related to nighttime noise would be less than significant.

Mechanical Equipment Noise

A significant impact from mechanical equipment would occur if noise emitted would exceed 25 dBA above the ambient noise level for more than 10 minutes per hour, 30 dBA above the ambient noise level for more than 3 minutes per hour, and 40 dBA above the ambient noise level for any amount of time at the adjacent residences.

Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning Noise

The project would include the addition of new rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. There are existing HVAC systems operating on the Town Hall building and their noise was captured in the noise measurements taken at the site on February 4, 2020. The existing HVAC units would be fully replaced by new HVAC units, which would likely be quieter than the existing ones due to technological advances. New HVAC equipment would increase the existing ambient noise level of 60.8 dBA L_{eq} (NM 2, see **Table 7**) on the adjacent property to approximately 66.2 dBA L_{eq}, which would be an increase of approximately 5.4 dBA. An increase in ambient noise levels of 5.4 dBA is less than the permitted 25-dBA increase in ambient noise from operation of mechanical equipment for more than 10 minutes per hour. Therefore, impacts related to new HVAC equipment noise would be less than significant.

Emergency Generator Noise

The project would include one backup emergency generator on the project site. The location of the generator has not been determined; for the purposes of this analysis, it was conservatively assumed to be located adjacent to the Town Hall structure along the northern-facing edge of the building, approximately 35 feet from the nearest residence. The generator would emit a noise level of 98.7 dBA at 23 feet.[32] Generator operation would be approximately 95 dBA at the nearest residence 35 feet away. The proposed generator would be used only during an emergency. Per CMMC Section 9.36.050(b), emergency generator noise is exempt from the Town's Noise Ordinance standards. However, periodic testing and maintenance of the generator would occur several times a year to ensure the generator is in proper working order. Testing of the generators would occur no more than 50 hours annually, per the BAAQMD's Authority to Construct.

Generator noise of approximately 95 dBA at the nearest noise sensitive receivers would exceed ambient noise levels of 61 dBA (NM 2, see **Table 7**) by approximately 34 dBA. Therefore, the Town's noise threshold of 25 dBA above the ambient noise level for more than 10 minutes per hour would be exceeded (CMMC Section 9.36.030) and emergency generator noise would result in a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** is therefore required to ensure a noise reduction of at least 10 dBA from the generator is achieved to ensure that noise levels at the nearest receivers do not exceed the threshold of 25 dBA above ambient noise.

[32] MTU Onsite Energy. 2017. *Engineer's Guidebook: A Complete Product Listing*. Available: https://3gc4k42yztlq3nust52pnm72-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/EngineersGuidebookUpdate102017.pdf. Accessed February 2020.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: The generator shall be installed with implementation of one or more of the following options to reduce noise during maintenance and testing:

- Install a sound attenuation enclosure around the generator. Depending on the design and materials used, sound attenuation enclosures can reduce the generator noise from 10 dBA to 40 dBA.[33] The sound attenuation enclosure shall provide at minimum a 10 dBA noise reduction; or
- Include an exhaust silencer on the emergency generator. Depending on the design, silencers can reduce generator noise from 10 dBA to 40 dBA.[34] The silencer shall provide at minimum a 10 dBA noise reduction; or
- The generator shall be positioned on the project site at least 105 feet from nearby noise sensitive receivers.

The installation of a sound enclosure and/or exhaust silencer would adequately reduce the generator noise by a minimum of 10 dBA, which would reduce generator noise to 85 dBA at the nearest noise sensitive receiver. A noise level of 85 dBA would be approximately 24 dBA above the ambient noise level of 61 dBA. Therefore, implementation of a sound enclosure or exhaust silencer would ensure generator noise does not exceed the threshold of 25 dBA above the ambient noise level for more than 10 minutes per hour at the nearest receivers.

Placement of the generator at least 105 feet from the nearest sensitive receivers would reduce generator noise to 85.5 dBA at 105 feet. The relocated generator noise would be reduced to 85.5 dBA at 105 feet, which is 24.5 dBA above the ambient noise level of approximately 61 dBA. Therefore, relocation of the generator would ensure generator noise does not exceed the threshold of 25 dBA above the ambient noise level.

With implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-1**, noise impacts from the proposed emergency generator would be less than significant.

Off-Site Traffic Noise

The project would generate new vehicle trips and increase traffic on area roadways. As discussed in **Section 4.17, Transportation**, the project would add approximately 45 average daily trips to nearby roadways. While there are two entrances to the project site, Willow Avenue currently experiences fewer daily trips; therefore, all of these new trips were added to Willow Avenue to provide an off-site traffic noise analysis under worst-case scenario assumptions.

The project's contribution to roadway noise was evaluated through a calculation by comparing existing traffic noise levels to traffic noise levels with operation of the project. Generally, a doubling of traffic (i.e., 100 percent traffic increase) would increase noise levels by approximately 3 dBA, which is the human level of perception for an increase in noise.[35] The 45 daily trips added by the project would constitute an approximately 22.5 percent increase in traffic volume along Willow Avenue, assuming all traffic generated by the project would travel

[33] Worldwide Power Products. 2020. *Noise Pollution in Diesel Generators*. Available: https://www.wpowerproducts.com/news/diesel-generator-noise-pollution/. Accessed February 2020.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.

along Willow Avenue. Even under this worst-case scenario, traffic volume increase would not result in a noise increase of more than 3 dBA. Such an increase would be imperceptible and would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Thus, impacts related to off-site traffic noise would be less than significant.

b) Would the project result in excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? (Less than Significant)

The Town has not adopted a significance threshold to assess vibration impacts during construction and operation. Therefore, the FTA guidelines set forth in the *FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual* (2018) are used to evaluate potential construction vibration impacts related to both potential building damage and human annoyance. Based on the FTA criteria, construction vibration impacts would be significant if construction vibration levels exceed 100 vibration decibels (VdB), which is the general threshold at which damage can occur to fragile buildings, or 72 VdB at residences during nighttime hours.[36]

The project does not include substantial vibration sources associated with operation. Thus, construction activities have the greatest potential to generate ground-borne vibration affecting nearby receivers. Project construction would potentially utilize vibratory equipment including loaders, bulldozers, and concrete saws. The nearest structure to the project site is a residence located approximately 40 feet to the northwest from the project site. As shown in **Table 8**, ground-borne vibration from typical sources of construction equipment would not exceed the 100 VdB threshold for fragile buildings. As stated previously, CMMC Section 9.36.030(b) limits construction to daytime hours; therefore, construction would not exceed the 72 VdB threshold for vibration during nighttime hours. This impact would be less than significant.

Table 8 Vibration Levels at Sensitive Receptors

Equipment	Estimated VdB at 40 feet
Large bulldozer	81
Loaded trucks	80
Jackhammer	73
Small bulldozer	52

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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? (No Impact)

The nearest airport to the project site is the San Rafael Airport, located approximately ten miles north. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip or airport land use plan. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No impact would occur.

[36] Ibid.

4.14. Population and Housing

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

According to the California Department of Finance (DOF), the population of the Town in 2019 was 10,047.[37] The General Plan predicts that the Town's population will grow by approximately 25 people per year between 2020 and 2040 for a total of around 10,547 residents by 2040.

Discussion

a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)? (Less than Significant)

The project involves an Addition to the existing Town Hall building and does not include the construction of residential units. The project would facilitate the addition of six additional jobs in the Town; however, this would not trigger substantial unplanned population growth. This impact would be less than significant.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (No Impact)

As discussed in **Section 4.11, Land Use and Planning**, the project site is designated for P/SP Facilities land use and does not contain existing residences. As such, the project would not displace existing people or housing, and no impact would occur.

[37] California Department of Finance. 2019. *E-5 Population and Housing Elements for Cities Counties, and the Sate, 2011-2019 with 2010 Census Benchmark*. Available: http://www.dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/Estimates/e-5/. Accessed December 30, 2019.

4.15. Public Services

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
ii) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
v) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

The project does not include any residential components that would induce population growth or increase demand for public series, including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities.

The existing Town Hall is a public facility, and as described in the Project Description, would be under construction for approximately nine months. During this time, Town business would continue to operate from the existing Town Hall structure. Furthermore, potential adverse physical impacts associated with provision of a physically altered governmental facility – the Corte Madera Town Hall Addition – are evaluated herein.

The project site is located next to the Fire Station. The project construction could interfere with emergency egress from this facility. **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1** would require a Traffic Control Plan to outline circulation routes and schedules for construction-period traffic, which would be reviewed by the Fire Department staff prior to the onset of construction activities.

Implementation of this **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1** would avoid interference with the Fire Station. Given the above, this impact would be less than significant.

4.16. Recreation

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

The project does not include residential development that would induce permanent population growth and increase demand for recreational facilities. The Town Park parking lot would be offered for additional off-site parking during construction, but this use would not permanently increase usage nor require the expansion of recreational facilities such that there would be adverse physical effects on the environment. This impact would be less than significant.

4.17. Transportation

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

Fehr & Peers prepared a Transportation Assessment in 2020 (**Appendix D**) to analyze the project's potential transportation impacts. This study is incorporated by reference. To document and evaluate existing conditions, 24-hour roadway counts were collected on Tamalpais Drive east of the project site on Wednesday, February 26, 2020. In addition, residential zip code data was obtained to assess the average distance for work trips made by current Town employees.

Discussion

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? (Less than Significant)

Transit

According to Policy CIR-1.8 of the General Plan, a transit impact is considered significant if it would result in a substantial unanticipated increase in transit patronage or would result in development that is inaccessible to transit riders. A project is considered inaccessible if the distance required to walk between the site and the nearest transit station is substantially longer than 0.25-mile. Based on Town employee travel surveys, it is unlikely that new employee trips generated by the project would commute using transit, and thus the project would generate a minimal increase in demand for transit service. Additionally, the project site is located within 0.25-mile of the Marin/Golden Gate Transit stop at Tamalpais Drive and Redwood Avenue. This impact would be less than significant.

Bicycle

Tamalpais Drive features a Class II bike lane westbound and a Class III bike lane eastbound. Approximately 100 yards east from the project site, bicycle facilities on Tamalpais Drive connect to the Corte Madera-Larkspur Class I bicycle path. This bicycle path is part of the North-South Greenway as displayed in the Marin County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (MCBPP).

Based on General Plan Policy CIR-3.1, a bicycle impact is considered significant if it would disrupt existing bicycle facilities, interfere with planned bicycle facilities, conflict or create inconsistencies with adopted bicycle system plans, guidelines, policies or standards, or not provide secure and safe bicycle parking in adequate proportion to anticipated demanded. As depicted in **Section 1, Figure 1**, there would be temporary construction staging areas located adjacent to the project site along Tamalpais Drive, which could encroach the Class II bike lane to a Class II bike facility during construction. However, this temporary encroachment would only occur during project construction, and bicycle access and circulation would be fully restored upon project operation. Furthermore, the construction-period Traffic Control Plan prepared for the project would address bicycle safety and circulation during with construction

Project operation would not conflict with adopted bicycle system plans, guidelines, policies, and standards, including those discussed in the MCBPP. During operation, the project would not interfere with the Class III bike lane or Class I bike path along Tamalpais Drive. Project-generated traffic would result in a 0.25 percent increase in traffic volumes in Tamalpais Drive, and would

not significantly affect bicyclist safety nor frequency of collisions due to increased traffic volumes. This impact would be less than significant.

Pedestrian

Existing pedestrian facilities include sidewalks along roadways adjacent to the project, striped crosswalks along Tamalpais Drive, and pedestrian access into and out of the project site. Additionally, the Tamalpais Drive and Willow Avenue intersection includes continental striped crosswalks with flashing beacons and red flags to improve pedestrian visibility. General Plan Policy CIR-1.6 and Policy CIR-3.5 states a pedestrian impact is considered significant if implementation of the project would disrupt pedestrian activities, interfere with planned pedestrian facilities, or create inconsistencies with adopted pedestrian system plans, guidelines, policies, or standards. In addition, the MCBPP provides a recommended Town-wide network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and improvements to better integrate these modes within the overall transportation network for the Town.

Project construction would involve temporary construction staging areas located adjacent to the project site along Tamalpais Drive, as depicted in **Section 1, Figure 1**, which could potentially encroach on sidewalks. However, this temporary encroachment would only occur during project construction, and pedestrian access and circulation would be fully restored upon project operation. Furthermore, the construction-period Traffic Control Plan prepared for the project would address pedestrian safety and circulation during with construction.

Project operation would not interfere with pedestrian facilities, including sidewalks adjacent to the project as well as flashing beacons and red flags for pedestrian visibility at the Tamalpais Drive and Willow Avenue intersection. Additionally, the project would be compliant would be compliant with all adopted pedestrian system plans, guidelines, policies, and standards, including the MCBPP. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? (Less than Significant)

The Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* recommends a 110 daily trip screening threshold for small projects. If there is no substantial evidence that the project would generate a potentially significant level of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), projects that generate vehicle trips below this screening threshold can be presumed to result in less-than-significant vehicle miles traveled (VMT) impacts.[38]

The project's VMT estimates were developed using trip generation methodology provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition*. **Table 9** presents the project's trip generation for the daily, AM peak our, and PM peak hour periods. As shown in **Table 9**, the project is anticipated to generate 45 daily trips, and thus does not exceed the OPR's 110 daily trip screening threshold.

[38] "vehicle miles traveled" refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project.

Table 9 Project Trip Generation

Land Use	Trip Rates			Trips		
	Daily	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Daily	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Government Office Building (6 employees)	7.45	1.10	0.71	45	7	5

To further verify that the project would not substantially increase VMT, the average distance for project-generated home-based trips[39] was compared to the average distance for home-based work trips in Marin County using data from the employee travel surveys and output from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission travel behavior forecasting model. Existing Town employee travel survey data indicates that the average distance for project-generated home-based work trips is 6.5 miles, whereas the average distance for home-based work trips in Marin County is 8.9 miles. Since the average distance for project-generated home-based work trips would be shorter than the average distance for home-based work trips in Marin County, it can be presumed that the project would not exceed the OPR's VMT screening threshold. Given the above, this impact would be less than significant.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Less than Significant)

Project implementation would not entail the permanent alteration of roadway or automobile circulation, and thus there would not be increases in hazards due to geometric design features. Construction and staging activities could encroach into local roadways; however, **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1** includes implementation of a Traffic Control Plan, which would include measures to avoid and minimize hazards during construction. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Less than Significant)

An emergency vehicle access impact would be significant if the project would provide inadequate design features to accommodate emergency vehicle access and circulation. The Fire Station is located approximately 200 feet of the proposed project. **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1** would include implementation of a Traffic Control Plan that would include measures to avoid encroachment and disruption at the adjacent Fire Station during project construction activities. Additionally, project-generated traffic would constitute around a 0.25 percent increase in traffic volumes along Tamalpais Drive, and would not result in a significant change to emergency response times. During operation, project site layout and access points would remain unchanged. Therefore, the project's impact on emergency access would be less than significant.

[39] Home-based work trips are defined as trips made between a home location and a work location. Other trip types (such as trips made between a work location a retail location) are not included in this calculation.

4.18. Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
• i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

Tribal cultural resources are sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a tribe that are listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the national, state, or local register of historical resources. Additionally, a tribal resource may also be a resource that the lead agency determines, in its discretion, is a tribal cultural resource.

The Sacred Lands File, operated by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), is a confidential set of records containing places of religious or social significance to Native Americans. Circlepoint requested a Sacred Lands File search for the project site from the NAHC on January 17, 2020 (included as **Appendix E**). The NAHC response on January 27, 2020 indicated that no known Native American cultural resources exist within the project vicinity, although the absence of specific site information in the Sacred Lands File does not indicate the absence of Native American cultural resources in the project vicinity. Included in the response

was a list of three Native American representatives who could provide site-specific knowledge on local Native American cultural resources.

To help determine whether a project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, Circlepoint contacted the California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project. On February 19, 2020, Circlepoint submitted a request to the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and the Guidiville Indian Rancheria for further information regarding potential tribal resources within the project vicinity. The correspondence contained information about the project; an inquiry for any unrecorded Native American cultural resources or other areas of concern within or adjacent to the project site; and a solicitation of comments, questions, or concerns with regard to the project. Circlepoint did not receive responses to this notice.

Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)? (Less than Significant)

AND

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. (Less than Significant)

As discussed in **Section 4.5, Cultural Resources**, the project site does not contain any known sites or structures eligible for listing in the CRHR. The Historic Assessment conducted for the project did not identify historic resources on the project site. The Native American tribes contacted during the consultation process initiated on February 19, 2020 did not identify protected resources on the project site. Although Native American and historic-period archaeological resources have the potential to be discovered on the project site, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce potential impacts during construction. This impact would be less than significant.

4.19. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD) administers Corte Madera's water system. MMWD obtains 75 percent of its water supply from 21,600 acres of protected watershed in seven reservoirs on Mt. Tamalpais, and the rest is imported from the Russian River in Sonoma County.[40] Generally, 59 percent of water consumption is from single-family residential units, 16 percent by multi-family residential units, 13 percent is by commercial uses, 6 percent by institutional and governmental uses, and 6 percent by landscape uses.[41]

Corte Madera is serviced by Sanitary District No.2 for its water and wastewater system. Wastewater flows to the Wastewater Treatment Plant at 1301 Andersen Drive, San Rafael. The treatment of sanitary sewer flow is provided by Central Marin Sanitation Agency (CMSA).

[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid.

Corte Madera's stormwater systems consists of a series of storm drains, catch basins, manholes, inlets, storm drainpipes, pump stations, detention basins and other features located throughout the Town. The Town also has ten separate watersheds for the management of storm drainage. The watersheds drain via nine local pump stations and/or adjacent wetlands of the San Francisco Bay.[42]

Mill Valley Refuse Center provides solid waste, recycling, and organic materials collection, transportation, and disposal services to the Town. Mill Valley Refuse hauls recyclables and organic solid waste to the Mill Valley Refuse center in San Rafael for sorting. Solid waste is sent to the Mill Valley owned landfill.

The Town owns the potable waterline from the MMWD water meter to the structure and the private sewer lateral from the Sanitary District No. 2 sewer main to the structure, which provide water and wastewater service to the project site. The project site is connected to the Town's utility infrastructure which includes an existing domestic water service line and a sanitary sewer line. The project would also connect to existing natural gas and electricity lines. Stormwater at the site would drain into an existing catch basin on Tamalpais Road that connects to the stormwater line, and the new building would tie-in to this existing line to convey stormwater infrastructure.

Discussion

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Less than Significant)

Interconnections to the Town's water, wastewater drainage, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities would remain in their current configuration after project implementation. New utility features, which include photovoltaic cells on the Town Hall roof, electric vehicle charging stations in the parking lot, and a rainwater catchment system for landscaping irrigation would be added. The Town Hall Addition could result in an addition of six new employees, but this growth would negligibly affect utility demand on the project site and would not significantly alter the existing utility infrastructure servicing the project site such that it would result in a significant environmental effect. As such, this impact would be less than significant.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? (Less than Significant)

The Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD) provides water supplies to the existing Town Hall and would continue services to the Town Hall Addition. According to the General Plan EIR, MMWD would have adequate water supply to accommodate growth projected in the General Plan. Implementation of the project would be consistent with planned growth anticipated in the

[42] Town of Corte Madera. *Corte Madera's FEMA 100-year Floodplain*. Available: https://www.townofcortemadera.org/DocumentCenter/View/260/Section-48-PDF?bidId=. Accessed December 26, 2019.

General Plan under Policy LU-6.7, which includes consideration of the upgrade and expansion of the Town Hall and Council Chambers. This impact would be less than significant.

c) 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? (Less than Significant)

Implementation of the project would increase the capacity of the Town Hall to allow for the addition of up to six additional staff members, which would result in a negligible increase in wastewater when compared to existing Town Hall wastewater generation. Thus, the increase in staff members would be unlikely to exceed regional wastewater treatment capacity. This impact would be less than significant.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? (Less than Significant)

Project construction activities, such as utility trenching and foundation excavation, would generate construction debris. Material that cannot feasibly be used on site or recycled would be off hauled by trucks to local landfills or material reclamation facilities. The project would be subject to the Town's solid waste disposal requirements and state recycling requirements to reduce waste generated during construction and demolition. The project would generate up to six jobs, which would unlikely generate a substantial amount of additional waste. Thus, project implementation is unlikely to exceed regional solid waste capacity, and therefore this impact would be less than significant.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (No Impact)

The project would not result in unique types of solid waste that would conflict with existing regulations applicable to waste disposal. The project would be required to comply with recycling programs established under AB 939. As a result, the project would comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. No impact would occur.

4.20. Wildfire

		Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
	Is the project site located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones?		☐ **Yes**	☒ **No**	
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) FHSZ Maps includes proposed FHSZ Maps for the State Responsibility Area lands. CAL FIRE allows those reviewing local responsibility area hazard zone maps to verify any adopted ordinances that may affect communities' hazard mapping and building code requirements. The project site is located with a local responsibility area. Due to the urbanized area surrounding the project site, the risk for wildfire is considered very low. The project site is not located within a FHSZ, and no wildfire impacts would occur.[43]

4.21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

		Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

[43] California Department of Fire and Forestry Protection. 2008. *California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Update Project*. Available: https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-prevention-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/. Accessed December 24, 2019.

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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

As discussed in **Section 4.4, Biological Resources**, trees proposed for removal on the project site could provide potential nesting habitat for protected bird species as well as potential wildlife nursery sites for breeding and roosting bats. Additionally, project implementation has the potential to result in the exposure or destruction of unrecorded archaeological resources and human remains, as well as unknown paleontological resources on the project site as discussed in **Section 4.5, Cultural Resources** and **Section 4.7, Geology and Soils**, respectively. **Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, CUL-1, CUL-2,** and **GEO-1** would be implemented to reduce these impacts to wildlife species habitat and important historic and prehistoric cultural resources to a less-than-significant level.

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)? (Less than Significant)

The project would result in potentially significant project-level impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and public services. All other impacts of the project were determined either to have no impact or to be less than significant without the need for mitigation. Mitigation measures outlined within this Initial Study shall be implemented to reduce project-level impacts to a less-than-significant level. As such, the project would not result in any significant impacts that would substantially combine with impacts of other current or probable future projects. Therefore, the project would not considerably contribute to significant cumulative impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Less than Significant)

As discussed in the environmental analysis throughout this Initial Study, the project would not result in environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse direct or indirect effects on human beings. This impact would be less than significant.