RESOLUTION NO. 6356

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MENLO PARK ADOPTING CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS, A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AND CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE GENERAL PLAN (LAND USE & CIRCULATION ELEMENTS) AND M-2 AREA ZONING UPDATE

WHEREAS, the General Plan (Land Use and Circulation Elements) and M-2 Area Zoning Update public outreach and participation process known as ConnectMenlo ("Project") began in August 2014 and has included over 60 organized events including workshops and open houses, mobile tours of the City of Menlo Park ("City") and nearby communities, informational symposia, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, recommendations by a General Plan Advisory Committee composed of City commissioners, elected officials, and community members, and consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council at public meetings;

WHEREAS, the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA," Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) require an analysis and a determination regarding the Project's potential environmental impacts;

WHEREAS, the Project consists of long-term planning and policy documents that will guide future development activities in the City and does not approve any specific development projects. Therefore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, it is appropriate that the Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for the Project is a program-level EIR;

WHEREAS, the City released a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") for the Project to the Office of Planning and Research ("OPR") State Clearinghouse and interested agencies and persons on June 18, 2015 for a 30-day review period, during which interested agencies and the public could submit comments about the Project. The City held a public scoping meeting on September 21, 2015. Comments on the NOP were received by the City and considered during preparation of the Draft EIR;

WHEREAS, a Notice of Availability ("NOA") was issued and the Draft EIR was made available for public review on June 1, 2016 for a 45-day public review period through July 15, 2016. As a result of comments received on the Draft EIR, the City Council extended the Draft EIR review period for 15 days, providing in total a 60-day public review period ending on August 1, 2016;

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR was filed with the California Office of Planning and Research and copies of the Draft EIR were made available at the Community

Development Department, on the City's website and at the Menlo Park Public Library;

WHEREAS, on October 10, 2016, the City published a Response to Comments Document that contains all of the comments received on the Draft EIR during the public comment period, including a transcript of the public hearing, and written responses to those comments, prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EIR and Response to Comments Document, together with three errata, constitute the Final EIR;

WHEREAS, all required public notices and public hearings were duly given and held according to law;

WHEREAS, after notice having been lawfully given, a duly noticed public hearing was held before the City Planning Commission on October 19, 2016 and October 24, 2016 at which all persons interested had the opportunity to appear and comment and at which the Planning Commission considered and made recommendations to the City Council regarding on the Final EIR and the merits of the Project;

WHEREAS, after notice having been lawfully given, a duly noticed public hearing was held before the City Council on November 15, 2016 and November 29, 2016 at which all persons interested had the opportunity to appear and comment and at which the City Council considered the Final EIR and the merits of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed the Final EIR, all staff reports pertaining to the Final EIR, the Planning Commission hearing minutes and reports, and all evidence received by the City, including at the Planning Commission and at the City Council hearings and found that the Final EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA;

WHEREAS, after closing the public hearing, the City Council acting on its independent judgment and analysis voted affirmatively to certify the Final EIR pursuant to CEQA;

WHEREAS, the City Council certifies that it has reviewed the comments received and the responses thereto and finds that the Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3), the City also finds that the Final EIR reflects the

City's independent judgment as the lead agency for the Project and is supported by substantial evidence;

WHEREAS, the Final EIR identified certain potentially significant adverse effects on the environment caused by the Project;

WHEREAS, the City Council specifically finds that where more than one reason for approving the Project and rejecting alternatives is given in its findings or in the record, and where more than one reason is given for adopting the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City Council would have made its decision on the basis of any one of those reasons;

WHEREAS, the City Council desires, in accordance with CEQA, to declare that, despite the potential for significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives, there exist certain overriding economic, social, and other considerations for approving the project that the City Council believes justify the occurrence of those impacts; and

WHEREAS, the City Council having fully reviewed, considered and evaluated all the testimony and evidence submitted in this matter, voted affirmatively to certify the Final EIR, make the findings required by CEQA, adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") and approve the Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Menlo Park hereby certifies the Final EIR, makes the following findings with respect to the Project's significant effects on the environment as identified in the Final EIR, as required under Sections 15091, 15092, and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, and adopts the MMRP as follows:

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

As fully described in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR, the Project involves the updated goals, policies and programs of the General Plan Land Use Element and Circulation Element and the updated M-2 Area Zoning Ordinance, and the associated new development potential in the M-2 Area, also referred to as the Bayfront Area, combined with the remaining and previously approved buildout potential in the current General Plan that would be reaffirmed and carried forward to the 2040 buildout horizon.

The buildout of the potential future development in these identified locations is based on a horizon year of 2040; therefore, the EIR analyzes growth occurring between 2016 and 2040. The 2040 horizon year is generally consistent with

other key planning documents, including *Plan Bay Area*, which is the Bay Area's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy to Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act.

A. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Every city and county in California is required to prepare and to adopt a comprehensive long-term general plan for the physical development of the county or city and, in some cases, land outside the city or county boundaries (Government Code Section 65300). With the Housing, Open Space/Conservation, Noise and Safety Elements of the General Plan having been recently updated, the focus of the Project is on the Land Use and Circulation Elements. The City of Menlo Park has undertaken a community-based planning process to review changes to these elements as part of a focused General Plan Update. A major focus of the Project is balancing potential development impacts and the provision of community benefits, especially for the Belle Haven neighborhood. Targeted community benefits include alternative transportation to alleviate severe traffic congestion, housing to support both the adjacent neighborhood and the increasing workforce, and expanded service and retail uses.

The Land Use Element frames the type and scale of potential development that may occur, particularly in the M-2 Area, which is the area generally between US 101 and the San Francisco Bay and where most change is expected in Menlo Park over the next two decades. The proposed Land Use and Circulation Elements are intended to guide development and conservation in the City through the 2040 buildout horizon of this General Plan. These two elements are central components of the General Plan because they describe which land uses should be allowed in the City, where those land uses should be located, how those land uses may be accessed and connected, and how development of those uses should be managed so as to minimize impacts and maximize benefits to the City and its residents. The Circulation Element addresses transportation issues throughout the City, and both updated Elements will be consistent with the other General Plan Elements. The Project aims to improve transportation connections citywide for all modes of travel and to upgrade traffic metrics to keep up with the area's fast rate of development.

B. M-2 AREA ZONING UPDATE

The Draft EIR also assesses the proposed zoning provisions for the M-2 Area, which is the focus of future land use changes under the Project, to implement the updated General Plan programs, including development regulations and design

standards for the M-2 Area. The updated Zoning Ordinance will include the creation of three new zoning districts in the M-2 Area—Office (O), Life Sciences (LS) and Residential Mixed Use (R-MU). Properties in the M-2 Area will be rezoned with the new zoning designations for consistency with the General Plan.

C. BUILDOUT PROJECTIONS

The horizon-year projections were based on the probable, or reasonably foreseeable, “planning period development” that is expected to occur within the planning period through the year 2040. As shown in Table 1, the remaining buildout potential under the current General Plan that is being reaffirmed as part of the Project is 1.8 million square feet of non-residential space, up to three hotels, and 1,000 residential units, which could generate up to 2,580 new residents and 4,400 new employees. The proposed net new development potential within the M-2 Area (the only new development potential proposed in the City) is 2.3 million square feet of non-residential space, 400 hotel rooms and 4,500 residential units, which could generate up to 11,570 new residents and 5,500 new employees. When combined and considered in the citywide context, the Project includes 4.1 million square feet of non-residential space, 400 hotel rooms and 5,500 residential units, which could generate up to 14,150 new residents and 9,900 employees. The environmental impact of this combined citywide development potential is the Project that is analyzed in the EIR.

TABLE 1 PROPOSED PROJECT BUILDOUT PROJECTIONS

Category	Current General Plan Remaining Development Potential[a]	+	Proposed New Development Potential (M-2 Area Only)[b]	=	Proposed Project[c]
BAYFRONT AREA					
Non-Residential Square Feet[d]	1.4 million		2.3 million		3.7 million
Hotel Rooms[e]	0		400		400
Residential Units[f]	150		4,500		4,650
Population[g]	390		11,570		11,960
Employees	3,400		5,500		8,900
REMAINDER OF CITY					
Non-Residential Square Feet	355,000		0		355,000
Hotel Rooms[e]	0		0		0
Residential Units[f]	850		0		0
Population[g]	2,190		0		0
Employees	1,000		0		0
CITYWIDE TOTALS					
Non-Residential Square Feet	***1.8 million***		***2.3 million***		***4.1 million***
Hotel Rooms[e]	***0***		***400***		**400**
Residential Units[f]	***1,000***		***4,500***		**5,500**
Population[g]	***2,580***		***11,570***		**14,150**
Employees	***4,400***		***5,500***		**9,900**

Notes: *Numbers are estimates and rounded for the purposes of this programmatic environmental review.*
a. This column represents the previously-approved and ongoing development potential under the existing General Plan.
b. This is the proposed new development potential of the proposed project. New development potential would occur in the M-2 Area only.
c. This column represents the total buildout development potential of the proposed project, which is the sum of columns (a) and (b).
d. Potential Commercial square footage in the M-2 Area would occur within Office, Life Science, and Residential districts.
e. Three hotels are proposed under the current General Plan; Hotel square footage is not included in the New Development Potential in the M-2 Area development potential non-residential square feet.
f. Residential units proposed in the M-2 Area would include multi-family units and dormitory style units. Residential units proposed throughout the remainder of the city could include multi-family units and single-family units developed as second units where single-family units currently exist.
g. Assumes 2.57 persons per household per Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) *Projections 2013, Subregional Study Area Table*.

D. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Project addresses growth in the M-2 Area but also circulation citywide and will seek to accomplish the following objectives:

- Establish and achieve the community's vision.
- Realize economic and revenue potential.
- Directly involve Bayfront Area property owners (as land use changes are expected only in that area).
- Streamline development review.
- Improve mobility for all travel modes.
- Preserve neighborhood character.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

A. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

According to CEQA, lead agencies are required to consult with public agencies having jurisdiction over a proposed project, and to provide the general public with an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR. A NOP of an EIR was issued by the City to the OPR State Clearinghouse and interested agencies and persons on June 18, 2015 for a 30-day review period, during which interested agencies and the public could submit comments about the Project. The City also held a public scoping meeting on September 21, 2015. Comments on the NOP were received by the City and considered during preparation of the Draft EIR.

A NOA was issued on Wednesday, June 1, 2016 and the Draft EIR was made available for public review for a 45-day public review period through Friday, July 15, 2016. As a result of comments received on the Draft EIR, the City extended the Draft EIR review period for a total 60-day comment period between June 1, 2016 and August 1, 2016, which is 15 days beyond the CEQA required 45-day comment period per Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EIR was distributed to local, regional, and State agencies and the general public was advised of the availability of the Draft EIR. Copies of the Draft EIR were made available for review to interested parties at the at the City Main Library (800 Alma Street), Belle Haven Branch Library (413 Ivy Drive), Onetta Harris Community Center (100 Terminal Avenue), and the Community Development Department (701 Laurel Street) in Menlo Park, as well as on the ConnectMenlo website at www.menlopark.org/connectmenlo.

The Responses to Comments Document provides responses to the comments received during the comment period on the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR and the Responses to Comments Document comprise the Final EIR. The Planning

Commission was presented with the Final EIR for consideration at a public hearing. The Planning Commission, however, does not take final action on the Final EIR or the Project, but provides recommendations. The City Council then considers the Planning Commission's recommendations on the Final EIR and the Project during a noticed public hearing, and takes the final action with regard to certification of the Final EIR and approval of the Project. The City Council is currently scheduled to consider certification of the Final EIR at a public hearing in late 2016.

III. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, the City of Menlo Park, acting by and through its City Council hereby certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with the CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City further certifies that it has been presented with the Final EIR and that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the Project. The City further certifies that the Final EIR reflects its independent judgment and analysis.

IV. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these findings, the record of proceedings consists of the following documents and testimony:

(a) The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project;

(c) The Draft EIR for the Project, dated June 2016;

(d) All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the Draft EIR;

(e) The Final EIR for the Project, including comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, and the technical appendices, dated October 2016;

(f) The MMRP for the Project;

(h) All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents related to the Project prepared by the City, or consultants to the City with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's action on the Project;

(i) All documents submitted to the City (including the Planning Commission and City Council) by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project;

(j) Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Project;

(k) All matters of common knowledge to the Planning Commission and City Council, including, but not limited to:

  (i) City's General Plan and other applicable policies;

  (ii) City's Zoning Ordinance and other applicable ordinances;

  (iii) Information regarding the City's fiscal status;

  (iv) Applicable City policies and regulations; and

  (v) Federal, state and local laws and regulations.

(l) Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by CEQA Section 21167.6(e).

The documents described above comprising the record of proceedings are located in the Community Development Department, City of Menlo Park, 701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, California 94025. The custodian of these documents is the City's Community Development Director or his/her designee.

V. FINDINGS

The findings, recommendations, and statement of overriding considerations set forth below ("Findings") are made and adopted by the City Council of the City of Menlo Park as the City's findings under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines relating to the Project. The Findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the City Council regarding the Project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives to the Project, and the overriding considerations that support approval of the Project despite any remaining environmental effects it may have.

These findings summarize the environmental determinations of the Final EIR with regard to Project impacts before and after mitigation, and do not attempt to repeat the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, these findings provide a summary description of and basis for each impact conclusion identified in the Final EIR, describe the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR, and state the City's findings and rationale about the significance of each impact following the adoption of mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions

can be found in the Final EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the Project's impacts.

In adopting mitigation measures, below, the City intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure identified in the Final EIR has been inadvertently omitted from these findings, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language of a mitigation measure set forth below fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measure in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall control unless the language of the mitigation measure has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

Sections VI and VII, below, provide brief descriptions of the impacts that the Final EIR identifies as either significant and unavoidable or less than significant with adopted mitigation. These descriptions also reproduce the full text of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR for each significant impact.

VI. FINDINGS FOR SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The Final EIR identifies the following significant and unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the approval of the Project, some of which can be reduced, although not to a less-than-significant level, through implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1). In some cases, the City cannot require or control implementation of mitigation measures for certain impacts because they are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies. Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(2). Therefore, as explained below, some impacts will remain significant and unavoidable notwithstanding adoption of feasible mitigation measures. To the extent that these mitigation measures will not mitigate or avoid all significant effects on the environment, and because the City cannot require mitigation measures that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies to be adopted or implemented by those agencies, it is hereby determined that any remaining significant and unavoidable adverse impacts are acceptable for the reasons specified in Section XII, below. Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3). As explained in Section X, below, the findings in this Section VI are based on the Final EIR, the discussion and analysis in which is hereby incorporated in full by this reference.

A. IMPACT AQ-2A: DESPITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT POLICIES, CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT EMISSIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD GENERATE A SUBSTANTIAL NET INCREASE IN EMISSIONS THAT EXCEEDS THE BAAQMD REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS.

The Final EIR finds that future development under the Project would result in a substantial long-term increase in criteria air pollutants over the 24-year General Plan horizon. Criteria air pollutant emissions would be generated from on-site area sources (e.g., fuel used for landscaping equipment, consumer products), vehicle trips generated by the Project, and energy use (e.g., natural gas used for cooking and heating). Because cumulative development within the City of Menlo Park could exceed the regional significance thresholds, the Project could contribute to an increase in health effects in the basin until such time as the attainment standards are met in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2a set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Due to the programmatic nature of the Project, no additional mitigation measures are feasible and available beyond Mitigation Measure AQ-2a; therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2a:

Prior to issuance of a building permits, all development projects in the city that are subject to CEQA and exceed the screening sizes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City's Planning Division a technical assessment evaluating potential project-related operational air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If operational-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as identified in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines, the project applicant is required to incorporate mitigation measures into the development project to reduce air pollutant emissions during operation. The identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division prior to building permit issuance.

B. IMPACT AQ-2B: DESPITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT POLICIES, CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT EMISSIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD GENERATE A SUBSTANTIAL NET INCREASE IN EMISSIONS THAT EXCEEDS THE BAAQMD REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS.

The Final EIR finds that future development under the Project would result in a substantial long-term increase in criteria air pollutants over the 24-year General Plan horizon. Criteria air pollutant emissions would be generated from construction-related activities and if uncontrolled, fugitive dust (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) levels downwind of actively disturbed areas during construction or overlapping construction activities could violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and expose sensitive receptors to elevated concentrations of pollutants during construction activities. Because cumulative development within the City of Menlo Park could exceed the regional significance thresholds, the Project could contribute to an increase in health effects in the basin until such time as the attainment standards are met in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). The impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2b1 and AQ-2b2 set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Due to the programmatic nature of the Project, no additional mitigation measures are feasible and available beyond Mitigation Measures AQ-2b1 and AQ-2b2; therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2b1:

Prior to building permit issuance, the City shall require applicants for all development projects in the city to comply with the current Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) basic control measures for reducing construction emissions of PM_{10} (Table 8-1, Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for All Proposed Projects, of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines).

Mitigation Measure AQ-2b2:

Prior to issuance of a building permit, development projects in the City that are subject to CEQA and exceed the screening sizes in the BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City of Menlo Park a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD

thresholds of significance, as identified in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the project applicant

is required to incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities to below these thresholds (e.g., Table 8-2, Additional Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for projects with Construction Emissions Above the Threshold of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, or applicable construction mitigation measures subsequently approved by BAAQMD). These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans), subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division prior to building permit issuance.

C. IMPACT AQ-5: DESPITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT EMISSIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE GENERAL PLAN WOULD GENERATE A SUBSTANTIAL NET INCREASE IN EMISSIONS THAT EXCEEDS THE BAAQMD REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS.

The Final EIR finds that the Project will combine with regional growth within the air basin to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of pollutants for the SFBAAB, which is currently designated a nonattainment area for California and National O_3, California and National $PM_{2.5}$, and California PM_{10} ambient air quality standards (AAQS). Any project that produces a significant regional air quality impact in an area that is in nonattainment adds to the cumulative impact. Mitigation measures AQ-2a, AQ-2b1 and AQ-2b2, set forth and incorporated above, and Mitigation Measure AQ-3a and AQ-3b set forth and incorporated below (see Section VII(A)) would reduce impacts to the extent feasible, but the Project's impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

There are no feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Air pollutant emissions associated with the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to air quality impacts, and the Project's impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure AQ-5:

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2a through AQ-3b.

D. IMPACT GHG-1: THE PROJECT WOULD RESULT IN A SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSIONS FROM EXISTING CONDITIONS BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN HORIZON YEAR 2040 AND WOULD NOT ACHIEVE THE 2040 EFFICIENCY TARGET, WHICH IS BASED ON A TRAJECTORY TO THE 2050 GOAL OF AN 80 PERCENT REDUCTION FROM 1990 LEVELS PURSUANT TO EXECUTIVE ORDER S-03-05. ADDITIONAL STATE AND FEDERAL ACTIONS ARE NECESSARY TO ENSURE THAT STATE AND FEDERALLY REGULATED SOURCES (I.E., SOURCES OUTSIDE THE CITY'S JURISDICTIONAL CONTROL) TAKE SIMILAR AGGRESSIVE MEASURES TO ENSURE THE DEEP CUTS NEEDED TO ACHIEVE THE 2050 TARGET.

The Final EIR finds that the Project would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions from existing conditions by the horizon year 2040 and would not achieve the 2040 efficiency target, which is based on a trajectory to the 2050 goal of an 80 percent reduction from 1990 levels. The policies identified in the General Plan as well as the transportation demand management (TDM) and other green building sustainability measures in the Zoning Ordinance update would reduce GHG emissions, to the extent feasible. However, additional state and federal actions are necessary to ensure that state and federally regulated sources (i.e., sources outside the City's jurisdictional control) take measures to ensure the deep cuts needed to achieve the 2050 target. Therefore, GHG impacts for consistency with the 2040 and more aggressive long-term targets of Executive Order S-03-15 are considered significant. The City has a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to achieve the GHG reduction goals of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 for year 2020.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would ensure that the City updates the CAP to identify a post-2020 GHG reduction goal to align with the upcoming California Air Resources Board's (CARB) Scoping Plan Update for statewide 2030 GHG emissions reductions target and identify a GHG reduction goal for the Project horizon year. At this time there are no post-2020 federal and state measures that would assist the City in achieving the efficiency target at the proposed project year. No additional mitigation measures are feasible and available; therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1:

Prior to January 1, 2020, the City of Menlo Park shall update the Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address the GHG reduction goals of Executive Order B-30-15 and

Executive Order S-03-05 for GHG sectors that the City has direct or indirect jurisdictional control over. The City shall identify a GHG emissions reduction target

for year 2030 and 2040 that is consistent with the GHG reduction goals identified in Executive Order B-30-15 and Executive Order S-03-05. The CAP shall be updated to include measures to ensure that the City is on a trajectory that aligns with the state's 2030 GHG emissions reduction target.

E. IMPACT GHG-2: WHILE THE PROJECT SUPPORTS PROGRESS TOWARD THE LONG TERM-GOALS IDENTIFIED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER B-30-15 AND EXECUTIVE ORDER S-03-05, IT CANNOT YET BE DEMONSTRATED THAT MENLO PARK WILL ACHIEVE GHG EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS THAT ARE CONSISTENT WITH A 40 PERCENT REDUCTION BELOW 1990 LEVELS BY 2030 OR AN 80 PERCENT REDUCTION BELOW 1990 LEVELS BY THE YEAR 2050 BASED ON EXISTING TECHNOLOGIES AND CURRENTLY ADOPTED POLICIES AND PROGRAMS.

The Final EIR finds that the Project would be consistent with the regional objectives of the Plan Bay Area and the City's CAP. The policies and programs in the Project would ensure substantial progress toward the long-term GHG reductions goals for 2050. However, CARB has not yet drafted a plan to achieve the statewide GHG emissions goals established in Executive Order S-03-05. In addition to the local measures included in the Project, additional state and federal measures are necessary to achieve the more aggressive targets established for 2050 in Executive Order S-03-05. Therefore, GHG impacts are considered to be significant, requiring mitigation. As described above, the City has a CAP to achieve the GHG reduction goals of AB 32 for year 2020.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 set forth above, adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would ensure that the City updates the CAP to identify a post-2020 GHG reduction goal to align with the upcoming CARB Scoping Plan Update for statewide 2030 GHG emissions reductions target and identify a GHG reduction goal for the Project horizon year. At this time there are no post-2020 federal and state measures that would assist the City in achieving the efficiency target at the proposed project year. No additional mitigation measures are feasible and available; therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure GHG-2:

Implement of Mitigation Measure GHG-1.

F. IMPACT POP-4: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT, IN COMBINATION WITH PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS, WOULD RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACT WITH RESPECT TO POPULATION AND HOUSING.

The Final EIR finds that the Project's proposed development projections are not in alignment with the existing Association of Bay Area Government's (ABAG) *Projections 2013,* which is the is the official regional planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area region, which is composed of the nine counties -Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma, Sonoma - and contains 101 cities. ABAG produces growth forecasts on four-year cycles so that other agencies, including the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), can use the forecasts to make project funding and regulatory decisions. The General Plans, zoning regulations and growth management programs of local jurisdictions inform ABAG's projections. Following adoption of the Project, future ABAG projections would take into account the buildout of the Project and Menlo Park's growth will no longer contribute to a cumulative exceedance of regional projections. Exceeding regional growth projections is not, by itself, a significant impact on the environment. The Project includes ongoing growth potential in the *Plan Bay Area's* El Camino Real and Downtown Priority Development Area, which is an area identified for transit-oriented infill, and includes housing and jobs in the M-2 Area that would be guided by a planning framework that promotes a "live/work/play" environment in an infill setting; therefore, meeting the intent of the MTC/ABAG's *Plan Bay Area* is the Bay Area's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/ Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) to reduce environmental impacts, specifically those associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation and circulation. The significant and unavoidable impact is a conservative conclusion that is strictly related to the consistency with the existing *Projections 2013* prepared by ABAG and is does not result in a physical impact to the environment. The EIR finds that because the City does not have the jurisdiction to regulate or guide the cumulative development outside of City of Menlo Park that could contribute to the cumulative exceedance of ABAG projections there is no mitigation the City can implement or monitor that would reduce the impact. There are no feasible and available mitigation measures available to reduce this impact. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

G. IMPACT TRANS-1a: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT WOULD EXCEED THE CITY'S CURRENT IMPACT THRESHOLDS UNDER THE 2040 PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS AT SOME ROADWAY SEGMENTS IN THE STUDY AREA.

The Final EIR finds that that implementation of the Project would generate additional motor vehicle trips on the local roadway network, resulting in significant impacts some study segments during at least one of the AM or PM peak hours (7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., respectively). Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a, which is a typical improvement strategy to manage increased net daily trips by adding travel lanes to accommodate increased capacity of the roadway, could require additional right-of-way that is not under the jurisdiction of the City, which would affect local property owners and is considered infeasible in most locations. Also, the widening of roadways can lead to other secondary impacts, such as induced travel demand (e.g., more vehicles on the roadway due to increased capacity on a particular route), air quality degradation, increases in noise associated with motor vehicles, and reductions in transit use (less congestion or reduced driving time may make driving more attractive than transit travel). Wider roadways also result in a degradation of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including increased intersection crossing times. Thus, while traffic may increase on certain roadways by varying percentages, it should be viewed as more than a level-of-service or traffic-operation issue. For these reasons, these types of measures are considered infeasible to reduce ADT on the impacted roadway segments. Furthermore, while implementation of the proposed Zoning regulations would reduce impacts at some roadways segments, it would not necessarily reduce all the impacted segments. For example, the proposed Zoning regulations that require a 20 percent trip reduction is anticipated to eliminate impacts on eight roadway segments, including segments of Alma Street, Encinal Avenue, Hamilton Avenue, Junipero Serra Boulevard, Laurel Street, Newbridge Street, and Linfield Drive. The trip reduction requirement would reduce traffic volumes at all other locations between 1 and 17 percent, resulting in reduced impacts. Additionally, the proposed street classification system would reclassify some street segments in the Bayfront Area, including segments of Chrysler Drive, Constitution Drive, Chilco Street, Adams Drive, and others, from local streets to Mixed-Use Collectors. These reclassifications would change the street design standards and eliminate or reduce impacts as streets are rebuilt to new standards over time. Furthermore, the net growth in 2040 Plus Project conditions

daily traffic volumes, which represents the net change from existing conditions, includes growth that will occur without the

project under 2040 No Project Conditions. Fully mitigating the impact to less than significant levels is infeasible because it would require eliminating most of the year 2040 traffic growth on impacted segments, including background traffic growth, regional traffic growth outside the control of the City and/or not part of the project. For these reasons, impacts to roadway segments are considered significant and unavoidable. It should be noted that the identification of this program-level impact does not preclude the finding of less-than-significant impacts for subsequent projects that comply with the applicable regulations and meet applicable thresholds of significance. However, due to the programmatic nature of the proposed project, no feasible and additional mitigating policies are available.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a:

Widen impacted roadway segments at appropriate locations throughout the city to add travel lanes and capacity to accommodate the increase in net daily trips.

H. IMPACT TRANS-1b: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT WOULD RESULT IN INCREASED DELAY TO PEAK HOUR MOTOR VEHICLE TRAFFIC EXCEEDING THE SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLD AT SOME OF THE STUDY INTERSECTIONS.

The Final EIR finds that that implementation of the Project would generate additional motor vehicle trips on the local roadway network, resulting in significant impacts some study intersections during at least one of the AM or PM peak hours (7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., respectively). Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the proposed project, would update the City's existing Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to secure a funding mechanism for future roadway and infrastructure improvements that are necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on then current standards, but not to a less-than-significant level. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the City cannot guarantee improvements at these intersections at this time. This is in part because the nexus study has yet to be prepared, some of the improvements have the potential to cause secondary environmental impacts that would need to be addressed before construction could occur, and some of the impacted intersections are within the jurisdiction of the City of East Palo Alto and Caltrans. The City will continue to cooperate with these jurisdictions to identify improvements that would reduce or minimize the impacts to intersections and roadways as a result of implementation of future development projects in Menlo Park, but, many of the improvements in Mitigation

Measure TRANS-1a are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other agencies and not the City of Menlo Park. No additional mitigation measures are feasible and available; therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b:

The City of Menlo Park shall update the existing Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to guarantee funding for citywide roadway and infrastructure improvements that are necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards. The fees shall be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a more intensive use. The fees collected shall be applied toward circulation improvements. The fees shall be calculated by multiplying the proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel room by the appropriate rate. Transportation Impact fees shall be included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City shall use the Transportation Impact Fees to fund construction (or to recoup fees advanced to fund construction) of the transportation improvements identified below, among other things that at the time of potential future development may be warranted to mitigate traffic impacts. It should be noted that any project proposed prior to the adoption of an updated TIF will be required to conduct a project-specific Transportation Impact Assessment to determine the impacts and necessary transportation mitigations that are to be funded by that project.

As part of the update to the TIF program, the City shall also prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the proposed project. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the improvements and facilities required to mitigate the impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed project. The following examples of improvements and facilities would reduce impacts to acceptable level of service standards and these, among other improvements, could be included in the TIF program impact fees nexus study:

- ***Sand Hill Road (westbound) and I-280 Northbound On-ramp (#1):*** *Modify the signal-timing plan during the PM peak hour to increase the maximum allocation of green time to the westbound approach during the PM peak hour.*
- ***Sand Hill Road (eastbound) and I-280 Northbound Off-ramp (#2):*** *Add an additional northbound right-turn lane on the off-ramp to improve operations to acceptable LOS D during the AM peak hour.*

- ***El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue (#28):*** *One eastbound right-turn lane on Menlo Avenue to improve conditions.*
- ***Willow Road and Newbridge Street (#33):*** *Implement measures on Chilco Street south of Constitution Drive to reduce or prevent cut-through traffic through the Belle Haven neighborhood, such as peak-hour turn restrictions from Constitution Drive to southbound Chilco Street, and measures to enhance*
- *east/west circulation from Willow Road via O'Brien Drive and the proposed mixed-use collector street opposite Ivy Drive, extending east to University Avenue, to discourage use of Newbridge Street.*
- ***Willow Road and Hamilton Avenue (#36):*** *Provide primary access to potential future development sites east of Willow Road via O'Brien Drive and/or the proposed Mixed-Use Collector that would intersect Willow Road between Hamilton Avenue and O'Brien Drive. Implement measures on Chilco Street south of Constitution Drive to prevent cut-through traffic through the Belle Haven neighborhood, such as peak-hour turn restrictions from Constitution Drive to southbound Chilco Street. Although the provision of an eastbound left-turn lane on Hamilton Avenue where it approaches Willow Road would reduce the delay, this potential mitigation is not recommend because it would encourage cut-through traffic via Chilco Street and Hamilton Avenue, potentially affecting the Belle Haven neighborhood. Therefore, to avoid facilitating the use of Chilco Street and Hamilton Avenue as cut-through routes in the adjacent residential neighborhood, mitigating this traffic impact is not recommended at this time, consistent with City policies that discourage cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods. The improvements should be incorporated into the updated fee program for ongoing consideration.*
- ***Bayfront Expressway and Willow Road (#37):*** *Evaluate the potential for grade separation to allow conflicting movements to occur simultaneously. The evaluation must consider traffic improvements, along with potential secondary impacts caused by potential right-of-way acquisition, impacts to adjacent wetlands and the Dumbarton Rail corridor, as well as potential impacts or benefits for multi-modal accommodation. If found feasible, the updated fee program should incorporate fair-share contributions from future development towards grade separation.*
- ***Bayfront Expressway and University Avenue (#38):*** *Evaluate the potential for grade separation to allow conflicting movements to occur simultaneously. The evaluation must consider traffic improvements, along with potential secondary impacts caused by potential right-of-way acquisition, impacts to adjacent wetlands and the Dumbarton Rail corridor, as well as potential impacts or benefits for multi-modal accommodation. If found feasible, the updated fee program should incorporate fair-share contributions from future development towards grade separation.*
- ***Chilco Street and Constitution Drive (#45):*** *Install a traffic signal and signalized crosswalks at the intersection. Construct three southbound lanes*

on the one-block segment of Chilco Street, between Bayfront Expressway and Chilco Street, to include two southbound left-turn lanes to accommodate the volume of left-turning vehicles entering the project site. In addition, during the AM peak hour, provide a "split-phase" signal operation on Chilco Street. Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Chilco Street approaching Constitution Drive. Construct two outbound lanes on Chilco Street between Constitution Drive and Bayfront Expressway. If the Facebook Campus Expansion Project is

approved, this mitigation measure would be required to be constructed as a requirement of that project.

- ***Chrysler Drive and Constitution Drive (#46):*** *Construct a southbound left-turn on Chrysler Drive, approaching Constitution Drive.*
- ***University Avenue and Adams Drive (#47):*** *Install a traffic signal at this intersection.*
- ***University Avenue and Bay Road (#51):*** *Realign the eastbound and westbound approaches to allow replacement of the east/west "split-phase" signal on Bay Street with standard protected signal phases in order to allow eastbound and westbound pedestrian crossings to occur simultaneously, which would allow for an increase in green time allocated to northbound/southbound movements on University Avenue and reduce peak-hour delay at this intersection. This intersection is located in the City of East Palo Alto and under the control of Caltrans. If this measure if found feasible by the City of East Palo Alto, the improvements should be incorporated into the City of Menlo Park's updated fee program to collect fair-share contributions from future development towards such improvements.*
- ***University Avenue and Donohoe Street (#54):*** *Mitigating this impact would require providing additional westbound lane capacity on Donohoe Street, including an extended dual left-turn pocket, dedicated through lane, and dual right-turn lanes; providing a southbound right-turn lane on University Avenue and lengthening the northbound turn pockets. However, this mitigation is likely to be infeasible given right-of-way limitations, proximity to existing US 101 on- and off-ramps, and adjacent properties. In addition, this intersection is located in the City of East Palo Alto and under the control of Caltrans. If this measure if found feasible by the City of East Palo Alto, the improvements should be incorporated into the City of Menlo Park's updated fee program to collect fair-share contributions from future development towards such improvements.*
- ***University Avenue and US 101 Southbound Ramps (#56):*** *Mitigating this impact would require modifications to the US 101 Southbound On/Off Ramps and at this location This intersection is located in the City of East Palo Alto and under the control of Caltrans. If this measure if found feasible by the City of East Palo Alto, the improvements should be incorporated into the City of Menlo Park's updated fee program to collect fair-share contributions from future development towards such improvements.*

- ***Chilco Street and Hamilton Avenue (#60):*** *Installation of a traffic signal would mitigate this impact to less than significant levels, but would have the undesirable secondary effect of encouraging the use of Chilco Street as a cut-through route, which conflicts with City goals that aim to reduce cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods. Therefore, to avoid facilitating cut-through traffic, mitigating this traffic impact by increasing capacity is not recommended at this time, but should be incorporated into the updated fee program for ongoing consideration.*

I. IMPACT TRANS-2: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT WOULD RESULT IN IMPACTS TO ROUTES OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

The Final EIR finds that Routes of Regional Significance would be adversely impacted during at least one of the peak hours as a result of implementation of the Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a, set forth and incorporated above, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. As discussed above, Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a is a typical improvement strategy to manage increased net daily trips. However, providing additional travel lanes would increase segment capacity but would not be feasible segments given available right-of-way and both downstream and downstream capacity limitations on facilities such as US 101 and the Dumbarton Bridge. In addition, the routes are under the control of Caltrans, and the City cannot guarantee implementation of mitigation. No additional mitigation measures are feasible and available; therefore, the impacts to regional routes of significance would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-2:

Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

J. IMPACT TRANS-6a: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT WOULD NOT PROVIDE ADEQUATE PEDESTRIAN OR BICYCLE FACILITIES TO CONNECT TO THE AREA-WIDE CIRCULATION SYSTEM.

The Final EIR finds that the Project would not provide adequate pedestrian or bicycle facilities to connect to the area-wide circulation system. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a would update the City's existing Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to secure a funding mechanism for future pedestrian and bicycle improvements that are determined to be necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on then current standards, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, because the City cannot guarantee improvements at this time. This is because the nexus study

has yet to be prepared. No additional mitigation measures are feasible and available; therefore, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a:

The City of Menlo Park shall update the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to provide funding for citywide bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards. The fees shall be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a

more intensive use. The fees collected shall be applied toward improvements that will connect development sites within the area circulation system, including the elimination of gaps in the citywide pedestrian and bicycle network. The fees shall be calculated by multiplying the proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel room by the appropriate rate. Transportation Impact fees shall be included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City shall use the transportation Impact fees to fund construction (or to recoup fees advanced to fund construction) of the transportation improvements identified in this mitigation measure, among other things that at the time of potential future development may be warranted to mitigate traffic impacts. It should be noted that any project proposed prior to the adoption of an updated TIF will be required to conduct a project-specific Transportation Impact Assessment to determine the impacts and necessary pedestrian or bicycle facilities mitigations that are to be funded by that project.

As part of the update to the TIF program, the City shall also prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the proposed project. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the bicycle and pedestrian improvements and facilities required to mitigate the traffic impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed project. The following examples of pedestrian and bicycle improvements would reduce impacts to acceptable standards, and these, among others improvements, could be included in the updated TIF program, also described under TRANS-1:

- ***US 101 Pedestrian & Bicycle Overcrossing at Marsh Road, and Marsh Road Corridor Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements (Haven Avenue to Marsh Road/Bay Road):*** *Provide pedestrian and bicycle circulation between the Bayfront Area east of US 101 with the area circulation system west of US 101 along Marsh Road, including access to schools and commercial sites*

west of Marsh Road that are accessed via Bay Road and Florence Street. Improvements should facilitate pedestrian and bicycle circulation between Haven Avenue and across US 101 near Marsh Road. The recommended improvement would include a dedicated pedestrian and bicycle crossing adjacent to Marsh Road. Alternatively, the provision of continuous sidewalks with controlled pedestrian crossings and Class IV protected bicycle lanes on the Marsh Road overpass, if feasible, could mitigate this impact.

- ***Ringwood Avenue Corridor Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements (Belle Haven to Middlefield Road):*** *Eliminate pedestrian and bicycle facility gaps on primary access routes to the Ringwood Avenue bicycle/pedestrian*

  overcrossing of US 101 (located near the terminus of Ringwood Avenue and Market Place). Improvements should include complete sidewalks on the north side of Pierce Road and bicycle facility improvements on the proposed Ringwood Avenue-Market Place-Hamilton Avenue bicycle boulevard (see Street Classification Map in Chapter 3, Project Description). These improvements would also enhance pedestrian and bicycle access to Menlo-Atherton High School.
- ***University Avenue Pedestrian Improvements:*** *Eliminate gaps in the sidewalk network on those portions of University Avenue that are within the Menlo Park City limits. The TIF Program should also include a contribution towards elimination of sidewalk gaps outside the City limits (within the City of East Palo Alto) to ensure that continuous sidewalks are provided on the west University Avenue between Adams Drive and the Bay Trail, located north of Purdue Avenue.*
- ***Willow Road Bikeway Corridor (Bayfront Expressway to Alma Street):*** *Provide a continuous bikeway facility that eliminates bicycle lane gaps, provides Class IV bicycle lanes on the US 101 overpass and where Willow Road intersects US 101 northbound and southbound ramps, and upgrades existing Class II bicycle lanes to Class IV protected bicycle lanes where feasible, particularly where the speed limit exceeds 35 miles per hour (mph).*
- ***Willow Road Pedestrian Crossings (Bayfront Expressway to Newbridge Street):*** *Provide enhanced pedestrian crossings of Willow Road at Hamilton Avenue, Ivy Drive (including proposed new street connection opposite Ivy Drive), O'Brien Drive and Newbridge Street. Enhanced crossings should include straightened crosswalks provided on each leg, high visibility crosswalk striping, accessible pedestrian signals, and pedestrian head-start signal timing (leading pedestrian intervals) where feasible. These enhanced crossings would provide improved access between the Belle Haven neighborhood and potential future development between Willow Road and University Avenue.*

- ***Dumbarton Corridor Connections:*** *Through separate projects, Samtrans is currently considering the potential for a bicycle/pedestrian shared-use trail along the Dumbarton Corridor right-of-way between Redwood City and East Palo Alto, through Menlo Park. If found feasible, the City's TIF Program should incorporate walking and bicycling access and connections to the proposed trail, including a potential rail crossing between Kelly Park and Onetta Harris Community Center and Chilco Street and pedestrian and bicycle improvements on streets that connect to the Dumbarton Corridor: Marsh Road, Chilco Street, Willow Road, and University Avenue.*

K. IMPACT TRANS-6b: THE PROJECT WOULD GENERATE A SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN TRANSIT RIDERS THAT CANNOT BE ADEQUATELY SERVICED BY EXISTING PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICES, AND THE PROJECT WOULD GENERATE DEMAND FOR TRANSIT SERVICES AT SITES MORE THAN ONE-QUARTER MILE FROM EXISTING PUBLIC TRANSIT ROUTES.

The Final EIR finds that the Project would generate a substantial increase in transit riders that cannot be adequately serviced by existing public transit services, and the project would generate demand for transit services at sites more than one-quarter mile from existing public transit routes. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-6b set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure TRANS-6b would update the City's existing Shuttle Fee program to guarantee funding for operations of City-sponsored shuttle service that is necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, because the City cannot guarantee improvements at this time. This is because the nexus study has yet to be prepared. No additional mitigation measures are feasible and available; therefore, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-6b:

The City of Menlo Park shall update the existing Shuttle Fee program to guarantee funding for citywide operations of City-sponsored shuttle service that is necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards. The fees shall be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a more intensive use. The fees collected shall be applied toward circulation improvements and right-of-way acquisition. The fees shall be calculated by multiplying the proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel

room by the appropriate rate. Shuttle fees shall be included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City shall use the Shuttle fees to fund operations of City-sponsored shuttle service to meet the increased demand.

As part of the update to the Shuttle Fee program, the City shall also prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the proposed project. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the transit improvements and facilities required to mitigate the transit impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed project. The types of transit-related improvements and facilities that

would reduce impacts to acceptable standards including increasing the fleet of City-sponsored Shuttles and adding additional transit stop facilities within one-quarter mile from residential and employment centers These, among other improvements, could be included in the Shuttle Fee program impact fees nexus study.

L. IMPACT TRANS-6c: THE PROJECT WOULD RESULT IN INCREASED PEAK-HOUR TRAFFIC DELAY AT INTERSECTIONS ON BAYFRONT EXPRESSWAY, UNIVERSITY AVENUE AND WILLOW ROAD, AS IDENTIFIED IN TRANS-1, THAT COULD DECREASE THE PERFORMANCE OF TRANSIT SERVICE AND INCREASE THE COST OF TRANSIT OPERATIONS.

The Final EIR finds that would result in increased peak-hour traffic delay at intersections on Bayfront Expressway, University Avenue and Willow Road that could decrease the performance of transit service and increase the cost of transit operations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-6c set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-6c, which could result in the provision transit service on the on the Dumbarton Corridor could mitigate this impact, because provision of Dumbarton transit service would require approval of other public agencies and is not under the jurisdiction of the City of Menlo Park, implementation of this mitigation cannot be guaranteed and this impact would remain is significant and unavoidable. No additional mitigation measures are feasible and available.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-6c:

The City should continue to support the Dumbarton Corridor Study, evaluating the feasibility of providing transit service to the existing rail corridor and/or

operational improvements to Bayfront Expressway, Marsh Road and Willow Road, such as a dedicated high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane, bus queue-jump lanes, or transit-signal priority that could reduce travel time for current bus operations.

VII. FINDINGS FOR SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL BY MITIGATION MEASURES

The Final EIR identifies the following significant impacts associated with the Project. It is hereby determined that the impacts addressed by these mitigation measures will be mitigated to a less than significant level or avoided by adopting and incorporating these mitigation measures conditions into the Project. Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1). As explained in Section X, below, the

findings in this Section VII are based on the Final EIR, the discussion and analysis in which is hereby incorporated in full by this reference.

A. IMPACT AQ-3a: WAREHOUSING OPERATIONS COULD GENERATE A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF DIESEL PARTICULATE MATTER (DPM) EMISSIONS FROM OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT USE AND TRUCK IDLING. IN ADDITION, SOME WAREHOUSING, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES MAY INCLUDE USE OF TRANSPORT REFRIGERATION UNITS (TRUs) FOR COLD STORAGE THAT COULD EXPOSE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS TO SUBSTANTIAL POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS.

The Final EIR finds that the buildout of the Project could result in new sources of criteria air pollutant emissions and/or toxic air contaminants near existing or planned sensitive receptors. Existing and Project policies would reduce concentrations of TACs and $PM_{2.5}$ generated by new development. Review of projects by BAAQMD for permitted sources of air toxics (e.g., industrial facilities, dry cleaners, and gasoline dispensing facilities) would ensure health risks are minimized. Mitigation Measure AQ-3a would ensure that mobile sources of TACs not covered under BAAQMD permits are considered during subsequent project-level environmental review. Development of individual projects would be required to achieve the incremental risk thresholds established by BAAQMD. Implementation of the Mitigation Measures AQ-3a, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3a:

Applicants for future non-residential land uses within the city that: 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered TRUs, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of a proposed project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Menlo Park prior to future discretionary Project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds 10 in one million (10E-06), $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Mitigation measures may include but are not limited to:

- *Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible.*
- *Electrifying warehousing docks.*
- *Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles.*
- *Restricting off-site truck travel through the creation of truck routes.*

Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of a proposed project.

B. IMPACT AQ-3B: PLACEMENT OF NEW SENSITIVE LAND USES NEAR MAJOR SOURCES OF AIR POLLUTION COULD BE EXPOSED TO ELEVATED CONCENTRATIONS OF AIR POLLUTANTS.

The Final EIR finds that the placement of new sensitive receptors near major sources of TACs and $PM_{2.5}$ could expose people to substantial pollutant concentrations. General Plan policies would reduce concentrations of criteria air pollutant emissions and air toxics generated by new development. Mitigation Measure AQ-3b would ensure that placement of sensitive receptors near major sources of air pollution would achieve the incremental risk thresholds established by BAAQMD.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3b:

As part of the discretionary review process for development applications, applicants for all non-residential projects within the City that: 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered TRUs, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land

use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of a proposed project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City's Planning Division. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds 10 in one million (10E-06), $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m^3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Mitigation measures may include but are not limited to:

- *Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible.*
- *Electrifying warehousing docks.*
- *Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles.*
- *Restricting off-site truck travel through the creation of truck routes.*

Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific HRA shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of a proposed project, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.

C. IMPACT BIO-1: IMPACTS TO SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES OR THE INADVERTENT LOSS OF BIRD NESTS IN ACTIVE USE, WHICH WOULD CONFLICT WITH THE FEDERAL MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT AND CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME CODE COULD OCCUR AS A RESULT OF NEW DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL IN THE BAYFRONT AREA AND FROM EXISTING AND ONGOING DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL IN THE REMAINDER OF THE CITY IF ADEQUATE CONTROLS ARE NOT IMPLEMENTED.

The Final EIR finds that potential for occurrence of special-status species in developed areas is generally very remote in comparison to undeveloped lands with natural habitat that contain essential habitat characteristics for the range of species known in the Menlo Park vicinity; however, the western snowy plover, Santa Cruz kangaroo rat, salt-marsh harvest mouse and California least tern, among others, have the potential for occurrence in the remaining undeveloped lands in Bayfront Area and special-status species, including the Alameda song sparrow, American Badger, hoary bat, Santa Cruz kangaroo rat, pallid bat, California tiger salamander, western pond turtle, California red-legged frog have the potential for occurrence elsewhere in the study area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

As part of the discretionary review process for development projects, new construction and building additions, regardless of size, in addition to appropriate CEQA review, the City shall require all project applicants to prepare and submit project-specific baseline biological resources assessments (BRA) if the project would occur on or adjacent to a parcel containing natural habitat with features such as mature and native trees, unused structures that could support special-status species, other sensitive biological resources, and/or active nests of common birds protected under Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Sensitive biological resources triggering the need for the baseline BRA shall include: wetlands, occurrences or suitable habitat for special-status species, sensitive natural communities, and important movement corridors for wildlife such as creek corridors and shorelines.

The baseline BRA shall be prepared by a qualified biologist.

The baseline BRA shall provide a determination on whether any sensitive biological resources are present on the site, including jurisdictional wetlands and

waters, essential habitat for special-status species, and sensitive natural communities. If jurisdictional wetlands and/or waters are suspected to be present on the site, a jurisdictional delineation confirmed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will be provided as part of the baseline BRA.

The baseline BRA shall also include consideration of possible sensitive biological resources on any adjacent undeveloped lands that could be affected by the project and lands of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge (Refuge).

The baseline BRA shall incorporate guidance from relevant regional conservation plans, including, but not limited to, the then current Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan, South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, Tidal Marsh Recovery Plan and the USFWS Recovery Plan for the Pacific Coast Population of the Western Snowy Plover, for determining the potential presence or absence of sensitive biological resources, however, the presence or absence of sensitive biological resources will be determined by on-site surveys. If the adjacent property is the Refuge, Refuge staff shall be contacted regarding the presence or absence of sensitive biological resources.

If sensitive biological resources are determined to be present on the site or may be present on any adjacent parcel containing natural habitat, coordination with the appropriate regulatory and resource agencies must occur. Appropriate measures, such as preconstruction surveys, establishing no-disturbance zones and restrictive time periods during construction, protective development setbacks and restrictions, and applying bird-safe building design practices and materials, shall be developed by the qualified biologist in consultations with the regulatory and resource agencies to provide adequate avoidance, or provide compensatory mitigation if avoidance is infeasible. With respect to fully protected species, if the BRA for any development project determines that any of the following Fully Protected Species are present, then neither take of such species will be permitted nor will mitigation measures including species collection or relocation. The Fully Protected Species include American Peregrine Falcon (Falco peregrinus anatum), California Black Rail (Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus), California Clapper Rail – Ridgway's Rail (Rallus longirostris obsoletus), California Least Tern (Sterna albifrons browni), White-tail Kite (Elanus leucurus), Salt-marsh harvest mouse (Reithrodontomys raviventris), and San Francisco garter snake (Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia).

The qualified biologist shall consult with the Refuge management and, where appropriate, the Endangered Species Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for determining the potential presence or

absence of sensitive biological resources and appropriate avoidance or compensatory mitigation measures, if required.

Where jurisdictional waters or federally and/or State-listed special-status species would be affected, appropriate authorizations, i.e. the USACE, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), USFWS, NMFS, Refuge and CDFW, shall be obtained by the project applicant, and evidence of such authorization provided to the City prior to issuance of grading or other construction permits.

For sites that are adjacent to undeveloped lands with federally and/or State-listed special status species, or sensitive habitats, or lands of the Refuge, the BRA shall include evaluation of the potential effects of:

- *additional light,*
- *glare,*
- *shading (i.e. shadow analysis),*
- *noise,*
- *urban runoff,*
- *water flow disruption,*
- *water quality degradation/sedimentation,*
- *attraction of nuisance species/predators (e.g. attraction of refuse) and their abatement (e.g. adverse impacts of rodenticides), and*
- *pesticides*

generated by the project, as well as the possibility for increased activity from humans and/or domesticated pets and their effects on the nearby natural habitats. The BRA shall include proposed avoidance, minimization and mitigation of these adverse impacts.

The City of Menlo Park Planning Division may require an independent peer review of the adequacy of the baseline BRA as part of the review of the project to confirm its adequacy. Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific BRA shall be incorporated as a component of a proposed project and subsequent building permit, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department and the appropriate regulatory and resource agencies.

The following zoning regulations enacted by ordinances (including, but not limited to, 16.43 O-Office District, 16.43.080 Corporate housing, 16.43.140 Green and sustainable building; 16.44 LS-Life Science District, 16.44.130 Green and sustainable building) to minimize impacts to biological resources are incorporated

by reference into this mitigation measure and shall be a component of the project building permits:

1. *Setbacks (A) Minimum of two hundred (200) feet from the waterfront; waterfront is defined as the top of the levee.*
2. *Waterfront and Environmental Considerations. The following provisions are applicable when the property is adjacent to the waterfront or other sensitive habitat.*
    a. *Non-emergency lighting shall be limited to the minimum necessary to meet safety requirements and shall provide shielding and reflectors to minimize light spill and glare and shall not directly illuminate sensitive habitat areas. Incorporate timing devices and sensors to ensure night lighting is used only when necessary.*
    b. *Landscaping and its maintenance shall not negatively impact the water quality, native habitats, or natural resources.*
    c. *Pets shall not be allowed within the corporate housing due to their impacts on water quality, native habitats, and natural resources.*
3. *Bird-friendly design.*
    a. *No more than ten percent (10%) of façade surface area shall have non-bird- friendly glazing.*
    b. *Bird- friendly glazing includes, but is not limited to opaque glass, covering the outside surface of clear glass with patterns, paned glass with fenestration, frit or etching patterns, and external screens over non-reflective glass. Highly reflective glass is not permitted.*
    c. *Occupancy sensors or other switch control devices shall be installed on non-emergency lights and shall be programmed to shut off during non-work hours and between 10 PM and sunrise.*
    d. *Placement of buildings shall avoid the potential funneling of flight paths towards a building façade.*
    e. *Glass skyways or walkways, freestanding (see-through) glass walls and handrails, and transparent building corners shall not be allowed.*
    f. *Transparent glass shall not be allowed at the rooflines of buildings, including in conjunction with roof decks, patios and green roofs.*
    g. *Use of rodenticides shall not be allowed.*

If it is determined through the BRA or CEQA review that further assessment/monitoring/reporting is required by appropriate regulatory or resource agencies, it shall be the responsibility of the City to ensure all project requirements are implemented.

D. IMPACT BIO-2: IMPACTS TO COASTAL SALT MARSH VEGETATION IN THE BAYLANDS, AND POSSIBLY AREAS OF RIPARIAN SCRUB AND WOODLAND ALONG SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK AND OTHER DRAINAGES IN THE STUDY AREA COULD OCCUR AS A RESULT OF NEW DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL IN THE BAYFRONT AREA AND FROM EXISTING AND ONGOING DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL IN THE REMAINDER OF THE CITY IF ADEQUATE CONTROLS ARE NOT IMPLEMENTED.

The Final EIR finds that impacts to riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities include both direct and indirect impacts that may occur. Direct impacts occur as a result of converting natural resources to developed properties, including the addition of impervious surfaces or hydrologic alterations. Habitat loss and degradation of existing habitat are direct impacts. Direct impacts may also be temporary impacts if they disturb a habitat that is subsequently restored after construction. An indirect impact is a physical change in the environment, which is not immediately related to, but is caused by the project. For example, if development results in reducing the sizes of remaining habitats, the values and functions of that habitat would be reduced and indirect impacts would occur. Increased stormwater runoff could potentially contribute to the loss of wetland habitat, affecting special status species that rely on this habitat.

Sensitive natural communities in the study area include areas of coastal salt marsh vegetation in the baylands, native valley oaks dominate the 88-acre Saint Patrick's Seminary in central Menlo Park and possibly areas of riparian scrub and woodland along San Francisquito Creek and other drainages. A portion of the Bayfront Area along University Avenue has a designation of Life Sciences over areas of marshland cover. These marshlands appear to be primarily freshwater and brackish in nature, but would still be a sensitive natural community type and are most likely regulated wetlands as discussed further under Impact Discussion BIO 3 below. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2:

Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

E. IMPACT BIO-3: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT COULD RESULT IN DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACTS TO WETLAND HABITAT IF ADEQUATE CONTROLS ARE NOT IMPLEMENTED.

The Final EIR finds that development and land use activities consistent with the Project could result in direct loss or modification to existing wetlands and unvegetated other waters, as well as indirect impacts due to water quality degradation. Affected wetlands could include both the wetland-related sensitive natural community types described above, as well as areas of open water, degraded and modified streams and channels, unvegetated waters, and isolated seasonal wetlands or freshwater seeps. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3:

Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

F. IMPACT BIO-4: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT COULD RESULT IN IMPACTS ON THE MOVEMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE, WILDLIFE CORRIDORS, OR WILDLIFE NURSERY SITES IF ADEQUATE CONTROLS ARE NOT IMPLEMENTED.

The Final EIR finds that development and land use activities consistent with the Project would result in a reduction in the remaining natural habitat in the study area. However, most wildlife in these areas are already acclimated to human activity in the urbanized portions of the study area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4:

Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

G. IMPACT BIO-6: IMPACTS TO SENSITIVE HABITAT IN THE STANFORD HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN (HCP) AREA COULD OCCUR AS A RESULT OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL IN THE STUDY AREA THAT IS LOCATED WITHIN THE STANFORD HCP AREA IF ADEQUATE CONTROLS ARE NOT IMPLEMENTED.

The Final EIR finds that development within sensitive habitats within the Stanford Habitat Conservation Plan area could occur under the Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-6 set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-6:

Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

H. IMPACT BIO-7: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT IN COMBINATION WITH PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS, WOULD RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WITH RESPECT TO BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could result in further conversion of existing natural habitats to urban and suburban conditions, limiting the existing habitat values of the surrounding area and potentially resulting in significant cumulative impacts with respect to biological resources.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, set forth and incorporated above, the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this cumulative impact, and the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-7:

Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4 and BIO-6.

I. IMPACT CULT-1: FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN MENLO PARK COULD LEAD TO DEMOLITION AND ALTERATION THAT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO CHANGE THE HISTORIC FABRIC OR SETTING OF HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES SUCH THAT THE RESOURCE'S ABILITY TO CONVEY ITS SIGNIFICANCE MAY BE MATERIALLY IMPAIRED.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could result in new development and that could impair the historic integrity of resources are generally more important with larger and denser new construction and the impacts on historical resources would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1 set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CULT-1:

At the time that individual projects are proposed on any site citywide with a building more than 50 years old or any site adjoining a property with a building more than 50 years old, the City shall require the project applicant to prepare a site-specific evaluation to determine if the project is subject to completion of a site-specific historic resources study. If it is determined that a site-specific historic resources study is required, the study shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architecture or Architectural History. At a minimum, the study shall consist of a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System, an intensive-level pedestrian field survey, an evaluation of significance using standard National Register Historic Preservation and California Register Historic Preservation evaluation criteria, and recordation of all identified historic buildings

and structures on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 Site Record forms. The study shall describe the historic context and setting, methods used in the investigation, results of the evaluation, and recommendations for management of identified resources. If applicable, the specific requirements for inventory areas and documentation format required by certain agencies, such as the Federal Highway Administration and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), shall be adhered to.

If the project site or adjacent properties are found to be eligible for listing on the California Register, the project shall be required to conform to the current Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, and Restoring Historic Buildings, which require the preservation of character defining features which convey a building's historical significance, and offers guidance about appropriate and compatible alterations to such structures.

J. IMPACT CULT-2A: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT COULD HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO CAUSE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT TO AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE PURSUANT TO CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15064.5.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could result in new development and that could impair the historic integrity of unknown archaeological deposits associated with the historic period of Menlo Park and Native American prehistoric archeological sites. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-2a set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the proposed project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CULT-2a:

If a potentially significant subsurface cultural resource is encountered during ground disturbing activities on any parcel in the city, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until a qualified archeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. All developers in the study area shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction activities shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) criteria by a qualified archeologist. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also

perform appropriate technical analyses; prepare a comprehensive report complete with methods, results, and recommendations; and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered resources. The report shall be submitted to the City of Menlo Park, Northwest Information Center (NWIC), and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), if required.

K. IMPACT CULT-2b: FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN MENLO PARK COULD IMPACT ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES WITHOUT PROPER CONSULTATION WITH NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could result in new development and that could impair the historic integrity of unknown archaeological deposits associated with the historic period of Menlo Park and Native American prehistoric archeological sites. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-2b set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CULT-2b:

As part of the City's application approval process and prior to project approval, the City shall consult with those Native American Tribes with ancestral ties to the Menlo Park city limits regarding General Plan Amendments in the city and land use policy changes. Upon receipt of an application for proposed project that requires a General Plan Amendment or a land use policy change, the City shall submit a request for a list of Native American Tribes to be contacted about the proposed project to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Upon receipt of the list of Native American Tribes from the NAHC, the City shall submit a letter to each Tribe on the provided list requesting consultation with the Native American Tribe about the proposed project via the via the City's preferred confirmation of receipt correspondence tracking method (e.g., Federal Express, United States Postal Service Certified Mail, etc.).

L. IMPACT CULT-3: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT WOULD HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY AFFECT A UNIQUE PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCE OR SITE, OR UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURE.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could result in new development and that could impair unknown fossils or unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features in the study area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3 set forth below, which is hereby adopted and

incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CULT-3:

In the event that fossils or fossil bearing deposits are discovered during ground disturbing activities anywhere in the city, excavations within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. Ground disturbance work shall cease until a City-approved qualified paleontologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed

(in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards [Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995]), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction activities are allowed to resume at the location of the find. If avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of construction activities on the discovery. The excavation plan shall be submitted to the City of Menlo Park for review and approval prior to implementation, and all construction activity shall adhere to the recommendations in the excavation plan.

M. IMPACT CULT-4: GROUND-DISTURBING ACTIVITIES AS A RESULT OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN MENLO PARK COULD ENCOUNTER HUMAN REMAINS THE DISTURBANCE OF THOSE REMAINS COULD RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNDER CEQA.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could result in new development and that could impair human remains, including those of Native Americans, associated with pre-contact archaeological deposits in the study area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-4 set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CULT-4:

Procedures of conduct following the discovery of human remains citywide have been mandated by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA). According to the provisions in CEQA, if human remains are encountered at the site, all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease and necessary steps to ensure the integrity of the immediate area shall be taken. The San Mateo County Coroner shall be notified immediately. The Coroner shall then determine whether the remains are Native American. If the

Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC within 24 hours, who will, in turn, notify the person the NAHC identifies as the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of any human remains. Further actions shall be determined, in part, by the desires of the MLD. The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations regarding the disposition of the remains following notification from the NAHC of the discovery. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the owner shall, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. Alternatively, if the owner does not accept the MLD's recommendations, the owner or the descendent may request mediation by the NAHC.

N. IMPACT CULT-5: GROUND-DISTURBING ACTIVITIES AS A RESULT OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN MENLO PARK COULD ENCOUNTER TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (TCRS) THE DISTURBANCE OF WHICH COULD RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UNDER CEQA.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could result in new development and that could impair unknown archeological resources including Native American artifacts and human remains, which could be defined as tribal cultural resources (TCRs). Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-5a through CULT-5c set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the proposed project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CULT-5a:

Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-2a.

Mitigation Measure CULT-5b:

Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-2b.

Mitigation Measure CULT-5c:

Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-4.

O. IMPACT CULT-6: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT, IN COMBINATION WITH PAST, PRESENT AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS, WOULD RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WITH RESPECT TO CULTURAL RESOURCES.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could impair cultural resources, including unknown archaeological resources, paleontological resources, human remains, or TCR's historic building and potentially resulting in significant cumulative impacts with respect to biological resources.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-6, set forth and incorporated below, the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this cumulative impact, and the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CULT-6:

Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-1, CULT-2a, CULT-2b, CULT-3, and CULT-4.

P. IMPACT HAZ-4: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT COULD OCCUR ON SITES WITH KNOWN HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND, AS A RESULT, CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Final EIR finds that because hazardous materials are known to be present in soil, soil gas, and/or groundwater due to past land uses at certain sites that may be redeveloped as part of the Project, the direct contact, inhalation, or ingestion of hazardous materials could potentially cause adverse health effects to construction workers and future site users. The severity of health effects would depend on the contaminant(s), concentration, use of personal protective equipment during construction, and duration of exposure. The disturbance and release of hazardous materials during earthwork activities, if present, could pose a hazard to construction workers, nearby receptors, and the environment and impacts could be potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-4a and HAZ-4b, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-4a:

Construction at the sites of any site in the City with known contamination, shall be conducted under a project-specific Environmental Site Management Plan (ESMP) that is prepared in consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), as appropriate. The purpose of the ESMP is to protect construction workers, the general public, the environment, and future site occupants from subsurface hazardous materials previously identified at the site and to address the possibility of encountering unknown contamination or hazards in the subsurface. The ESMP shall summarize soil and groundwater analytical data collected on the project site during past investigations; identify management options for excavated soil and groundwater, if contaminated media are encountered during deep excavations;

and identify monitoring, irrigation, or other wells requiring proper abandonment in compliance with local, State, and federal laws, policies, and regulations.

The ESMP shall include measures for identifying, testing, and managing soil and groundwater suspected of or known to contain hazardous materials. The ESMP shall: 1) provide procedures for evaluating, handling, storing, testing, and disposing of soil and groundwater during project excavation and dewatering activities, respectively; 2) describe required worker health and safety provisions for all workers potentially exposed to hazardous materials in accordance with State and federal worker safety regulations; and 3) designate personnel responsible for implementation of the ESMP.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-4b:

For those sites throughout the city with potential residual contamination in soil, gas, or groundwater that are planned for redevelopment with an overlying occupied building, a vapor intrusion assessment shall be performed by a licensed environmental professional. If the results of the vapor intrusion assessment indicate the potential for significant vapor intrusion into an occupied building, project design shall include vapor controls or source removal, as appropriate, in accordance with regulatory agency requirements. Soil vapor mitigations or controls could include vapor barriers, passive venting, and/or active venting. The vapor intrusion assessment and associated vapor controls or source removal can be incorporated into the ESMP (Mitigation Measure HAZ-4a).

Q. IMPACT HAZ-9: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT, IN COMBINATION WITH PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS, WOULD RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WITH RESPECT TO HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

The Final EIR takes into account growth projected by the Project within the Menlo Park city boundary and Sphere of Influence (SOI), in combination with impacts from projected growth in the rest of San Mateo County and the surrounding region, as forecast by the Association of Bay Area of Governments (ABAG). Potential cumulative hazardous materials impacts could arise from a combination of the development of the Project together with the regional growth in the immediate vicinity of the study area. As discussed under Impact HAZ-4, disturbance and release of hazardous materials during earthwork activities, if present, could pose a hazard to construction workers, nearby receptors, and the environment and impacts could be potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-9, set forth and incorporated below, in conjunction with

compliance with General Plan policies and strategies, other local, regional, State, and federal regulations, the proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this cumulative impact, and the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-9:

Implement Mitigation Measures HAZ-4a and HAZ-4b.

R. IMPACT LU-2: FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS IN MENLO PARK COULD BE INCONSISTENT WITH THE APPLICABLE GOALS, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN THE GENERAL PLAN THAT HAVE BEEN PREPARED TO REDUCE AND/OR AVOID IMPACTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE SUPPORTING ZONING STANDARDS.

The Final EIR finds that future projects that are inconsistent with the applicable goals, policies and programs in the General Plan and supporting Zoning standards would be considered a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-2, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure LU-2:

As part of the discretionary review process for development projects, all proposed development anywhere in Menlo Park is required to demonstrate consistency with the applicable goals, policies, and programs in the General Plan and the supporting Zoning standards to the satisfaction of the City of Menlo Park's Community Development Department. A future project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning standards if, considering all its aspects, it will further the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan and supporting Zoning standards and not obstruct their attainment.

S. IMPACT LU-4: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT, IN COMBINATION WITH PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS, WOULD RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WITH RESPECT TO LAND USE AND PLANNING.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could result in a cumulative land use impact if future projects under the proposed project are inconsistent with the applicable goals, policies and programs in the General Plan and supporting Zoning standards. Implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-4 set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the proposed project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure LU-4:

Implement Mitigation Measure LU-2.

T. IMPACT NOISE-1: FUTURE PROJECTS IN MENLO PARK COULD RESULT IN DEVELOPMENT THAT EXCEEDS NOISE LIMITS REQUIRED UNDER TITLE 24 AND THE CITY'S REGULATIONS.

The Final EIR finds that if future projects in Menlo Park exceed the noise limits required under Title 24 or the City's regulations as set forth in the Zoning regulations this would result in a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOISE-1a, NOISE-1b, and NOISE-1c, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1a:

To meet the requirements of Title 24 and General Plan Program N1.A, project applicants shall perform acoustical studies prior to issuance of building permits for citywide development of new noise-sensitive uses. New residential dwellings, hotels, motels, dormitories, and school classrooms must meet an interior noise limit of 45 dBA CNEL or Ldn. Developments in areas exposed to more than 60 dBA CNEL must demonstrate that the structure has been designed to limit interior noise in habitable rooms to acceptable noise levels. Where exterior noise levels are projected to exceed 60 dBA CNEL or Ldn at the façade of a building, a report must be submitted with the building plans describing the noise control measures that have been incorporated into the design of the project to meet the 45 dBA noise limit. Project applicants for all new multi-family residential projects subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department, prior to building permit issuance, must perform acoustical studies within the

projected Ldn 60 dB noise contours, so that noise mitigation measures can be incorporated into project design and site planning, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1b:

Stationary noise sources and landscaping and maintenance activities citywide shall comply with Chapter 8.06, Noise, of the Menlo Park Municipal Code.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1c:

Project applicants for all development projects in the city shall minimize the exposure of nearby properties to excessive noise levels from construction-related activity through CEQA review, conditions of approval and/or enforcement of the City's Noise Ordinance. Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, and/or building permits for development projects, a note shall be provided on development plans indicating that during on-going grading, demolition, and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related noise:

- *Construction activity is limited to the daytime hours between 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday, as prescribed in the City's municipal code.*
- *All internal combustion engines on construction equipment and trucks are fitted with properly maintained mufflers, air intake silencers, and/or engine shrouds that are no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer.*
- *Stationary equipment such as generators and air compressors shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive uses.*
- *Stockpiling is located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors.*
- *Limit unnecessary engine idling to the extent feasible.*
- *Limit the use of public address systems.*
- *Construction traffic shall be limited to the haul routes established by the City of Menlo Park.*

U. IMPACT NOISE-2: FUTURE PROJECTS IN MENLO PARK COULD CAUSE EXPOSURE OF PEOPLE TO, OR GENERATION OF, EXCESSIVE GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION OR GROUNDBORNE NOISE LEVELS.

The Final EIR finds that if future projects in Menlo Park could cause exposure of people to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measured NOISE-2a and NOISE-2b, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-2a:

To prevent architectural damage citywide as a result of construction-generated vibration:

- *Prior to issuance of a building permit for any development project requiring pile driving or blasting, the project applicant/developer shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. The maximum levels shall not exceed 0.2 inch/second, which is the level that can cause architectural damage for typical residential construction. If maximum levels would exceed these thresholds, alternative methods such static rollers, non-explosive blasting, and drilling piles as opposed to pile driving shall be used.*

To prevent vibration-induced annoyance as a result of construction-generated vibration:

- *Individual projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities, such as blasting, pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, within 200 feet of sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. A vibration study shall be conducted for individual projects where vibration-intensive impacts may occur. The study shall be prepared by an acoustical or vibration engineer holding a degree in engineering, physics, or allied discipline and who is able to demonstrate a minimum of two years of experience in preparing technical assessments in acoustics and/or groundborne vibrations. The study is subject to review and approval of the Community Development Department.*

Vibration impacts to nearby receptors shall not exceed the vibration annoyance levels (in RMS inches/second) as follows:

- *Workshop = 0.126*
- *Office = 0.063*
- *Residential Daytime (7:00 AM–10:00 PM)= 0.032*
- *Residential Nighttime (10:00 PM to 700 AM) = 0.016*

If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses, additional requirements, such as use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques, shall be implemented during construction (e.g., nonexplosive blasting methods, drilled piles as opposed to pile driving, preclusion for using vibratory rollers, use of small- or medium-sized bulldozers,

etc.). Vibration reduction measures shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the project and applicable building plans, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-2b:

To reduce long-term vibration impacts of future development citywide on existing or potential future sensitive uses:

- *Locate sensitive uses away from vibration sources.*
- *Design industrial development to minimize vibration impacts on nearby uses. Where vibration impacts may occur, reduce impacts on residences and businesses through the use of setbacks and/or structural design features that reduce vibration to levels at or below the guidelines of the Federal Transit Administration near rail lines and industrial uses.*
- *Work with the railroad operators (e.g., Caltrain, Union Pacific, etc.) to reduce, to the extent possible, the contribution of railroad train noise and vibration to Menlo Park's noise environment.*

V. IMPACT NOISE-4: FUTURE PROJECTS IN MENLO PARK COULD RESULT IN CONSTRUCTION-RELATED NOISE THAT EXCEEDS NOISE LIMITS REQUIRED UNDER THE CITY'S REGULATIONS.

The Final EIR finds that future projects would be required to demonstrate compliance with the City's required standards to ensure they do not result in the generation of construction noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or the Municipal Code, and/or the applicable standards of other agencies. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOISE-4, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-4:

Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-1c.

W. IMPACT NOISE-7: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT, IN COMBINATION WITH PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS, WOULD RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WITH RESPECT TO NOISE.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project could result in a cumulative noise impact if future projects under the proposed project are inconsistent with the applicable goals, policies and programs in the General Plan and supporting Zoning standards related to maintaining acceptable noise operational and construction-related impacts. Implementation of Mitigation

Measure NOISE-7, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the proposed project, would avoid or reduce this impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-7:

Implement Mitigation Measures NOISE-1a through NOISE-1c, NOISE-2a, NOISE-2b, and NOISE-4.

X. IMPACT UTIL-10: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT, WHEN CONSIDERED WITH THE OTHER JURISDICTIONS THAT DIVERT SOLID WASTE TO THE OX MOUNTAIN LANDFILL, COULD RESULT IN POTENTIAL LACK OF LANDFILL CAPACITY FOR DISPOSAL OF SOLID WASTE UNDER CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS.

The Final EIR finds that anticipated rates of solid waste disposal would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to target disposal rates, and that the City would continue its current recycling ordinances and waste management policies. Nevertheless, the 2034 estimated closure date for the Ox Mountain Landfill would result in insufficient solid waste disposal capacity at buildout of the proposed project when considered with other development in the service area of the Ox Mountain Landfill, resulting in a significant cumulative impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-10, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce this impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure UTIL-10:

The City shall continue its reduction programs and diversion requirements in an effort to further reduce solid waste that is diverted to the landfill and lower its per capita disposal rate citywide. In addition, the City shall monitor solid waste

generation volumes in relation to capacities at receiving landfill sites to ensure that sufficient capacity exists to accommodate future growth. The City shall ensure any waste management firm it contracts with has access to a new landfill site(s) to replace the Ox Mountain landfills, at such time that this landfill is closed.

VIII. ALTERNATIVES

The Final EIR analyzed three alternatives to the Project, examining the environmental impacts and feasibility of each alternative, as well as the ability of the alternatives to meet Project objectives. The Project objectives are listed in Chapter 3 (Project Description) of the Draft EIR; the potentially significant environmental effects of the Project, including feasible mitigation measures

identified to avoid these impacts, are analyzed in Chapter 4 (Environmental Evaluation) of the Draft EIR; and the alternatives are described in detail in Chapter 5 (Alternatives to the Proposed Project) of the Draft EIR.

Brief summaries of the alternatives are provided below. A brief discussion of the Environmentally Superior Alternative follows the summaries of the alternatives. As explained in Section IX, below, the findings in this Section VII are based on the Final EIR, the discussion and analysis in which is hereby incorporated in full by this reference.

A. THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE: CURRENT GENERAL PLAN

CEQA requires evaluation of the "no project" alternative. State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e). Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(3)(A), the No Project Alternative assumes that growth and development would continue to occur under the provisions of the current General Plan, including the development allocations non-residential space, hotel and residential unit allocations. Thus, no new development potential beyond what is currently permitted in the current General Plan would occur.

As shown in Draft EIR Table 5-1, the No Project Alternative would allow for the following new development allocations:

- Non-residential allocation: 1.8 million square feet (no net increase from current General Plan)
- Hotel allocation: 0 rooms (no net increase from current General Plan)
- Residential allocation: 1,000 units (no net increase from current General Plan)

When compared to the Project, implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in less development potential, and therefore fewer impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, population and housing, public services and recreation, and utilities and services

systems. However, each of these topic areas were found to be less than significant under the Project with implementation of the Project's goals, policies and programs and Mitigation Measures BI0-1, CULT-1, CULT-2a, CULT-2b, CULT-3, CULT-4, and CULT-5a through CULT-5c, HAZ-4a, HAZ-4b, HAZ-9, NOISE-1a though NOISE-1c, NOISE-2a, NOISE-2b, NOISE-4, NOISE-7, and UTIL-10. Therefore, adoption of the No Project Alternative does not strictly reduce impacts merely because it allows for less development. For example, the Project includes land uses that plan to improve the balance between jobs and housing—the result is 14 Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) per service population, which is lower than the 19 miles anticipated with the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would continue the business-as-usual land use imbalance

related to jobs and housing and would not foster a live/work/play environment in the M-2 Area and therefore, impacts related to VMT and consequently, air quality and GHG emissions would be greater than the Project.

While the current General Plan includes goals, policies, and programs that reduce impacts to the environment, the No Project Alternative does not include the improved and enhanced goals, policies, and programs that address the distinct issues and opportunities that the Menlo Park community is likely to face during the updated planning horizon of the General Plan. The proposed policies of the Land Use and Circulation Elements have been carefully prepared to reduce and/or avoid impacts to the environment as a result of future development in the City to the extent feasible. The proposed policies aim to reduce VMT, greenhouse gas emissions, air quality pollutants, energy consumption, water demand, and solid waste generation by promoting infill development; increasing opportunities for alternative modes of transportation, pedestrian, and bicycle access and connectivity, and local jobs; protecting open space; conserving natural resources; and requiring adherence to green building practices. General Plan policies aim to avoid hazardous conditions and facilitate a healthy and safe environment for residents and visitors to Menlo Park. In addition, General Plan polices aim to protect cultural resources and ensure that new development and redevelopment is compatible with neighboring land uses.

Furthermore, the proposed Zoning update includes regulations for development in the M-2 Area that would introduce Residential and Non-Residential Green Building Requirements, installation of electric vehicle (EV) chargers and meeting 100 percent of electricity and natural gas demand through either onside generation and/or purchase of renewable electricity or electricity credits to offset energy use. The Zoning Ordinance update also requires that future development project applicants submit a zero-waste management plan to the City, which will cover how the applicant plans to minimize waste to landfill and incineration. The continuation

of the ongoing General Plan and Zoning in the M-2 Area do not allow the City to stay current and address the evolving needs of it residents and employees.

As discussed in Section 5.4.3 of the Draft EIR, the No Project Alternative would not satisfy the Project objectives. One Project objective was to plan for changes to land uses in the M-2 Area. The No Project Alternative would not plan for any changes to the M-2 Area. Another Project objective was to achieve the community's vision. The No Project Alternative would not plan for a live/work/play environment in the M-2 Area that was envisioned by the community. The No

Project Alternative does achieve the community's vision or the Project objective to improve mobility for all travel modes. The No Project Alternative would not implement the new proposed General Plan goals, policies and programs, and Zoning regulations that would implement the community's vision for Menlo Park moving into the future. Another Project objective was to realize economic and revenue potential. With the No Project Alternative, there would be no new potential for housing which generates property tax revenue, for commercial uses that generate sales tax revenue, or for new hotel rooms that generate transient occupancy taxes for the City. Finally, the No Project Alternative would not meet the Project objective streamline environmental review and proposed projects would continue to undergo full environmental review under the outdated General Plan. For the foregoing reasons, the No Project Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible.

B. REDUCED NON-RESIDENTIAL INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

Under the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative, the updated goals, policies and programs of the General Plan Land Use Element and Circulation Element the updated M-2 Area Zoning Ordinance would be implemented. All net new non-residential development under the Project in the M-2 Area would be reduced by 50 percent and the ongoing development potential under the existing General Plan would continue under this Alternative. In other words, all potential development under the existing General Plan would not be reduced. All other components under the Project as described under Section 3.7 of Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, would occur, such as an update to the City's Zoning Ordinance for the M-2 Area to ensure consistency with the General Plan Update and previously adopted ordinances and policies.

As shown in Draft EIR Table 5-1, the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative would allow for the following new development allocations:

- Non-residential allocation: 2.9 million square feet (net increase of 1.1 million square feet from current General Plan)
- Hotel allocation: 200 rooms (net increase of 200 rooms from current General Plan)
- Residential: 5,500 units (net increase of 4,500 from current General Plan)

When compared to the Project, implementation of this alternative would result in less development potential and impacts related to air quality, biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, public services and recreation, transportation and circulation, and utilities and services systems. However, because the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative assumes that the same General Plan goals, policies, and programs, updated Zoning regulation, and recommended Mitigation Measures AQ-3a, AQ-3b, BI0-1, CULT-1, CULT-2a, CULT-2b, CULT-3, CULT-4, and CULT-5a through

CULT-5c, HAZ-4a, HAZ-4b, HAZ-9, NOISE-1a though NOISE-1c, NOISE-2a, NOISE-2b, NOISE-4, NOISE-7, and UTIL-10 for the Project would apply, the impacts would not be less in these categories simply because less development is proposed. In other words, impacts would be reduced under both scenarios with the application of the mitigating features of the Project and the mitigation measures enforced through the MMRP. Mitigating Project features and Mitigation Measures AQ-2a, AQ-2b1, AQ-2b2, and AQ-5, and TRANS-1a, TRANS-1b, and TRANS-6a through TRANS-6c, would not reduce impacts because some aspects of the measures are not within the City's jurisdiction to implement. Development under the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative would result in less non-residential development but maintain the same level of residential as the Project, and therefore has the potential to improve the existing land use to job balance in the study area necessary to ensure that VMT-related impacts such as air quality, GHG emissions, and transportation and circulation would be lower when compared to the Project. It is for this reason this alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative. However, this identification does not in and of itself mean this is the most appropriate alternative to fulfill the vision and Project objectives for ConnectMenlo.

The Project is a reflection of the community's vision as identified through ConnectMenlo, which was a robust community engagement process. Under the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative, the total number of non-residential square footage, hotel rooms, and employees in the M-2 Area would be 50 percent less than anticipated under the Project. This alternative, therefore, does not fully achieve the community's vision because it is a reduction from that vision. Under this alternative, the 50 percent reduction in non-residential development would commensurately reduce economic and revenue potential as compared to the Project, especially from primary sources such as sales tax, business-to-business transaction taxes, and transient occupancy tax. Therefore, this alternative would not fully achieve the economic and revenue potential objective set forth for the Project. The Project and its live/work/play vision oriented toward pedestrian, transit and bicycle use (especially for commuting to nearby jobs) for the M-2 Area was developed working with M-2 Area property owners. Reducing the envisioned non-residential development potential will not achieve the vision of those property

owners or the public who participated in ConnectMenlo to create that vision or the objective to improve mobility for all travel modes. For the foregoing reasons, Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible.

C. REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the updated goals, policies and programs of the General Plan Land Use Element and Circulation Element the updated M-2 Area Zoning Ordinance would be implemented. In addition, all net

new development in the M-2 Area under the Project would be reduced by 25 percent. Potential development under the existing General Plan would not be reduced. All other components proposed by the Project as described under Section 3.7 of Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, would occur, such as an update to the City's Zoning Ordinance for the M-2 Area to ensure consistency with the General Plan Update and previously adopted ordinances and policies.

As shown in Draft EIR Table 5-1, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would allow for the following new development allocations:

- Non-residential allocation: 3.5 million square feet (net increase of 1.7 million square feet from current General Plan)
- Hotel allocation: 300 rooms (net increase of 300 rooms from current General Plan)
- Residential: 4,375 units (net increase of 3,375 units from current General Plan)

Like the Reduced Non-residential Intensity Alternative, when compared to the Project, implementation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in less development potential and impacts related to air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, public services and recreation, and utilities and services systems. However, because the Reduced Intensity Alternative assumes that the same General Plan goals, policies, and programs, updated Zoning regulation, and recommended Mitigation Measures AQ-3a, AQ-3b, BI0-1, CULT-1, CULT-2a, CULT-2b, CULT-3, CULT-4, and CULT-5a through CULT-5c, HAZ-4a, HAZ-4b, HAZ-9, NOISE-1a though NOISE-1c, NOISE-2a, NOISE-2b, NOISE-4, NOISE-7, and UTIL-10 for the Project would apply, the impacts would not be less in these categories simply because less development is proposed. In other words, impacts would be reduced under both scenarios with the application of the mitigating features of the Project and the mitigation measures enforced through the MMRP. Mitigating Project features and Mitigation Measures AQ-2a, AQ-2b1, AQ-2b2, and AQ-5, and TRANS-1a, TRANS-1b, and TRANS-6a through TRANS-6c, would not reduce impacts because some aspects of the measures are not within the City's jurisdiction to implement.

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative the total number of residential and non-residential square footage, hotel rooms, and employees in the M-2 Area would be 25 percent less than anticipated under the Project and would generally meet all of the project objectives, but not to the same extent as the Project. As

described above under the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative, the reduced economic and revenue potential from that of the Project would not fully achieve the economic and revenue potential objective set forth by the Project and consequently, would not fully establish and achieve the community's vision for jobs that would support and promote live/work/play environments oriented toward pedestrians, transit, and bicycle use (especially for commuting to nearby jobs) to the same extent as the Project. For the foregoing reasons, Reduced Intensity Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible.

E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of the Project and the alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection be disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of significant impacts. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure and the alternative selected may not be the alternative that best meets the goals or needs of Menlo Park. The project under consideration cannot be identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Additionally, in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), if the environmentally superior alternative is the "No Project" Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

As shown in Table 5-2 in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR, the No Project Alternative would, in comparison to the Project, result in reduced environmental impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, population and housing (cumulative), public services, and utilities and service systems, but would ultimately result in greater impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and transportation and traffic. Neither the Reduced Non-Residential Alternative nor the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in greater impacts when compared to the Project. Therefore, as shown on Table 5-2, the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would result in fewer significant impacts than the Reduced Intensity Alternative. This is in part because the equal reduction of jobs and housing in the Reduced Intensity Alternative would maintain the imbalance that currently exists in the city, which could result in a higher VMT than both the proposed project and the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative.

For the foregoing reasons, the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

XII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth above, the City has found that the Project will result in project and cumulative significant adverse environmental impacts related to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, population and housing, and traffic and circulation that cannot be avoided following adoption, incorporation into the Project, and implementation of mitigation measures described in the EIR. In addition, there are no feasible project alternatives that would mitigate or avoid all of the Project's significant environmental impacts. Section 15093(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides that when the decision of the public agency results in the occurrence of significant impacts that are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its actions. See also Public Resources Code Section 21081(b). Having balanced the economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the Project, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, against its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, the City finds that the Project benefits outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

The following statement identifies the reasons why, in the City's judgment, specific benefits of the Project outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects. The City finds that each of the Project benefits discussed below is a separate and independent basis for these findings. The reasons set forth below are based on the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

1. The Project would promote a vibrant economy by supporting a diversity of business and employment opportunities.
2. The Project provides for the greatest and most balanced economic growth alternative by creating 2.3 million square feet of new employment-related land uses and allowing the City greater opportunities to remain a competitive and innovative business destination in the regional development environment, which would support increased property and sales tax revenues.
3. The Project plans for 400 additional hotel rooms that will generate transient occupancy tax revenue for the City.
4. The Project updates the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to guarantee funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and roadway and infrastructure improvements that are necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects.

ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

1. The Project is environmentally superior to the existing General Plan, as discussed in Draft EIR Chapter 5 and summarized above in Section VII(A).
2. The Project recognizes the importance of linking land use and transportation planning.
3. The Project concentrates growth in existing urbanized areas and thereby results in fewer impacts from the construction of new infrastructure, maximizes use of existing impervious surfaces, provides multi-modal transportation opportunities, and reduces vehicle miles traveled, which translates into air quality and greenhouse gas emissions benefits and increases in resources and energy efficiency.
4. The Project largely concentrates growth at locations with existing uses and, as a result, potential future development would consist largely of either redevelopment of existing buildings and/or sites, and selective demolition of existing structures and replacement with new construction.
5. The Project includes policies that encourage conservation of water and energy resources in conformance with the City's sustainability goals.
6. The Project includes policies and mitigation measures, enforceable through the MMRP, that protect the Don Edwards Bay National Wildlife Refuge and other sensitive habitat areas.
7. The Project is in conformance with the principles of planning sustainable communities by meeting both the present and future housing needs of the City.
8. The Project is consistent with Plan Bay Area, which is the Bay Area's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS), as well as SB 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act.

SOCIAL BENEFITS

1. The Project plans for citywide equity by providing the greatest job and housing opportunities in the M-2 Area to support a greater balance of land uses in this area of the City.
2. The Project includes up to 5,500 new residential units of which 4,500 would be in the M-2 Area, which represent significant new housing opportunities and include built in incentives for affordable housing.
3. The Project would result in reduced environmental justice inequities by facilitating and promoting the abatement of incompatible land uses and providing an equitable distribution of public amenities.

4. The Project would encourage mixed-use development in the M-2 Area to help improve walkability and quality of life for Menlo Park residents and the region by providing the opportunity for a better jobs/housing balance.
5. The Project provides opportunities for increased building heights and makes additional building height and residential density increases contingent on future development projects in Menlo Park providing the City with community benefits through corporate contributions.
6. The Project plans for M-2 Area residents to receive community benefits through corporate contributions as a result of the live/work/play environment envisioned.
7. The Project maintains investment backed expectations for the community at large.
8. The Project includes goals, policies, and programs that encourage social (and health) benefits associated with improved multi-modal transportation enhancements.

XII. ADOPTION OF THE MMRP

The City Council hereby adopts the mitigation measures set forth for the Project in the Final EIR and the MMRP attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by this reference.

VI. SEVERABILITY

If any term, provision, or portion of these findings or the application of these findings to a particular situation is held by a court to be invalid, void or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of these findings, or their application to other actions related to the Project, shall continue in full force and effect unless amended or modified by the City.

I, Pamela Aguilar, City Clerk of Menlo Park, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing Council Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted at a meeting by said Council on the 6th day of December, 2016, by the following votes:

AYES: Carlton, Keith, Ohtaki

NOES: None

ABSENT: Cline, Mueller

ABSTAIN: None

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Official Seal of said City on this 6th day of December, 2016.

_____
Pamela Aguilar, CMC
City Clerk

Mitigation Monitoring or Reporting Program

This Mitigation Monitoring or Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the proposed Menlo Park General Plan (Land Use & Circulation Elements) and M-2 Area Zoning Update (proposed project). The purpose of the MMRP is to ensure the implementation of mitigation measures identified as part of the environmental review for the proposed project. The MMRP includes the following information:

- The full text of the mitigation measures;
- The party responsible for implementing the mitigation measures;
- The timing for implementation of the mitigation measure;
- The agency responsible for monitoring the implementation; and
- The monitoring action and frequency.

The mitigation measures in this MMRP shall be applied to all future development anywhere in the city unless otherwise specified in the specific mitigation measure. The City of Menlo Park must adopt this MMRP, or an equally effective program, if it approves the proposed project with the mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of project approval.

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
Air Quality						
AQ-2a: Prior to issuance of a building permits, all development projects in the city that are subject to CEQA and exceed the screening sizes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City's Planning Division a technical assessment evaluating potential project-related operational air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If operational-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as identified in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines, the project applicant is required to incorporate mitigation measures into the development project to reduce air pollutant emissions during operation. The identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division prior to building permit issuance.	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Once for the preparation of the technical assessment	Initials:_____ Date:_____
AQ-2b1: Prior to building permit issuance, the City shall require applicants for all development projects in the city to comply with the current Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) basic control measures for reducing construction emissions of PM10 (Table 8-1, Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for All Proposed Projects, of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines).	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Prior to approval and during scheduled site visits	Initials:_____ Date:_____
AQ-2b2: Prior to issuance of a building permit, development projects in the City that are subject to CEQA and exceed the screening sizes in the BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City of Menlo Park a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Once for the preparation of the technical assessment	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
identified in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the project applicant is required to incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities to below these thresholds (e.g., Table 8-2, Additional Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for projects with Construction Emissions Above the Threshold of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, or applicable construction mitigation measures subsequently approved by BAAQMD). These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans), subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division prior to building permit issuance.						
AQ-3a: As part of the discretionary review process for development applications, applicants for all non-residential projects within the City that: 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered TRUs, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of a proposed project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City's Planning Division. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds 10 in one million (10E-06), PM2.5 concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Mitigation measures may include but are not limited to: ▪ Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible. ▪ Electrifying warehousing docks.	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Once for the preparation of the HRA	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
▪ Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. ▪ Restricting off-site truck travel through the creation of truck routes. Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific HRA shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of a proposed project, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.						
AQ-3b: As part of the discretionary review process, applicants for all residential and other sensitive land use projects (e.g., hospitals, nursing homes, day care centers) anywhere in the City within 1,000 feet of a major sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs) (e.g., warehouses, industrial areas, freeways, and roadways with traffic volumes over 10,000 vehicle per day), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the source/edge of the nearest travel lane, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City's Planning Division. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children ages 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), PM2.5 concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to: ▪ Air intakes located away from high volume roadways and/or truck loading zones. ▪ Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Once for the preparation of the HRA	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
buildings provided with appropriately sized maximum efficiency rating value (MERV) filters. Measures identified in the HRA shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.						
AQ-5: Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2a through AQ-3b.						Initials:_____ Date:_____
Biological Resources						
BIO-1: As part of the discretionary review process for development projects, new construction and building additions regardless of size, in addition to appropriate CEQA review, the City shall require all project applicants to prepare and submit project-specific baseline biological resources assessments (BRA) if the project would occur on or adjacent to a parcel containing natural habitat with features such as mature and native trees, unused structures that could support special-status bat species, other sensitive biological resources, and/or active nests of common birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Sensitive biological resources triggering the need for the baseline BRA shall include: wetlands, occurrences or suitable habitat for special-status species, sensitive natural communities, and important movement corridors for wildlife such as creek corridors and shorelines. The baseline BRA shall be prepared by a qualified biologist. The baseline BRA shall provide a determination on whether any sensitive biological resources are present on the site, including jurisdictional wetlands and waters, essential habitat for special-	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	A qualified biologist approved by the City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Once for the preparation of a biological assessment and again, if determined further assessment is required as specified in this mitigation measure	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
status species, and sensitive natural communities. If jurisdictional wetlands and/or waters are suspected to be present on the site, a jurisdictional delineation confirmed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will be provided as part of the baseline BRA. The baseline BRA shall also include consideration of possible sensitive biological resources on any adjacent undeveloped lands that could be affected by the project, and lands of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge (Refuge). The baseline BRA shall incorporate guidance from relevant regional conservation plans, including, but not limited to, the then current Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan, South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, Tidal Marsh Recovery Plan and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Recovery Plan for the Pacific Coast Population of the Western Snowy Plover, for determining the potential presence or absence of sensitive biological resources; however, the presence or absence of sensitive biological resources will be determined by on-site surveys. If the adjacent property is the Refuge, Refuge staff shall be contacted regarding the presence or absence of sensitive biological resources. If sensitive biological resources are determined to be present on the site or may be present on any adjacent parcel containing natural habitat, coordination with the appropriate regulatory and resource agencies must occur. Appropriate measures, such as preconstruction surveys, establishing no-disturbance zones and restrictive time periods during construction, protective development setbacks and restrictions, and applying bird-safe building design practices and materials, shall be developed by the qualified biologist in consultation with the regulatory and resource agencies to provide adequate avoidance, or provide						

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
compensatory mitigation if avoidance is infeasible. With respect to fully protected species, if the BRA for any development project determines that any of the following Fully Protected Species are present, then neither take of such species will be permitted nor will mitigation measures including species collection or relocation. The Fully Protected Species include American Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), California Black Rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus),* California Clapper Rail - Ridgway's Rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*) , California Least Tern (*Sterna albifrons browni*), White-tailed Kite (*Elanus leucurus*), Salt-marsh harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*), and San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*). The qualified biologist shall consult with the Refuge management and where appropriate, the Endangered Species Office of the USFWS, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for determining the potential presence or absence of sensitive biological resources and appropriate avoidance or compensatory mitigation measures, if required. Where jurisdictional waters or federally and/or State-listed special-status species would be affected, appropriate authorizations (i.e., the USACE, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), USFWS, NMFS, Refuge and CDFW), shall be obtained by the project applicant, and evidence of such authorization provided to the City prior to issuance of grading or other construction permits. For sites that are adjacent to undeveloped lands with federally and/or State-listed special status species, or sensitive habitats, or lands of the Refuge, the BRA shall include evaluation of the potential effects of:						

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
▪ additional light, ▪ glare, ▪ shading (i.e., shadow analysis), ▪ noise, ▪ urban runoff, ▪ water flow disruption, ▪ water quality degradation/sedimentation, ▪ attraction of nuisance species/predators (e.g., attraction to refuse) and their abatement (e.g., adverse impacts of rodenticides), ▪ and pesticides, generated by the project, as well as the possibility for increased activity from humans and/or domesticated pets and their effects on the nearby natural habitats. The BRA shall include proposed avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of these adverse impacts. The City of Menlo Park Planning Division may require an independent peer review of the adequacy of the baseline BRA as part of the review of the project to confirm its adequacy. Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific BRA shall be incorporated as a component of a proposed project and subsequent building permit, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department and the appropriate regulatory and resource agencies. The following zoning regulations enacted by ordinances (including but not limited to 16.43 O-Office District, 16.43.080 Corporate housing, 16.43.140 Green and sustainable building; 16.44 LS-Life Science District, 16.44.130 Green and sustainable building) to minimize impacts to biological resources are incorporated by reference into this mitigation measure and shall be a component of the project building permits:						

MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
1. Setbacks (A) Minimum of two hundred (200) feet from the waterfront; waterfront is defined as the top of the levee.						
2. Waterfront and Environmental Considerations. The following provisions are applicable when the property is adjacent to the waterfront or other sensitive habitat.						
a. Non-emergency lighting shall be limited to the minimum necessary to meet safety requirements and shall provide shielding and reflectors to minimize light spill and glare and shall not directly illuminate sensitive habitat areas. Incorporate timing devices and sensors to ensure night lighting is used only when necessary.						
b. Landscaping and its maintenance shall not negatively impact the water quality, native habitats, or natural resources.						
c. Pets shall not be allowed within the corporate housing due to their impacts on water quality, native habitats, and natural resources.						
3. Bird-friendly design.						
a. No more than ten percent (10%) of façade surface area shall have non-bird- friendly glazing.						
b. Bird- friendly glazing includes, but is not limited to opaque glass, covering the outside surface of clear glass with patterns, paned glass with fenestration, frit or etching patterns, and external screens over nonreflective glass. Highly reflective glass is not permitted.						
c. Occupancy sensors or other switch control devices shall be installed on non-emergency lights and shall be programmed to shut off during non-work hours and between 10 PM and sunrise.						

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
d. Placement of buildings shall avoid the potential funneling of flight paths towards a building façade. e. Glass skyways or walkways, freestanding (see-through) glass walls and handrails, and transparent building corners shall not be allowed. f. Transparent glass shall not be allowed at the rooflines of buildings, including in conjunction with roof decks, patios and green roofs. g. Use of rodenticides shall not be allowed. If it is determined through the BRA or CEQA review that further assessment/monitoring/reporting is required by appropriate regulatory or resource agencies, it shall be the responsibility of the City to ensure all project requirements are implemented.						
Cultural Resources						
CULT-1: At the time that individual projects are proposed on any site citywide with a building more than 50 years old or any site adjoining a property with a building more than 50 years old, the City shall require the project applicant to prepare a site-specific evaluation to determine if the project is subject to completion of a site-specific historic resources study. If it is determined that a site-specific historic resources study is required, the study shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architecture or Architectural History. At a minimum, the study shall consist of a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System, an intensive-level pedestrian field survey, an evaluation of significance using standard National Register Historic Preservation and California Register Historic Preservation evaluation criteria, and recordation of all identified historic buildings and structures on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 Site Record forms. The study shall describe the historic context and setting, methods used in the investigation, results of the evaluation, and	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	Qualified archeologist approved by the City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Once at time of preliminary assessment and again, if determined further assessment is required as specified in this mitigation measure	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
recommendations for management of identified resources. If applicable, the specific requirements for inventory areas and documentation format required by certain agencies, such as the Federal Highway Administration and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), shall be adhered to. If the project site or adjacent properties are found to be eligible for listing on the California Register, the project shall be required to conform to the current *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, and Restoring Historic Buildings,* which require the preservation of character defining features which convey a building's historical significance, and offers guidance about appropriate and compatible alterations to such structures.						
CULT-2a: If a potentially significant subsurface cultural resource is encountered during ground disturbing activities on any parcel in the city, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until a qualified archeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. All developers in the study area shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction activities shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) criteria by a qualified archeologist. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses; prepare a comprehensive report complete with methods, results, and recommendations; and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered resources. The report shall be submitted to the City of Menlo Park, Northwest Information Center (NWIC), and State Historic	Project applicant	During construction	Qualified archaeologist approved by the City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Initiated after a find is made during construction	During regularly scheduled site inspections that would be initiated after a find is made during construction	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
Preservation Office (SHPO), if required.						
CULT-2b: As part of the City's application approval process and prior to project approval, the City shall consult with those Native American Tribes with ancestral ties to the Menlo Park city limits regarding General Plan Amendments in the city and land use policy changes. Upon receipt of an application for proposed project that requires a General Plan Amendment or a land use policy change, the City shall submit a request for a list of Native American Tribes to be contacted about the proposed project to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Upon receipt of the list of Native American Tribes from the NAHC, the City shall submit a letter to each Tribe on the provided list requesting consultation with the Native American Tribe about the proposed project via the via the City's preferred confirmation of receipt correspondence tracking method (e.g., Federal Express, United States Postal Service Certified Mail, etc.).	The City of Menlo Park	During the project approval process	The City of Menlo Park Planning Division in conjunction with Native American Tribes with ancestral ties to the Menlo Park city limits	Initiated once Native American Tribes request consultation	To be determined by consulting parties	Initials:_____ Date:_____
CULT-3: In the event that fossils or fossil bearing deposits are discovered during ground disturbing activities anywhere in the city, excavations within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. Ground disturbance work shall cease until a City-approved qualified paleontologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed (in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards [Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995]), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction activities are allowed to resume at the location of the find. If avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of construction activities on the discovery. The excavation plan shall be submitted to the City of Menlo Park for review and	Project applicant	During construction	Qualified paleontologist approved by the City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Initiated after a find is made during construction	During regularly scheduled site inspections initiated after a find is made during construction	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
approval prior to implementation, and all construction activity shall adhere to the recommendations in the excavation plan.						
CULT-4: Procedures of conduct following the discovery of human remains citywide have been mandated by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA). According to the provisions in CEQA, if human remains are encountered at the site, all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease and necessary steps to ensure the integrity of the immediate area shall be taken. The San Mateo County Coroner shall be notified immediately. The Coroner shall then determine whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC within 24 hours, who will, in turn, notify the person the NAHC identifies as the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of any human remains. Further actions shall be determined, in part, by the desires of the MLD. The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations regarding the disposition of the remains following notification from the NAHC of the discovery. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the owner shall, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. Alternatively, if the owner does not accept the MLD's recommendations, the owner or the descendent may request mediation by the NAHC.	Project applicant	During construction	The San Mateo County Coroner	Initiated after a find is made during construction	During regularly scheduled site inspections initiated after a find is made during construction	Initials:_____ Date:_____
Greenhouse Gas Emissions						
GHG-1: Prior to January 1, 2020, the City of Menlo Park shall update the Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address the GHG reduction goals of Executive Order B-30-15 and Executive Order S-03-05 for GHG sectors that the City has direct or indirect jurisdictional control over. The City shall identify a GHG emissions reduction target for year 2030 and 2040 that is consistent with the GHG reduction goals identified in Executive Order B-30-15 and	City of Menlo Park	Prior to January 1, 2020	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Update the Climate Action Plan (CAP)	Once for update to the CAP	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
Executive Order S-03-05. The CAP shall be updated to include measures to ensure that the City is on a trajectory that aligns with the state's 2030 GHG emissions reduction target.						
GHG-2: Implement of Mitigation Measure GHG-1.						
Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
HAZ-4a: Construction at the sites of any site in the City with known contamination, shall be conducted under a project-specific Environmental Site Management Plan (ESMP) that is prepared in consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), as appropriate. The purpose of the ESMP is to protect construction workers, the general public, the environment, and future site occupants from subsurface hazardous materials previously identified at the site and to address the possibility of encountering unknown contamination or hazards in the subsurface. The ESMP shall summarize soil and groundwater analytical data collected on the project site during past investigations; identify management options for excavated soil and groundwater, if contaminated media are encountered during deep excavations; and identify monitoring, irrigation, or other wells requiring proper abandonment in compliance with local, State, and federal laws, policies, and regulations. The ESMP shall include measures for identifying, testing, and managing soil and groundwater suspected of or known to contain hazardous materials. The ESMP shall: 1) provide procedures for evaluating, handling, storing, testing, and disposing of soil and groundwater during project excavation and dewatering activities, respectively; 2) describe required worker health and safety provisions for all workers potentially exposed to hazardous materials in accordance with State and federal worker safety regulations; and 3) designate personnel responsible for implementation of the ESMP.	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	The appropriate "Oversight Agency" designated by the City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Prior to construction and during regularly scheduled site inspections	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
HAZ-4b: For those sites throughout the city with potential residual contamination in soil, gas, or groundwater that are planned for redevelopment with an overlying occupied building, a vapor intrusion assessment shall be performed by a licensed environmental professional. If the results of the vapor intrusion assessment indicate the potential for significant vapor intrusion into an occupied building, project design shall include vapor controls or source removal, as appropriate, in accordance with regulatory agency requirements. Soil vapor mitigations or controls could include vapor barriers, passive venting, and/or active venting. The vapor intrusion assessment and associated vapor controls or source removal can be incorporated into the ESMP (Mitigation Measure HAZ-4a).	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	Licensed environmental professional in accordance with RWQCB, DTSC, and SMCEHD approved by the City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Prior to construction and during regularly scheduled site inspections	Initials:_____ Date:_____
Land Use Planning						
LU-2: As part of the discretionary review process for development projects, all proposed development anywhere in Menlo Park is required to demonstrate consistency with the applicable goals, policies, and programs in the General Plan and the supporting Zoning standards to the satisfaction of the City of Menlo Park's Community Development Department. A future project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning standards if, considering all its aspects, it will further the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan and supporting Zoning standards and not obstruct their attainment.	Project applicant	During the building permit and site development review process and prior to permit issuance	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Once prior to plan review and approval	Initials:_____ Date:_____
Noise						
NOISE-1a: To meet the requirements of Title 24 and General Plan Program N1.A, project applicants shall perform acoustical studies prior to issuance of building permits for citywide development of new noise-sensitive uses. New residential dwellings, hotels, motels, dormitories, and school classrooms must meet an interior noise limit of 45 dBA CNEL or L_{dn}. Developments in areas exposed to more than 60 dBA CNEL must demonstrate that the structure	Project applicant	Prior to the issuance of construction permits	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Once for preparation of acoustical studies as outlined in the mitigation measure	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
has been designed to limit interior noise in habitable rooms to acceptable noise levels. Where exterior noise levels are projected to exceed 60 dBA CNEL or L_{dn} at the façade of a building, a report must be submitted with the building plans describing the noise control measures that have been incorporated into the design of the project to meet the 45 dBA noise limit. Project applicants for all new multi-family residential projects subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department, prior to building permit issuance, must perform acoustical studies within the projected Ldn 60 dB noise contours, so that noise mitigation measures can be incorporated into project design and site planning, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.						
NOISE-1b: Stationary noise sources and landscaping and maintenance activities citywide shall comply with Chapter 8.06, Noise, of the Menlo Park Municipal Code.	Project applicant	Prior to the issuance of construction permits	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	During construction	Initials:_____ Date:_____
NOISE-1c: Project applicants for all development projects in the city shall minimize the exposure of nearby properties to excessive noise levels from construction-related activity through CEQA review, conditions of approval and/or enforcement of the City's Noise Ordinance. Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, and/or building permits for development projects, a note shall be provided on development plans indicating that during on-going grading, demolition, and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related noise: ▪ Construction activity is limited to the daytime hours between 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday, as prescribed in the City's municipal code. ▪ All internal combustion engines on construction equipment and trucks are fitted with properly maintained mufflers, air intake silencers, and/or engine shrouds that are no less	Project applicant	Prior to the issuance of construction permits	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	During construction	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer. ▪ Stationary equipment such as generators and air compressors shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive uses. ▪ Stockpiling is located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors. ▪ Limit unnecessary engine idling to the extent feasible. ▪ Limit the use of public address systems. ▪ Construction traffic shall be limited to the haul routes established by the City of Menlo Park.						
NOISE-2a: To prevent architectural damage citywide as a result of construction-generated vibration: ▪ Prior to issuance of a building permit for any development project requiring pile driving or blasting, the project applicant/developer shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. The maximum levels shall not exceed 0.2 inch/second, which is the level that can cause architectural damage for typical residential construction. If maximum levels would exceed these thresholds, alternative methods such static rollers, non-explosive blasting, and drilling piles as opposed to pile driving shall be used To prevent vibration-induced annoyance as a result of construction-generated vibration: ▪ Individual projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities, such as blasting, pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, within 200 feet of sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. A vibration study shall be conducted for individual projects where vibration-intensive impacts may occur. The study shall be prepared by an acoustical or vibration engineer holding a degree in engineering, physics, or allied discipline and who is able to demonstrate a minimum of two years of experience in	Project applicant	Prior to the issuance of construction permits	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	During construction	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
preparing technical assessments in acoustics and/or groundborne vibrations. The study is subject to review and approval of the Community Development Department. Vibration impacts to nearby receptors shall not exceed the vibration annoyance levels (in RMS inches/second) as follows: ▪ Workshop = 0.126 ▪ Office = 0.063 ▪ Residential Daytime (7AM–10PM)= 0.032 ▪ Residential Nighttime (10PM to 7 AM) = 0.016 If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses, additional requirements, such as use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques, shall be implemented during construction (e.g., nonexplosive blasting methods, drilled piles as opposed to pile driving, preclusion for using vibratory rollers, use of small- or medium-sized bulldozers, etc.). Vibration reduction measures shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the project and applicable building plans, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department.						
NOISE-2b: To reduce long-term vibration impacts of future development citywide on existing or potential future sensitive uses: ▪ Locate sensitive uses away from vibration sources. ▪ Design industrial development to minimize vibration impacts on nearby uses. Where vibration impacts may occur, reduce impacts on residences and businesses through the use of setbacks and/or structural design features that reduce vibration to levels at or below the guidelines of the Federal Transit Administration near rail lines and industrial uses. ▪ Work with the railroad operators (e.g., Caltrain, Union Pacific, etc.) to reduce, to the extent possible, the contribution of railroad train noise and vibration to Menlo Park's noise environment.	Project applicant	Prior to the issuance of construction permits	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Plan review and approval	Once prior to plan review and approval	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
Transportation and Circulation						
TRANS-1a: Widen impacted roadway segments at appropriate locations throughout the city to add travel lanes and capacity to accommodate the increase in net daily trips.	City of Menlo Park	Ongoing	City of Menlo Park Transportation Division	Ongoing	Ongoing	Initials:_____ Date:_____
TRANS-1b: The City of Menlo Park shall update the existing Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to guarantee funding for citywide roadway and infrastructure improvements that are necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards. The fees shall be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a more intensive use. The fees collected shall be applied toward circulation improvements. The fees shall be calculated by multiplying the proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel room by the appropriate rate. Transportation Impact fees shall be included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City shall use the Transportation Impact Fees to fund construction (or to recoup fees advanced to fund construction) of the transportation improvements identified below, among other things that at the time of potential future development may be warranted to mitigate traffic impacts. It should be noted that any project proposed prior to the adoption of an updated TIF will be required to conduct a project-specific Transportation Impact Assessment to determine the impacts and necessary transportation mitigations that are to be funded by that project. As part of the update to the TIF program, the City shall also prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the proposed	City of Menlo Park	Ongoing	City of Menlo Park Transportation Division	Ongoing	Ongoing	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
project. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the improvements and facilities required to mitigate the impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed project. The following examples of improvements and facilities would reduce impacts to acceptable level of service standards and these, among other improvements, could be included in the TIF program impact fees nexus study: ▪ **Sand Hill Road (westbound) and I-280 Northbound On-ramp (#1)**: Modify the signal-timing plan during the PM peak hour to increase the maximum allocation of green time to the westbound approach during the PM peak hour. ▪ **Sand Hill Road (eastbound) and I-280 Northbound Off-ramp (#2)**: Add an additional northbound right-turn lane on the off-ramp to improve operations to acceptable LOS D during the AM peak hour. ▪ **El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue (#28):** One eastbound right-turn lane on Menlo Avenue to improve conditions. ▪ **Willow Road and Newbridge Street (#33):** Implement measures on Chilco Street south of Constitution Drive to reduce or prevent cut-through traffic through the Belle Haven neighborhood, such as peak-hour turn restrictions from Constitution Drive to southbound Chilco Street, and measures to enhance east/west circulation from Willow Road via O'Brien Drive and the proposed mixed-use collector street opposite Ivy Drive, extending east to University Avenue, to discourage use of Newbridge Street. ▪ **Willow Road and Hamilton Avenue (#36):** Provide primary access to potential future development sites east of Willow Road via O'Brien Drive and/or the proposed Mixed-Use Collector that would intersect Willow Road between Hamilton Avenue and O'Brien Drive. Implement measures on Chilco Street south of Constitution Drive to prevent cut-through						

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
traffic through the Belle Haven neighborhood, such as peak-hour turn restrictions from Constitution Drive to southbound Chilco Street. Although the provision of an eastbound left-turn lane on Hamilton Avenue where it approaches Willow Road would reduce the delay, this potential mitigation is not recommend because it would encourage cut-through traffic via Chilco Street and Hamilton Avenue, potentially affecting the Belle Haven neighborhood. Therefore, to avoid facilitating the use of Chilco Street and Hamilton Avenue as cut-through routes in the adjacent residential neighborhood, mitigating this traffic impact is not recommended at this time, consistent with City policies that discourage cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods. The improvements should be incorporated into the updated fee program for ongoing consideration. ▪ **Bayfront Expressway and Willow Road (#37):** Evaluate the potential for grade separation to allow conflicting movements to occur simultaneously. The evaluation must consider traffic improvements, along with potential secondary impacts caused by potential right-of-way acquisition, impacts to adjacent wetlands and the Dumbarton Rail corridor, as well as potential impacts or benefits for multi-modal accommodation. If found feasible, the updated fee program should incorporate fair-share contributions from future development towards grade separation. ▪ **Bayfront Expressway and University Avenue (#38):** Evaluate the potential for grade separation to allow conflicting movements to occur simultaneously. The evaluation must consider traffic improvements, along with potential secondary impacts caused by potential right-of-way acquisition, impacts to adjacent wetlands and the Dumbarton Rail corridor, as well as potential impacts or benefits for multi-modal accommodation. If found feasible, the updated fee program should incorporate fair-share contributions from future development towards grade separation.						

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
▪ **Chilco Street and Constitution Drive (#45):** Install a traffic signal and signalized crosswalks at the intersection. Construct three southbound lanes on the one-block segment of Chilco Street, between Bayfront Expressway and Chilco Street, to include two southbound left-turn lanes to accommodate the volume of left-turning vehicles entering the project site. In addition, during the AM peak hour, provide a "split-phase" signal operation on Chilco Street. Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Chilco Street approaching Constitution Drive. Construct two outbound lanes on Chilco Street between Constitution Drive and Bayfront Expressway. If the Facebook Campus Expansion Project is approved, this mitigation measure would be required to be constructed as a requirement of that project.						
▪ **Chrysler Drive and Constitution Drive (#46):** Construct a southbound left-turn on Chrysler Drive, approaching Constitution Drive.						
▪ **University Avenue and Adams Drive (#47):** Install a traffic signal at this intersection.						
▪ **University Avenue and Bay Road (#51):** Realign the eastbound and westbound approaches to allow replacement of the east/west "split-phase" signal on Bay Street with standard protected signal phases in order to allow eastbound and westbound pedestrian crossings to occur simultaneously, which would allow for an increase in green time allocated to northbound/southbound movements on University Avenue and reduce peak-hour delay at this intersection. This intersection is located in the City of East Palo Alto and under the control of Caltrans. If this measure if found feasible by the City of East Palo Alto, the improvements should be incorporated into the City of Menlo Park's updated fee program to collect fair-share contributions from future development towards such improvements.						
▪ **University Avenue and Donohoe Street (#54):** Mitigating this						

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
impact would require providing additional westbound lane capacity on Donohoe Street, including an extended dual left-turn pocket, dedicated through lane, and dual right-turn lanes; providing a southbound right-turn lane on University Avenue and lengthening the northbound turn pockets. However, this mitigation is likely to be infeasible given right-of-way limitations, proximity to existing US 101 on- and off-ramps, and adjacent properties. In addition, this intersection is located in the City of East Palo Alto and under the control of Caltrans. If this measure if found feasible by the City of East Palo Alto, the improvements should be incorporated into the City of Menlo Park's updated fee program to collect fair-share contributions from future development towards such improvements. ▪ **University Avenue and US 101 Southbound Ramps (#56):** Mitigating this impact would require modifications to the US 101 Southbound On/Off Ramps and at this location This intersection is located in the City of East Palo Alto and under the control of Caltrans. If this measure if found feasible by the City of East Palo Alto, the improvements should be incorporated into the City of Menlo Park's updated fee program to collect fair-share contributions from future development towards such improvements. ▪ **Chilco Street and Hamilton Avenue (#60):** Installation of a traffic signal would mitigate this impact to less than significant levels, but would have the undesirable secondary effect of encouraging the use of Chilco Street as a cut-through route, which conflicts with City goals that aim to reduce cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods. Therefore, to avoid facilitating cut-through traffic, mitigating this traffic impact by increasing capacity is not recommended at this time, but should be incorporated into the updated fee program for ongoing consideration.						
TRANS-6a: The City of Menlo Park shall update the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to provide funding for citywide bicycle	City of Menlo Park	Ongoing	City of Menlo Park	Ongoing	Ongoing	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
and pedestrian facilities that are necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards. The fees shall be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a more intensive use. The fees collected shall be applied toward improvements that will connect development sites within the area circulation system, including the elimination of gaps in the citywide pedestrian and bicycle network. The fees shall be calculated by multiplying the proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel room by the appropriate rate. Transportation Impact fees shall be included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City shall use the transportation Impact fees to fund construction (or to recoup fees advanced to fund construction) of the transportation improvements identified in this mitigation measure, among other things that at the time of potential future development may be warranted to mitigate traffic impacts. It should be noted that any project proposed prior to the adoption of an updated TIF will be required to conduct a project-specific Transportation Impact Assessment to determine the impacts and necessary pedestrian or bicycle facilities mitigations that are to be funded by that project. As part of the update to the TIF program, the City shall also prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the proposed project. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the bicycle and pedestrian improvements and facilities required to mitigate the traffic impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed project. The following examples of pedestrian and bicycle improvements would reduce impacts to acceptable standards,			Transportation Division			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
and these, among others improvements, could be included in the updated TIF program, also described under TRANS-1: ▪ **US 101 Pedestrian & Bicycle Overcrossing at Marsh Road, and Marsh Road Corridor Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements (Haven Avenue to Marsh Road/Bay Road):** Provide pedestrian and bicycle circulation between the Bayfront Area east of US 101 with the area circulation system west of US 101 along Marsh Road, including access to schools and commercial sites west of Marsh Road that are accessed via Bay Road and Florence Street. Improvements should facilitate pedestrian and bicycle circulation between Haven Avenue and across US 101 near Marsh Road. The recommended improvement would include a dedicated pedestrian and bicycle crossing adjacent to Marsh Road. Alternatively, the provision of continuous sidewalks with controlled pedestrian crossings and Class IV protected bicycle lanes on the Marsh Road overpass, if feasible, could mitigate this impact. ▪ **Ringwood Avenue Corridor Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements (Belle Haven to Middlefield Road):** Eliminate pedestrian and bicycle facility gaps on primary access routes to the Ringwood Avenue bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing of US 101 (located near the terminus of Ringwood Avenue and Market Place). Improvements should include complete sidewalks on the north side of Pierce Road and bicycle facility improvements on the proposed Ringwood Avenue-Market Place-Hamilton Avenue bicycle boulevard (see Street Classification Map in Chapter 3, Project Description). These improvements would also enhance pedestrian and bicycle access to Menlo-Atherton High School. ▪ **University Avenue Pedestrian Improvements:** Eliminate gaps in the sidewalk network on those portions of University Avenue that are within the Menlo Park City limits. The TIF Program should also include a contribution towards elimination of sidewalk gaps outside the City limits (within the City of East Palo Alto) to ensure that continuous sidewalks are provided on						

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
the west University Avenue between Adams Drive and the Bay Trail, located north of Purdue Avenue. ▪ **Willow Road Bikeway Corridor (Bayfront Expressway to Alma Street):** Provide a continuous bikeway facility that eliminates bicycle lane gaps, provides Class IV bicycle lanes on the US 101 overpass and where Willow Road intersects US 101 northbound and southbound ramps, and upgrades existing Class II bicycle lanes to Class IV protected bicycle lanes where feasible, particularly where the speed limit exceeds 35 miles per hour (mph). ▪ **Willow Road Pedestrian Crossings (Bayfront Expressway to Newbridge Street):** Provide enhanced pedestrian crossings of Willow Road at Hamilton Avenue, Ivy Drive (including proposed new street connection opposite Ivy Drive), O'Brien Drive and Newbridge Street. Enhanced crossings should include straightened crosswalks provided on each leg, high visibility crosswalk striping, accessible pedestrian signals, and pedestrian head-start signal timing (leading pedestrian intervals) where feasible. These enhanced crossings would provide improved access between the Belle Haven neighborhood and potential future development between Willow Road and University Avenue. ▪ **Dumbarton Corridor Connections:** Through separate projects, Samtrans is currently considering the potential for a bicycle/pedestrian shared-use trail along the Dumbarton Corridor right-of-way between Redwood City and East Palo Alto, through Menlo Park. If found feasible, the City's TIF Program should incorporate walking and bicycling access and connections to the proposed trail, including a potential rail crossing between Kelly Park and Onetta Harris Community Center and Chilco Street and pedestrian and bicycle improvements on streets that connect to the Dumbarton Corridor: Marsh Road, Chilco Street, Willow Road, and University Avenue.						

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
TRANS-6b: The City of Menlo Park shall update the existing Shuttle Fee program to guarantee funding for citywide operations of City-sponsored shuttle service that is necessary to mitigate impacts from future projects based on the then current City standards. The fees shall be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage in an existing building, or the conversion of existing square footage to a more intensive use. The fees collected shall be applied toward circulation improvements and right-of-way acquisition. The fees shall be calculated by multiplying the proposed square footage, dwelling unit, or hotel room by the appropriate rate. Shuttle fees shall be included with any other applicable fees payable at the time the building permit is issued. The City shall use the Shuttle fees to fund operations of City-sponsored shuttle service to meet the increased demand. As part of the update to the Shuttle Fee program, the City shall also prepare a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the proposed project. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the transit improvements and facilities required to mitigate the transit impacts of new development pursuant to the proposed project. The types of transit-related improvements and facilities that would reduce impacts to acceptable standards including increasing the fleet of City-sponsored Shuttles and adding additional transit stop facilities within one-quarter mile from residential and employment centers These, among other improvements, could be included in the Shuttle Fee program impact fees nexus study.	City of Menlo Park	Ongoing	City of Menlo Park Transportation Division	Ongoing	Ongoing	Initials:_____ Date:_____
TRANS-6c: The City should continue to support the Dumbarton Corridor Study, evaluating the feasibility of providing transit service to the existing rail corridor and/or operational	City of Menlo Park	Ongoing	City of Menlo Park Transportation	Ongoing	Ongoing	Initials:_____ Date:_____

MITGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Party Responsible for Implementation	Implementation Trigger/Timing	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Action	Monitoring Frequency	Verified Implementation
improvements to Bayfront Expressway, Marsh Road and Willow Road, such as a dedicated high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane, bus queue-jump lanes, or transit-signal priority that could reduce travel time for current bus operations.			Division			
Utilities and Service Systems						
UTIL-10: The City shall continue its reduction programs and diversion requirements in an effort to further reduce solid waste that is diverted to the landfill and lower its per capita disposal rate citywide. In addition, the City shall monitor solid waste generation volumes in relation to capacities at receiving landfill sites to ensure that sufficient capacity exists to accommodate future growth. The City shall ensure any waste management firm it contracts with has access to a new landfill site(s) to replace the Ox Mountain landfills, at such time that this landfill is closed.	City of Menlo Park	Ongoing	City of Menlo Park Planning Division	Ongoing	Ongoing	Initials:_____ Date:_____