



**County of San Mateo - Planning and Building Department**

# **ATTACHMENT E**

CEQA GUIDELINES §15168(c) CHECKLIST FOR LATER ACTIVITIES FOLLOWING CERTIFICATION OF THE NORTH FAIR OAKS COMMUNITY PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Rezoning Industrially and Commercially Zoned Properties Along Middlefield Road and Nearby Streets to Commercial Mixed Use; and Properties Along Spring Street, Fair Oaks Avenue and Bay Road to Mixed-Use Industrial in North Fair Oaks to Implement the Community Plan

ABBREVIATIONS: NORTH FAIR OAKS COMMUNITY PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (CP EIR); NORTH FAIR OAKS COMMUNITY PLAN (CP); Mitigation Measure (MM)

**Would the Rezoning of Commercially and Industrially zoned lands along the Middlefield Road and nearby streets to Commercial Mixed Use and along Fair Oaks Avenue, Spring Street and Bay Road to Mixed-Use Industrial cause new or substantially more severe significant impacts, or require new mitigation measures, due to project changes, changed circumstances, or new information that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the NFO EIR was certified? (CEQA Guidelines §15168(c), 15162**

| NFO EIR Evaluation Criteria  | NFOCP EIR Significance Conclusion (Before Mitigation) | NFO EIR Mitigation Measures |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>Aesthetics</b>  |   |                             |
| Will the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings;  | No significant impact                                 | no mitigation is required   |
| Will the project have a substantial, adverse effect on a scenic vista?   | No significant impact                                 | no mitigation is required   |
| Will the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | No significant impact                                 | no mitigation is required   |
| Will the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                    | No significant impact                                 | no mitigation is required   |
| Will the project cast shadows that substantially impairs the beneficial use, important values, or livability of any shadow-sensitive use?                              | No significant impact                                 | no mitigation is required   |

**No.** The CP EIR determined that implementing the CP would not have any significant effects on aesthetic resources and did not identify any needed mitigation. The CP EIR states that plan implementation (rezoning) will facilitate redevelopment of North Fair Oaks, which would result in an overall more coherent and compatible land use pattern and a more unified visual character in the Plan area. Rezoning makes redevelopment possible. The CP EIR determined that there are no officially designated scenic vistas within North Fair Oaks and that the project will not adversely affect scenic resources. The proposed rezoning does not change the County's tree protection ordinances, and there are no listed historic resources in the project area, nor any scenic highways. The proposed ordinances require planting of street trees, preservation of existing trees where feasible, and the provision of green infrastructure, including trees, which will improve the visual character of the area. The CP EIR determined that compliance with Transit Corridors Plan lighting standards and Title 24 lighting power allowances would be expected to adequately control unnecessary brightness of lighting, debilitating glare, and sky glow. The proposed zoning provisions require that lighting for projects be conditioned to require dark-sky approved fixtures, and places other limits on project lighting that protect the visual character of the area. The CP EIR noted that CP land use policies require upper story (second story and above) step backs to minimize shadows cast on public parks and greenways and building massing with greater intensities on major streets and lower intensities adjacent to existing residential development. Staff's shadow study demonstrated that existing development will not be substantially impacted or impaired by shadows from development conforming to the proposed zoning.

**Air Quality**

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| Will the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   | No significant impact  | no mitigation is required   | No. The CP EIR states that the project could potentially have significant effects on air quality standards compliance, could expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants, and could create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Mitigation Measures 5-1, 5-2 and 5-3 would reduce those potentially significant impacts to less than significant, and projects will be conditioned to manage odors, and prevent exposure to toxic air contaminants consistent with these mitigation measures. Estimated existing land uses within the NFO Plan area generate 51,020 daily vehicle trips. Buildout of the NFO Plan in 2035 would generate an estimated 81,248 daily vehicle trips, which would represent a 59 percent increase in vehicle use. The 2010 population within the NFO Plan area was estimated at 15,477 persons. The development of an additional 3,024 housing units under the NFO Plan would result in a projected increase in population of 11,794 persons, an increase of 76 percent. Therefore, the projected increase in vehicle use under the NFO Plan would be less than the projected increase in population. Therefore, there is no conflict with the BAAQMD Clean Air Plan. The rezoning allows development at the levels contemplated in the plan, therefore it will not create unforeseen impacts. The CP EIR states that development within the Community Plan area could generate short-term temporary emissions of dust, fuel combustion exhaust, and gases from architectural coatings and other building materials; grading, demolition, or construction activity for future discretionary development projects within the Community Plan area will be conditioned to implement best management practices that will avoid these impacts. The CP EIR did not identify a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants, and nothing in the proposed ordinances would allow activities that would alter this conclusion. The CP EIR determined that future development projects must locate development away from contaminant sources, conduct a site specific risk assessment or implement best management practices that effectively reduce exposure. The proposed ordinance (Chapter 29) requires the submittal of a health risk assessment to ensure that sources are identified and sensitive receptors protected. The CP EIR recognized that certain land uses such as restaurants or dry cleaners could generate objectionable odors affecting people. The proposed zoning prohibits dry cleaners using perchloroethylene, and projects, such as restaurants will be required to install equipment and manage activities so as to avoid exposing people to objectionable odors, and notice tenants or purchasers of any potential odors. |
| Will the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  | potentially significant impact   | Mitigation 5-1. Short-Term Construction Emissions   |   |
| Will the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? | No cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact | no mitigation is required   |   |
| Will the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or toxic air contaminants?   | potentially significant impact   | MM AQ 5-2. Site development housing sensitive receptors away from contaminant sources or conduct site specific risk assessments and install necessary filtration to protect sensitive receptors |   |
|   |  | MM AQ5-3. Condition mixed use projects including food service or dry cleaners, install proper equipment and implement Best Management Practices to minimize odors.                              |   |
| Will the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   | potentially significant impact   |   |   |

**Biological Resources**

|  |                       |                           |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Will the project adversely affect any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species? | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|

Will the project adversely affect any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or protected by state or federal agencies? less than significant no mitigation is required

Will the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? less than significant no mitigation is required

Will the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? potentially significant impact MM BR 6-1 Migratory Wildlife.

Will the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources? less than significant no mitigation is required

Will the project Cumulatively adversely impact biological resources? less than significant no mitigation is required

**Climate Change**

Will the project substantially impede the attainment of the State's GHG emissions reduction goal of reducing state GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, or 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050? No significant impact

Will the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? No significant impact no mitigation is required

**No.** The CP EIR found that the project could potentially interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Mitigation measure 6-1 would reduce this potential impact a less than significant level. Special-status species are not expected to occur within the Community Plan area because of a lack of suitable habitat. The CP EIR states that proximity to Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge, the potential presence of migrating raptors and passerines and nesting birds including raptors make it possible that impacts to protected avian wildlife could occur. Projects with potential nesting habitat will be conditioned to conduct surveys to identify any protected species, and implement measures to avoid or protect any protected species found during construction through buffers or other management practices as determined by a qualified avian biologist. Ongoing implementation of County tree preservation regulations will protect existing habitats. The proposed zoning will be implemented in a manner, through permit conditions to ensure that MM BR 6-1 is implemented, avoiding any significant impacts to migratory wildlife.

**No.** The CP EIR did not identify any significant impacts contributing to climate change and did not identify any mitigation measures. The CP EIR states that ongoing occupancy and operation of development under the Community Plan Update would result in a net increase in CO2 and other greenhouse gas emissions due primarily to transportation, energy use and solid waste disposal. The GHG emissions from ongoing occupancy and operation of development within the CP Area would represent a less-than-considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change. The proposed zoning does not allow activities or levels of

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Will the project result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change? | No cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact |
|---|--|

activity that would alter this conclusion.

### Cultural and Historic Resources

|   |                                |            |
|---|--------------------------------|------------|
| Will the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5? | potentially significant impact | MM CHR 8-2 |
|---|--------------------------------|------------|

|  |                                |            |
|--|--------------------------------|------------|
| Will the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5? | potentially significant impact | MM CHR 8-1 |
|--|--------------------------------|------------|

|  |                                |  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Will the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | potentially significant impact |  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|

|  |                             |            |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|
| Will the project cumulative cause a loss of significant archaeological, historical and paleontological resources due to a development? | Significant and unavoidable | MM CHR 8.4 |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|

|   |                                |            |
|---|--------------------------------|------------|
| Will the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | potentially significant impact | MM CHR 8-3 |
|---|--------------------------------|------------|

**No.** The CP EIR The Plan area contains three recorded archaeological resources, all prehistoric Native American habitation sites. There is a moderate to high potential for the presence of additional unrecorded Native American resources within the CP area. There are no previously recorded historic-period archaeological resources within the CP area. There are historic structures in the CP area, but none of them are within the proposed rezoning area, nor proximate enough to be affected by any potential construction. Based on review of historical literature and maps, there is a moderate to high potential for the presence of unrecorded historic-period archaeological resources within the Community Plan area. Mitigation measures 8-1 and 8-3 would reduce the impacts of the CP, and thus the project contribution to significant cumulative impacts on archaeological resources and paleontological resources, to a less-than-significant level. The proposed rezoning area contains no recorded historic resource. Despite the history of disturbance, the project could potentially disrupt, alter or eliminate as-yet undiscovered paleontological resources within or immediately adjacent to the CP area. Projects authorized under the proposed rezoning will be conditioned to implement all applicable mitigation measures, to avoid any impacts not identified in the CP EIR. The County is responsible for implementing MM CHR 8-1: identify and keep confidential the locations of the three recorded Native American habitation sites within the Community Plan area, P-41-000086, P-41-000299, and P-41-000303 and before any development occurs to shall assess the resources and provide project-specific recommendations. The rezoning project does not entitle development; the County implemented MM CHR 8-1 prior to any development. None of these sites are within the rezoning area. Also projects will be required to monitor excavation and grading and halt if archaeological, paleontological, historical resources or human remains are found, and preserve, document or avoid damage or loss under the guidance of a qualified professional (MM CHR 8-3, 8-4 and 8-1).

### Geology and Soils

Will the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides?

less than significant      no mitigation is required

Will the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

less than significant      no mitigation is required

Will the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

less than significant

Will the project be located on expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less than significant

**No.** The CP EIR found that there would be no significant impacts from seismic events or substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil from implementing the project and no mitigation measures were identified. Similarly the CP EIR concluded that the project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, and that the project would not occur on expansive soils and that no mitigation measures for these effects were needed. These soil and seismic fault conditions are not altered in any way by rezoning, and therefore cannot generate new impacts, because development would be undertaken consistent with policies contained in the San Mateo County General Plan Soil Resources Element and Natural Hazards Element, along with mandated individual project compliance with federal, State and local regulations addressing building construction.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

less than significant      no mitigation is required

Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

less than significant      no mitigation is required

Will the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? less than significant no mitigation is required

Will the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? less than significant no mitigation is required

Will the project For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? less than significant no mitigation is required

Will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area within the vicinity of a private airstrip? less than significant no mitigation is required

Will the project Impact implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? less than significant no mitigation is required

Will the project Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? less than significant no mitigation is required

**No.** The CP EIR concluded that there would be no significant impacts from hazardous materials, no risks from proximity to airports or airstrips, nor impacts to emergency plan implementation or exposure of people to wildfire from plan implementation and no mitigation measures were required. The rezoning project would not alter any of these conclusions as the rezoning is consistent with the policies in the CP.

### Hydrology and Water Quality

Will the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? less than significant

Will the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

less than significant

Will the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

less than significant

Will the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate of amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

less than significant

no mitigation is required

Will the project Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

less than significant

no mitigation is required

**No.** The CP EIR found that there would be no significant impacts from CP implementation on existing drainage patterns, would not require construction of new or expansion of existing storm drainage facilities with significant environmental effects, would not create runoff exceeding the capacity of storm drainage systems or increase polluted runoff or otherwise degrade water quality. The CP EIR also found that the project would not place new development within a 100-year flood hazard area, but did conclude that portions of the area may be exposed to future flooding from sea level rise. MM HWQ 11-1 requires that future individual development projects on properties within the Plan area subject to flooding as a result of predicted sea level rise shall be required to comply with specific flood damage avoidance requirements commonly required for development within 100-year flood hazard areas under the National Flood Insurance Program and Chapter 35.5, Flood Hazard Areas, of the San Mateo County Code of Ordinances. None of the parcels being rezoned lie within areas that are projected to experience flooding from sea level rise, therefore, the rezoning project will not in any way expose people or structures to flooding or flood risk. No new information has come to



Will the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?      less than significant      no mitigation is required

Will the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?      less than significant      no mitigation is required

Will the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?      less than significant      no mitigation is required

Will the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?      less than significant      no mitigation is required

Will the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?      potentially significant impact      MM HWQ 11-1

Will the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death resulting from inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?      less than significant      no mitigation is required

**Land Use and Planning**

Will the project disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of a community?      beneficial effect      no mitigation is required

Will the project be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?      less than significant      no mitigation is required

light to change the assumptions underpinning the CP EIR, and the rezoning project does not change plan implementation, therefore no new impacts to water quality, water management or flooding are anticipated.

**No.** The CP EIR concluded that CP implementation would have a beneficial effect on the physical arrangement of the plan area. The CP EIR states that the proposed land use intensities are comparable to those in the CP being superseded, and to those in the County's General Plan. No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures were required.

Will the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? less than significant no mitigation is required

Implementation of the proposed rezoning would not create any new circumstances involving new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts regarding land use and land use planning. The development intensities allowed in the CMU-3 and, M-1/NFO and M-1/Edison/NFO are cumulatively the same as the underlying general plan land use designations. The impacts of development in this portion of the plan area are fully addressed in the CP EIR.

**Noise and Vibration**

Will the project create permanent substantial noise increases at existing noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residences) due to project land use changes or associated traffic increases? potentially significant impact MM N 13-4

**No.** The CP EIR states that long-term noise measurements were primarily influenced by Caltrain. The measured CNEL was 79 dBA at 30 feet and 70 dBA at 250 feet from the edge of the Caltrain tracks. Also, demolition and construction activities associated with the updated Community Plan could temporarily increase noise levels at nearby residential and commercial sensitive receptors. Noise levels at 50 feet from the demolition or construction equipment source could reach approximately 105 dBA, resulting in intermittent interference with typical existing residential and business activities, and exceeding the County's noise ordinance limits. Demolition and construction activities associated with Plan Update-facilitated development activity could generate substantial temporary ground-borne vibration (e.g., from pile driving) exceeding standard vibration thresholds, which could interfere with normal activities or cause a nuisance for or damage to adjacent properties. MM N 13-1 and MM N 13-2 require that project authorizations include conditions requiring several best management practices of demolition and construction contractors to reduce noise and vibration to acceptable levels. The CP EIR also notes that the CP would permit new multifamily and single-family residential development within 100 feet of the Caltrain tracks or the Dumbarton Rail Corridor. Ground borne vibration levels are typically less than the FTA criteria for frequent events (72 VdB) at a distance of approximately 100 feet or more from the centerline of the Caltrain tracks or the Dumbarton Rail Corridor. MM N 13-3 requires that prior to the development of new habitable buildings in the Plan area within 100 feet of the centerline of the Caltrain tracks or Dumbarton Rail Corridor, completion of a detailed site-specific vibration study shall be required demonstrating that ground borne vibrations associated with rail operations either (1) would not exceed applicable FTA ground borne vibration impact assessment criteria or (2) can be reduced to below the applicable FTA criteria thresholds through building design and construction measures (e.g., stiffened floors, modified foundations). Two properties within the rezoning area lie within 100 feet of Caltrain and projects approved on these two sites will be conditioned to require achievement of the vibration standards included in the CP EIR. The CP EIR also notes that the occupants of new residential and other noise-sensitive development facilitated in the Plan area by the Community Plan Update could be exposed to noise levels in excess of County noise standards and California Building Code standards. MM N 13-4 requires that all proposed new

Will the project cause temporary noise increase, such as from construction related noise construction at levels sufficiently high to interfere with speech, sleep, or normal residential activities (above 60 dBA during the daytime and 55 dBA at night, and at least 5 dBA higher than ambient noise levels)? potentially significant impact MM N 13-1

Will the project increase temporary ground-borne vibration beyond commonly recognized thresholds of safety? potentially significant impact MM N 13-2

Will the project increase permanent ground-borne vibration beyond commonly recognized thresholds of safety? potentially significant impact MM N 13-3

multifamily residential or other noise-sensitive uses within 300 feet of the existing Caltrain line and proposed Dumbarton Rail Corridors, and within 120 feet of arterial roadways, shall submit for County approval a noise study, consistent with the requirements of the California Building Code, to identify noise reduction measures necessary to achieve compatibility with County noise standards and California Building Code noise compatibility standards. The noise study shall be approved by the County's Planning and Building Department prior to issuance of a building permit. The CP EIR notes that cumulative plus project traffic noise levels are expected to increase by 3 dBA, and traffic resulting from the updated Community Plan would contribute at least 1 decibel to the cumulative traffic noise level increase, along two street segments, both of which are outside of the rezoning area. Therefore, cumulative noise impacts will not occur as a result of implementing the proposed rezoning. However, development projects approved will be conditioned so that they must comply with MM N 13-4 and to implement measures that reduce noise exposure to acceptable levels. Furthermore, the development intensities proposed under the proposed rezoning is less than what was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore, the project cannot generate impacts that rise to the level assessed in the CP EIR and reduced through mitigation.

|   |                             |           |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Will the project have cumulative noise impacts? | Significant and unavoidable | MM N-13-5 |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------|

**Population, Housing and Employment**

|  |                       |                           |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Will the project induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly? | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|

**No.** New development facilitated by the updated Community Plan, together with other reasonably foreseeable development, would add new residents and new jobs within the Plan area by 2035. However, none of the increases in jobs, housing or population were determined to be significant in the CP EIR and no mitigation measures were necessary. As noted above under land use, the rezoning project would not increase jobs, housing or employment beyond what was evaluated in the CEP EIR. Therefore, no new impacts would occur.

|   |                       |                           |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Will the project displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|

**Public Services and Utilities**

|  |                       |                           |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Will the project require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|

|   |                       |                           |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Will the project require new or expanded water supply entitlements? | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|

|   |                       |                           |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Will the project require or result in the construction of new wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities with significant environmental impacts? | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
| Will the project demand for wastewater treatment exceed provider capacity to serve the project?   | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
| Will the project exceed Regional Water Quality Control Board wastewater treatment requirements?   | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
| Will the project over-burden police and fire service providers?   | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
| Will the project exceed capacity of existing schools?   | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
| Will the project generate recreation demand that exceeds existing park supply, or require the provision of new parks?   | less than significant | no mitigation is required |
| Will the project negatively impact existing solid waste disposal and recycling capacity?  | less than significant | no mitigation is required |

**No.** The CP EIR evaluated water demand and supply, wastewater generation and the supply of treatment facilities, supply and demand of parks, schools, police, fire and other emergency services, solid waste disposal and recycling demand and capacity, and Regional Water Quality Control Board compliance requirements for waste water treatment and concluded that the CP project would have no significant impacts warranting mitigation, for any of these service areas. The conclusions of the NFO Plan EIR relating to utilities and service systems remain valid. The rezoning Project is consistent with the NFO Plan EIR, and proposes development intensities slightly lower than those analyzed in the CP EIR. There is no evidence of substantial changes to the circumstances under which the NFO Plan EIR utilities and service systems impacts were analyzed. There is also no evidence of new information of substantial importance that would show a new or more severe significant utilities and service systems impact resulting from the Project. Therefore, no additional analysis under CEQA is required for the Project.

## Transportation

|  |                                |                          |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Will the project plus other development impact studied intersections level of service (LOS)?                     | potentially significant impact | MM T All                 |
| Will the project plus other projected development impact the LOS at Middlefield and Woodside Roads intersection? | potentially significant impact | MM T 16-2 and MM T 16-10 |

**No.** The conclusions of the CP EIR relating to transportation and traffic remain valid. The Project is consistent with the CP EIR. There is no evidence of substantial changes to the circumstances under which the NFO Plan EIR transportation and traffic impacts were analyzed. There is also no evidence of new information of substantial importance, that would show a new or more severe significant transportation and traffic impact resulting from the Project. Therefore, no additional analysis under CEQA is required for the Project.

**No.** The CP EIR states that under Existing Plus Project conditions, intersection operations would deteriorate from acceptable LOS D (existing) to unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour. MM T 16-2 requires the County to modify traffic signal operations to include a westbound right turn overlap phase and a northbound right turn overlap phase. The rezoning project allows lower intensity of development than was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required, provided these mitigation measures are implemented.

Will the project plus other projected development impact the LOS at 5th Avenue and Middlefield Road intersection? potentially significant impact MM T 16-5 and MM T 16-11

**No.** The CP EIR states that under Existing Plus Project conditions, intersection operations would deteriorate from acceptable LOS C (existing) to unacceptable LOS F during the AM peak hour, and from unacceptable LOS E (existing) to unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour. MM T 16-3 requires that the County prohibit on-street parking on north and southbound sides of 5th Ave within the vicinity of the intersection, shift the through/right turn lane and stripe a dedicated left turn lane; modify traffic signal operations from split phase to concurrent northbound and southbound travel with protected left turn phasing; prohibit parking in the eastbound direction within the vicinity of the intersection and stripe a dedicated eastbound right turn lane. The rezoning project allows lower intensity of development than was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required, provided these mitigation measures are implemented. The Redwood City Traffic County Impact Mitigation Fee Program includes the installation of a traffic signal at Edison and Middlefield as a planned capital improvement. As a condition of approval for future individual discretionary development projects within the Plan area, require project fair-share contribution toward the installation of this traffic signal. This mitigation would improve the intersection to LOS C during the AM peak hour, and therefore would reduce the project impact to a less-than-significant level.

Will the project plus other projected development impact the LOS at Middlefield and Semicircular Roads intersection? potentially significant impact MM T 16-4 and MM T 16-12

**No.** The CP EIR states that under Existing Plus Project conditions, intersection operations would deteriorate from unacceptable LOS E (existing) to unacceptable LOS F during the AM peak hour, and from unacceptable LOS D (existing) to unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour. MM T 16-4 requires that the County prohibit on-street parking within the vicinity of the intersection, and stripe a dedicated left turn lane, resulting in one left turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right turn lane; modify traffic signal operations. The rezoning project allows lower intensity of development than was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required, provided these mitigation measures are implemented.

Will the project plus other projected development impact the LOS at 5th Avenue and Bay Road intersection? potentially significant impact MM T 16-5

**No.** The CP EIR states that under Existing Plus Project conditions, intersection operations would deteriorate from acceptable LOS D (existing) to unacceptable LOS F during the AM peak hour, and from acceptable LOS C (existing) to unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour. MM T 16-5 acknowledges that the City of Redwood City will install a traffic signal at this intersection as a planned capital improvement. As a condition of approval for future individual discretionary development projects within the Plan area, the County will require projects to make a fair-share contribution toward the installation of this traffic signal, including within the rezoning area. The rezoning project allows lower intensity of development than was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required.

Will the project plus other projected development impact the LOS at Middlefield and Marsh Roads intersection?

potentially significant impact MM 16-13

**No.** The CP EIR states that under Existing Plus Project conditions, intersection operations would deteriorate from an acceptable LOS C to an unacceptable LOS E during the peak hour. MM T 16-13 found that the Menlo Gateway project, approved by the City of Menlo Park is required to make intersection improvements that would reduce the project plus cumulative impacts of the CP to a less than significant level. The rezoning project allows lower intensity of development than was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required.

Will the project plus other projected development impact the LOS at Bay and Woodside Roads intersection?

potentially significant impact MM T 16-6 and MM T 16-14

**No.** The CP EIR states that under Existing Plus Project conditions, intersection operations would deteriorate from acceptable LOS C (existing) to unacceptable LOS D during the AM peak hour, and from acceptable LOS C (existing) to unacceptable LOS E during the PM peak hour. MM T 16-6 acknowledges that MTC Transportation 2035 Plan and the Redwood City Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program identify the widening of Woodside Road to six travel lanes between El Camino Real and US 101 as a planned capital improvement. As a condition of approval for future individual discretionary development projects within the Plan area, require project fair-share contribution toward the addition of a southbound through lane and optimization of cycle length. This mitigation would improve the intersection to LOS C during the AM and PM peak hours. Cumulative plus project impacts would deteriorate intersection operations from acceptable LOS C (No Project) to unacceptable LOS E and LOS F during the AM and PM peak hour. MM T 16-14 acknowledges that additional right of way acquisition would be necessary to construct the additional north and south bound lanes on Woodside Road, and that such acquisition may be infeasible. The rezoning project allows the intensity of development that was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required, provided these mitigation measures are implemented.

Will the project plus other projected development adversely impact transit service in the Plan Area?

potentially significant impact MM T 16-7

**No.** The CP EIR MM T 16-7 requires that the County coordinate with SamTrans, Caltrain, the High Speed Rail Authority, and other appropriate transit authorities to ensure that existing and future transit services within the vicinity of North Fair Oaks are capable of accommodating potential Plan Update-related increases in transit demand. Given the anticipated long-term Plan area buildout period and the uncertainty of the existing and proposed transit facilities, equipment, and services beyond the County's jurisdiction, it cannot be determined at this time whether service improvements would be implemented concurrently with increase demand such that acceptable service levels would be maintained. Therefore, the impacts of the Plan on transit service are currently deemed to be significant and unavoidable. The rezoning project does not in any way increase the level of transit demand beyond that evaluated in the CP EIR and the provision of transit service in the rezoning project area has not changed significantly. Caltrain and SamTrans are undertaking projects and studies that will increase transit availability, including the Caltrain EMod project, and planning for bus rapid transit on the El Camino Real. These projects will not be completed for years.

Will the project decrease safety at at-grade rail crossings? potentially significant impact MM T 16-8 and 16-15

Will the project interfere with existing or planned pedestrian or bicycle facilities in the project area? less than significant no mitigation is required

MM T 16-1 and MM 16-9

Will the project degrade LOS at the El Camino Real/5th Avenue intersection? potentially significant impact

**No.** Future individual discretionary development project approvals within the Plan area that would generate substantial additional multi-modal trips (i.e., motor vehicles or pedestrians) crossing volume at at-grade railroad crossings in the project vicinity, will be required to implement the following: a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) and if necessary a Diagnostic Review must be completed with all affected properties and stakeholders, in coordination with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Based on the Diagnostic Review and the number of projected trips, the TIS will evaluate if the proposed development increases hazards at the crossing. Project approvals would include conditions that mitigate impacts to at-grade rail crossings to reduce the effects of additional traffic of all types. The rezoning project does not in any way increase likely traffic at grade rail crossings. The nearest at-grade crossing is located on Middlefield Road between Pacific and Hurlingame Avenues approximately one mile from the project area, and is unlikely to be affected by traffic from projects in this area, however, if necessary a TIS and DR will be prepared and mitigation measures implemented for future discretionary projects. The rezoning project allows lower intensity of development than was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required.

**No.** The CP EIR states that under Existing Plus Project conditions, the project would not interfere with existing or planned pedestrian or bicycle facilities. The rezoning project allows lower intensity of development than was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required.

**No.** MM T 16-1 requires restriping the southbound approach to one dedicated left turn lane, one dedicated right turn lane, and one shared left turn/right turn lane on 5th Ave. Under the Cumulative Plus Project condition during the AM peak hour, this mitigation would result in a projected LOS C; however, during the PM peak hour, the intersection would still operate at LOS D. Constructing additional lanes would require obtaining additional right-of-way and relocation of utilities, and would contradict the purpose of the Plan Update to create a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit-friendly environment. Achievement of an "acceptable" vehicular LOS standard at this intersection would not encourage development of the pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use, transit-oriented environment. Typically, construction of additional intersection lanes can worsen conditions for pedestrian and bicycle travel by increasing exposure to conflicts with vehicles and deteriorating the non-motorized environment. The rezoning project allows lower intensity of development than was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required.

### CEQA Required Assessment Conclusions

Will the Project induce growth or concentration of population, thereby leading to indirect impacts to the physical environment? less than significant no mitigation is required

**No.** The CP EIR states that under Existing Plus Project conditions, the potential environmental impacts of development within the North Fair Oaks induced by the updated Community Plan have been evaluated at a program level. Potential induced growth outside the North Fair Oaks due to enhanced development potential on adjacent land and

Will the provision of infrastructure improvements associated with the project stimulate population and housing growth beyond that projected by the North Fair Oaks Community Plan or the San Mateo County General Plan?

less than significant

no mitigation is required

increased economic activity, would occur as already contemplated in and consistent with adopted plans and the environmental documents prepared for those plans, and would therefore not represent growth for which adequate planning has not occurred. The rezoning project allows lower intensity of development than was evaluated in the CP EIR, therefore no additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation is required.