

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, PLANNING DIVISION

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000 et seq.), that the following project: Middlefield Road Parking Lot, when adopted and implemented, will not have a significant impact on the environment.

OWNER/APPLICANT: San Mateo County/County of San Mateo Department of Public Works

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 060-082-320, -330, -340, -350

LOCATION: 3060, 3070, 3080 Middlefield Road, North Fair Oaks

**POSTING
ONLY
MAR 24 2017**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

BESZ DE LA VEGA

The County proposes to construct a 0.38 acre paved surface parking lot with capacity for 43 vehicles. The parking lot will help alleviate the existing parking deficit in the surrounding Middlefield Road commercial and residential areas and will partially offset the parking spaces that will be removed as the result of future improvements under the of Middlefield Road Redesign Project.

PROJECT SETTING

The project site is located on the southern corner of the intersection of Middlefield Road and Second Avenue in a mixed-use commercial and residential area of North Fair Oaks, in San Mateo County. The approximately 16,300 square-foot site is currently an undeveloped vacant lot and is comprised of four separate parcels located at 3060, 3070, and 3080 Middlefield Road (Assessor Parcel Numbers 060-082-320, -330, -340, and -350).

FINDINGS AND BASIS FOR A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Planning Division has reviewed the initial study for the above project and, based upon substantial evidence in the record, finds that:

1. The project will not adversely affect water or air quality or increase noise levels substantially.
2. The project will not have adverse impacts on the flora or fauna of the area.
3. The project will not degrade the aesthetic quality of the area.
4. The project will not have adverse impacts on traffic, land use, recreation, or cultural resources.

5. In addition, the project will not:
 - a. Create impacts which have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.
 - b. Create impacts which achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
 - c. Create impacts for a project which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
 - d. Create environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The County of San Mateo has, therefore, determined that the environmental impact of the project is insignificant.

MITIGATION MEASURES included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects:

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: BAAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures

The County shall require construction contractors to implement all the BAAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below:

- Dust control watering shall be implemented, as necessary, for all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) up to two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All roadways to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible following grading.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

CUL-1: Disturbance of Prehistoric or Historic Archaeological Resources

If prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered during

construction, work shall be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated, recorded, and determined appropriate treatment of the resource, in consultation with the County. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. Cultural resources shall be recorded on DPR 523 historic resource recordation forms. Native American resources include chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, and pestles; and dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human burials. Historic-period resources include stone or adobe foundations or walls; structures and remains with square nails; and refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often located in old wells or privies. If it is determined that the proposed development could damage a unique archaeological resource, mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, with a preference for preservation in place.

CUL-2: Disturbance of Paleontological Resources.

If paleontological resources are encountered during grading or excavation at the project site, work shall avoid altering the resource and its stratigraphic context until a qualified paleontologist has evaluated, recorded, and determined appropriate treatment of the resource, in consultation with the County. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. Appropriate treatment may include collection and processing of "standard" samples by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils; preparation of significant fossils to a reasonable point of identification; and depositing significant fossils in a museum repository for permanent curation and storage, together with an itemized inventory of the specimens.

HAZ-1: Hazardous Materials Handling, Storage, and Disposal.

The San Mateo County Department of Public Works shall require the construction contractor to use the following BMPs to minimize potential adverse effects of the project to groundwater and soils from chemicals used during construction activities:

- Follow the manufacturer's recommendations on use, storage and disposal of chemical products used in construction;
- Avoid overtopping construction equipment fuel gas tanks;
- Provide secondary containment for any hazardous materials temporarily stored onsite;
- During routine maintenance of construction equipment, properly contain and remove grease and oils; and,
- Perform regular inspections of construction equipment and materials storage areas for leaks and maintain records documenting compliance with the storage, handling and disposal of hazardous materials.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Environmental Site Management Plan. The contractor shall, prior to construction, prepare an environmental site management plan that specifies the method for

handling and disposal of contaminated soil and building debris, should any be encountered during construction.

Contract specifications shall mandate full compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations related to identifying, transporting, and disposing of hazardous materials, including those encountered in excavated soil, and demolition debris. The contractor shall provide San Mateo County Department of Public Works with copies of hazardous waste manifests documenting that disposal of all hazardous materials has been performed in accordance with the law.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Health and Safety Plan. The construction contractor shall, prior to construction, prepare a site-specific health and safety plan in accordance with federal OSHA regulations (29 Code of Federal Regulations Section 1910.120) and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations (8 California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 5192) to address worker health and safety issues during construction. The health and safety plan shall identify:

- Potentially present chemicals,
- Health and safety hazards associated with those chemicals,
- All required measures to protect construction workers and the general public from exposure to harmful levels of any chemicals identified at the site (including engineering controls, monitoring, and security measures to prevent unauthorized entry to the work area), and
- Appropriate personal protective equipment, and emergency response procedures.

The health and safety plan shall designate qualified individuals responsible for implementing the plan and for directing subsequent procedures in the event that unanticipated contamination is encountered.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY CONSULTATION: None

INITIAL STUDY: The San Mateo County Planning and Building Department has reviewed the Environmental Evaluation of this project and has found that probable environmental impacts are insignificant. A copy of the initial study is attached.

REVIEW PERIOD: March 25, 2017 – April 14, 2017

All comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this Negative Declaration must be received by the County Department of Public Works, 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, 94063, no later than 5:00 p.m., October 7, 2010

CONTACT PERSON

Mr. Mark Y. Chow, P.E.
(650) 599-1489

MIDDLEFIELD ROAD PARKING LOT PROJECT

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared for
County of San Mateo Department of Public Works

March 2017



Table of Contents

1.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Project Location	1
1.3	Background	1
1.4	Existing Setting	2
1.5	Surrounding Conditions	4
1.6	Land Use Designation and Zoning	4
1.7	Proposed Project	6
1.8	Construction	6
1.9	CEQA Lead Agency	10
1.10	Required Approvals	10
1.11	References	10
2.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND RESPONSES	11
2.1	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	11
2.2	Determination	12
3.0	EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	13
3.1	Aesthetics	14
3.2	Agriculture and Forest Resources	16
3.3	Air Quality	18
3.4	Biological Resources	23
3.5	Cultural Resources	25
3.6	Geology and Soils	28
3.7	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	31
3.8	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	33
3.9	Hydrology and Water Quality	38
3.10	Land Use and Planning	40
3.11	Mineral Resources	43
3.12	Noise	44
3.13	Population and Housing	47
3.14	Public Services	48
3.15	Recreation	49
3.16	Transportation/Traffic	50
3.17	Tribal Cultural Resources	53
3.18	Utilities and Service Systems	54
3.19	Mandatory Findings of Significance	57
4.0	REPORT PREPARERS	59
5.0	MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN (MMRP)	60

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Site Location and Project Vicinity..... 3
Figure 2. Proposed Project Site Design 5

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Construction Equipment Summary..... 8
Table 2. Construction-Related Pollutant Emissions (tons per year) 19

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

This Initial Study checklist was prepared to assess the potential environmental effects of the Middlefield Road Parking Lot Project located at 3060, 3070, and 3080 Middlefield Road, herein referred to as the “proposed project” or “project.” This Initial Study includes a description of the existing environmental setting of the proposed project, and the various environmental effects that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The project is located in North Fair Oaks, an unincorporated portion of San Mateo County, bounded by the cities of Redwood City to the north, east, and west; Atherton to the south; and Menlo Park to the southeast. The City of San Francisco is approximately 30 miles to the north and the City of San José is about 20 miles to the south (County of San Mateo, 2011).

Highway 82/El Camino Real runs along the western boundary of North Fair Oaks; Highway 101 (Bayshore Freeway) runs to the east of the area’s eastern border; and Highway 84/Woodside Road runs to the north of the community. Caltrain/Union Pacific Railroad runs directly through North Fair Oaks, and the Southern Pacific Railroad Dumbarton Spur line also transects the community, running roughly northwest to southeast. However, there are no train stations or ready access to rail transit within the community; the closest Caltrain station, providing north-south service to San Francisco and San Jose, is located in Redwood City, more than a mile from North Fair Oaks (County of San Mateo, 2011).

As of 2010, North Fair Oaks was 798 acres in size, with approximately 15,000 residents and 4,000 housing units. The community has a diverse mix of land uses and is comprised of multiple areas with distinctly different character. While single, uniform land uses dominate some parts of North Fair Oaks, other areas have a variety of uses that are concentrated in the same location (County of San Mateo, 2011).

Middlefield Road is the main commercial corridor and functional core of the community and is typified by smaller-scale commercial uses, primarily locally-oriented retail located on either side of Middlefield Road.

1.3 BACKGROUND

Middlefield Road, is currently a four-lane road plus parking, is the primary thoroughfare in North Fair Oaks for all modes of transportation including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and drivers. However, the street currently presents an unfriendly pedestrian and bicycle environment with narrow sidewalks, no bike lanes, and front-in diagonal parking along most blocks that is dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, Middlefield Road lacks street amenities such as trees, landscaping, communal open space, and other beneficial elements.

In June 2013, the County Board of Supervisors approved \$12.5 million from Measure A funding to redesign Middlefield Road in North Fair Oaks from Pacific Avenue (to the north) to Fifth Avenue (to the south). The redesign would include undergrounding utilities, adding new street lights, and other changes.

Preliminary designs for the reconstruction of Middlefield Road and accompanying redesign changes have been drafted and are currently undergoing community review and comment. Proposed design features include the following elements:

- Two traffic lanes (one in each direction) with a center left turn lane;
- Designated bike lanes;

- Sidewalks wide enough to accommodate street amenities including benches and other seating, greenery, street and pedestrian lighting, trash and recycling receptacles, street art, and public spaces;
- Parallel parking;
- Trees and landscaping; and
- New traffic signals at certain intersections.

Middlefield Road currently has diagonal parking along some blocks. However, with implementation of the proposed redesign, diagonal parking would be replaced with parallel parking in order to create space for wider sidewalks, bike lanes, and landscaping. Both the existing on-street parking shortage and the loss of parking associated with the redesign were identified in the 2011 North Fair Oaks Community Plan (County of San Mateo, 2011) and its associated Environmental Impact Report, and the Plan addressed several Circulation and Parking Policies:

- **Policy 5L:** *Explore opportunities to expand off-street parking supply by providing County or privately-owned public parking lots or structures near areas of concentrated parking demand. This could include new surface parking lots or structured parking in commercial districts, or small neighborhood parking lots in residential areas with high parking demand.*
- **Policy 5M:** *Implement regular monitoring programs to assess parking conditions, identify areas of excess or underutilized parking supply, and help guide plans for future parking facilities.*

Street improvements and the conversion of diagonal parking to parallel parking under the Middlefield Road Redesign Project would result in the loss of approximately 40 or more parking spaces (County of San Mateo, 2016). The proposed Middlefield Road Parking Lot Project would replace the parking that would be lost and provide near-term parking relief for the nearby community.

1.4 EXISTING SETTING

The project site is located on the southern corner of the intersection of Middlefield Road and Second Avenue in a mixed-use commercial and residential area of North Fair Oaks, in San Mateo County, California. **Figure 1, Site Location and Project Vicinity**, shows the project site location and regional vicinity. The approximately 16,300 square-foot site is currently an undeveloped vacant lot and is comprised of four separate parcels located at 3060, 3070, and 3080 Middlefield Road (Assessor Parcel Numbers 060-082-320, -330, -340, and -350).

North Fair Oaks is one of the most populated areas in unincorporated San Mateo County. According to 2010 U.S. Census data, the average number of persons per household in North Fair Oaks is 3.67, compared to the County average of 2.82 (US Census Bureau, 2010). For renter-occupied units, the average number of persons per household in North Fair Oaks is more than 60 percent higher than the County average. Since the average number of persons per households is higher in the project vicinity, the area is subject to higher on-street parking demand. In addition, the existing high household auto ownership ratio in the project area generates high parking demand, which results in inadequate off-street parking (County of San Mateo, 2011). Total parking occupancy (including on- and off-street parking) in North Fair Oaks ranges from 69 to 75 percent throughout the day. On several streets, including Middlefield Road, parking occupancy ranges from 75 percent to at or above 100 percent (Dyett & Bhatia and Nelson Nygaard, 2013). Parking constraints present an ongoing challenge for residents and businesses.

Figure 1. Site Location and Project Vicinity



As stated in the North Fair Oaks Community Plan - Existing Conditions, Appendix A-Land Use (2010), there are no public off-street parking lots or structures within the North Fair Oaks Planning Area. Private off-street parking lots exist at multi-family housing sites in the Planning Area and at several of the commercial and industrial developments fronting El Camino Real (SR-82), Middlefield Road, Fifth Avenue, Bay Road, Spring Street, North Fair Oaks Avenue, and other streets.

Land uses in North Fair Oaks can be classified into four general categories: residential (366.2 acres), commercial (40.8 acres), industrial (117.2 acres) and public (33.2 acres). The remaining land, about 240 acres, is dedicated to road and railroad rights-of-way. About two-thirds of all parcels within North Fair Oaks are used for residential uses. Six percent of the land area is in public use, including schools and parks, as well as the Hetch Hetchy water pipeline right-of-way (owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)). Approximately one-fifth of the land area is in industrial use and 7.3 percent in commercial use (County of San Mateo, 2010).

The area along Middlefield Road from First Avenue to the western edge of North Fair Oaks, including the project site, is designated as an area of higher-density development with a mix of commercial, residential, public, and institutional uses.

1.5 SURROUNDING CONDITIONS

Middlefield Road in the vicinity of the project site is a commercial corridor. Within the North Fair Oaks community, portions of the community have a high concentration of industrial uses including:

- the area centered around Middlefield Road at the crossing of the Caltrain/Union Pacific Railroad and Dumbarton spur rail lines;
- the area at the northeast corner of North Fair Oaks, roughly bounded by Bay Road, Fair Oaks Avenue, Second Avenue, and Willow Street; and
- the industrial mixed-use corridor extending north-south along Edison Way.

The majority of the southern and southeastern portions of North Fair Oaks, south of Second Avenue and east of Middlefield Road, are comprised primarily of low-density single-family residential uses, with some duplexes and multifamily housing.

The northern and northwestern parts of North Fair Oaks, particularly west of Middlefield Road, have areas of higher density multifamily residential development, with duplexes, triplexes, and smaller multifamily apartments, as well as some areas with larger multifamily structures. Additionally, there are pockets of higher density development in other parts of the community, particularly along Oakside Avenue, Hampshire Avenue, and Ninth Avenue, north of Edison Way.

1.6 LAND USE DESIGNATION AND ZONING

The project site is located in an area identified in the North Fair Oaks Community Plan as Neighborhood Mixed-Use. The Neighborhood Mixed-Use land use designation allows a medium-density mix of locally-oriented uses including commercial, residential, and public uses that serve the daily needs of both residents and visitors to the area. The Neighborhood Mixed-Use land use designation is located exclusively along Middlefield Road, between First Avenue and Eighth Avenue. The area to the west of Middlefield Road in the project area is Multi-Family Residential. This Multi-Family Residential designation combines the County's existing Medium-High Density and High Density Residential designations into a single designation. Allowed densities in the Multi-Family Residential designation range from a minimum of 24 to a maximum of 60 dwelling units per acres (County of San Mateo, 2011).

Figure 2. Proposed Project Site Design



1.7 PROPOSED PROJECT

The County proposes to construct a 0.38 acre paved surface parking lot with capacity for 43 vehicles. **Figure 2, Proposed Project Site Design**, shows the project layout and design. The parking lot would help alleviate the existing parking deficit in the surrounding Middlefield Road commercial and residential areas and would partially offset the parking spaces that would be removed as the result of future improvements under the of Middlefield Road Redesign Project.

Under the future redesign of Middlefield Road, diagonal parking spaces would be converted to parallel parking spaces, freeing up additional roadway for bicycle and pedestrian improvements, but reducing the total number of parking spaces along Middlefield Road. Additionally, the County intends to incorporate elements along property frontages on Middlefield Road, including street trees and other landscaping elements that would improve the overall redesign and benefit the public.

1.8 CONSTRUCTION

The County intends to redevelop the subject properties as a parking lot, with the intent of including bio-treatments and other green techniques to reduce and capture runoff from the resultant parking lot. Construction of the proposed project includes the following components:

- **Parking Lot:** The existing dirt lot would be excavated to a depth of approximately one foot, re-graded, and re-surfaced with asphalt paving, striping, and curbs to provide about 41 standard parking stalls and 2 stalls designated for Americans with Disability Act (ADA) use.

Additional excavation would be required for some of the specific project-related components. Bio-treatment areas would be excavated to a depth of approximately 3 feet below finished grade. Street light foundations would be excavated to a depth of five feet, and foundations for the wooden fence posts would be excavated to a depth of 2.5 feet. Lastly, post foundations for the decorative perimeter fences would be 8 inches deep.

The total paved area of the parking lot would be approximately 16,750 square feet. The parking lot would consist of approximately four inches of asphalt concrete and six inches of an aggregate base.

- **Lighting:** Overhead lighting would be installed throughout the parking lot for safety. Lighting would be illuminated from sunset to sunrise (Photo 1).



Photo 1. An example of overhead lighting.

- **Landscaping and Bio-treatments:** Bio-treatments would be used to treat stormwater runoff from the parking lot. Landscape areas would be installed along the perimeter of the parking lot (Photos 2 and 3). Stormwater would flow into the landscape areas, permeate into an underground filtration system, and then flow into a storm drain located on Second Avenue. Landscaping in the form of a variety of water-efficient trees, shrubs and/or grasses would also be installed around portions of the perimeter of the project site. Landscaped areas would total approximately 325 square feet.



Photos 2 and 3. Examples of a bio-treatments along perimeter of a parking lot.

- **Perimeter Treatments:** The exterior of the parking lot would include installation of perimeter treatments such as concrete pillars (Photos 4 and 5) with lights and/or wrought-iron fencing (Photos 6 and 7). These treatments would also add visual character to the parking lot.



Photos 4 and 5. Examples of concrete pillar perimeter treatments.



Photos 6 and 7. Examples of wrought-iron perimeter fences.

1.8.1 Construction Schedule

The estimated construction period for the proposed project is estimated to be approximately 30-45 working days. Construction is expected to begin in the spring of 2017, with completion anticipated by June or July 2017. Construction activities would occur from approximately 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Construction of the proposed parking lot would involve the use of heavy equipment. **Table 1, Construction Equipment Summary**, lists the anticipated type and number of equipment needed for construction per day.

Table 1. Construction Equipment Summary

Equipment	Quantity per Day
Dump trucks	2
Back-hoe	1
Grader	1
Roller	1
Small hand held compactors	2
Flatbed trucks	2
Small crane	1
Concrete trucks	2-3
Small asphalt paver	1

Source: Quincy Engineering

Because the existing project site consists of an empty, graded dirt lot, construction of the project would begin with excavation of existing soils. Anticipated construction-related activities are listed below in sequential order:

- Site excavation and trenching/installation of utilities and drainage;
- Sawcutting and demolition of adjacent property owner driveway and landscaping for realignment of property fence.
- Final site grading;
- Installation of aggregate base for parking lot base;
- Trench across Second Avenue and install drainage culvert. Affected roadway pavement, curb, gutter and sidewalk to be immediately replaced;
- Install permeable rock, underdrains and inlets leading to bio-treatment areas;
- Concrete pouring/curing for sidewalk, curbs, and gutters;
- Placement of pavement in parking lot;
- Light pole installation;
- Parking lot striping and sign installation;
- Vegetation and bio-treatment installation; and
- Installation of perimeter treatments, including rear redwood fence.

1.8.2 Operation

It is anticipated that the County will operate the Middlefield Road parking lot with timed meters to control the turnover rate of the parking lot. Typically, parking lots located in busy commercial districts incorporate set periods of time (e.g., 2-hour, 4-hour parking) to promote sufficient parking availability for the surrounding businesses. The San Mateo County Public Works Department will work with the County Planning Department and the North Fair Oaks community to determine appropriate turnover rates once construction is complete.

Ingress and egress for Middlefield would occur from Second Avenue, west of Middlefield Avenue, with one-way directional traffic throughout the facility (Figure 2).

Specific operational hours for the Middlefield Road parking lot would be determined by the County Board of Supervisors, with input from the surrounding North Fair Oaks community. Typically, daily operating hours for such facilities are 6:00 am to 10:00 pm. The County is currently preparing a Parking Study as part of the future redesign of Middlefield Road that will also be used to help determine the appropriate operational hours for the parking lot as well as turnover rates.

In addition to providing public off-street parking, Middlefield Road parking lot may also be used occasionally for small, community-based events, such as seasonal festivals, crafts markets, or farmers markets. Due to the limited size of the parking lot, it is anticipated that such events would be small in scale and that attendees of these events would originate from the nearby surrounding community and would be within walking distance to the site.

Any uses beyond providing public parking may be subject to applicable County Codes and Ordinances. For the purposes of this CEQA document, it is assumed that community-based events would occur intermittently and would not conflict with existing County Codes and Ordinances for such activities.

1.9 CEQA LEAD AGENCY

Section 15367 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines defines the “Lead Agency” as the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. The County of San Mateo Public Works Department is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for planning, designing, and building the proposed project.

1.10 REQUIRED APPROVALS

As the County is a governmental entity serving as both property owner and project sponsor, the County itself is the jurisdictional agency that would issue permits and approvals for the project improvements occurring onsite. Based on the current understanding of the project, the following is a list of agencies and approvals likely to be required for the Middlefield Road Parking Lot Project includes:

- County of San Mateo Planning Commission certification of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- Design Review Permit issued by the Bay Side Design Review Committee and County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department;
- Building Permit issued by the County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department; and,
- Certificate of Compliance issued by the County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department.

1.11 REFERENCES

County of San Mateo, 2011, North Fair Oaks Community Plan, December.

County of San Mateo, 2010, North Fair Oaks Community Plan, Appendix A – Existing Conditions Analysis, June 17.

County of San Mateo, 2015, E-mail correspondence with Jenifer Logia, North Fair Oaks Forward Outreach Coordinator, December 14.

Dyett & Bhatia and Nelson Nygaard, 2013, North Fair Oaks Parking Study and Strategy, October.

Quincy Engineering, 2016, Data Requests and Design Information Provided to SWCA Environmental Consultants.

U.S. Census Bureau, 2010, Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010, Available online at <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF>, Accessed on January 5, 2017.

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND RESPONSES

1. **Project Title:** Middlefield Road Parking Lot Project
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Department of Public Works
555 County Center, Fifth Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** James C. Porter, P.E.
(650) 363-4100
4. **Project Location:** 3060, 3070, 3080 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, San Mateo County, CA 94063
5. **Assessor's Parcel No.:** 060-082-320, -330, -340, and -350
6. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Department of Public Works
555 County Center, Fifth Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
7. **General Plan Designation:** Neighborhood Mixed-Use
8. **Zoning:** NMU (Neighborhood Mixed-Use)
9. **Description of the Project:** The County proposes to construct a paved surface parking lot with capacity for up to 43 vehicles. The parking lot would include bio-treatments s, overhead lighting, and perimeter treatments such as fencing and/or concrete pillars. The parking lot would also occasionally be used for farmers' markets and community events.
10. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** Middlefield Road in the vicinity of the project is a commercial corridor. To the south and southwest of the project site, along Second Avenue, the land uses are low-density residential.

11. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None.

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |

2.2 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENT IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature	Date
James C. Porter	County of San Mateo Department of Public Works
Printed Name	For

3.0 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- (1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- (2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- (3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- (4) Negative Declaration: “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-than-Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measure and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 5, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- (5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration, Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- (6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- (7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.1 AESTHETICS				
Would the project:				
a. Have a significant adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: No scenic views are available at the project site. The site is located on relatively flat topography in a suburban residential and commercial neighborhood. A parking lot would be consistent with the general commercial character of the area, and no adverse visual effect would occur. The project would not obstruct or change views from existing scenic vistas. No water bodies or public lands are located in the vicinity of the project site. As a result, the project would have no impact on scenic vistas, views from residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads.				
b. Significantly damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site does not contain any trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings and is not located within a designated state scenic highway corridor. No impact on scenic resources would occur from the proposed project.				
c. Significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is located in an area characterized by modern-era residential and commercial developments between one and two stories tall. The parking lot would be consistent with the existing visual setting and would not substantially degrade the visual character of the project site and surrounding area. The project would have a less-than-significant impact on the existing visual quality of the site and its surroundings.				
d. Create a new source of significant light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>Discussion: The project would introduce new light fixtures to the project site for security purposes. The lights would be mounted on poles and would be designed to be energy efficient and would be required to have features that constrain the light and glare to the site as much as possible. The lighting system would be consistent with the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations for a Neighborhood Mixed-Use District, which specifies that all exterior lighting shall be designed and located so that direct rays and glare are confined to the premises. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact from light or glare.</p> <p>Source: County of San Mateo, 2016, Zoning Regulations, Planning and Building Department, p. 21C.13, January.</p>				
e. Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is not adjacent or within a designed Scenic Highway or State or County Scenic Corridor, and no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Transportation, 2016, Scenic Highways, Available online at http://www.dot.ca.gov/design/lap/livability/scenic-highways/index.html, Accessed on November 14, 2016.</p>				
f. If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project is within the Bayside Design Review District. The plans for the parking lot would be reviewed by the Bayside Design Review District Committee to ensure that the new development would be compatible with the physical setting of the site and the visual character of the community. The project would not conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions and no impact would occur.</p> <p>Sources: County of San Mateo, 2011, North Fair Oaks Community Plan, December. County of San Mateo, 2016, Zoning Regulations, Planning and Building Department, January.</p>				
g. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: As describe above, the project site is located within a low-to-medium density residential and commercial neighborhood, with no natural scenic qualities. Therefore, the project would not visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities, and no impact would occur.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES				
Would the project:				
a. For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is characterized as urban and built-up land on the Important Farmland map prepared by the California Department of Conservation for San Mateo County. Therefore, no Important Farmland would be converted to a non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, 2014, San Mateo County Important Farmland 2014, February, Available online at ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2014/smt14.pdf, Accessed on November 15, 2016.</p>				
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The site is zoned Neighborhood Mixed-Use District (NMU); it is not zoned for agricultural use or under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract, and no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: County of San Mateo, 2016, GIS Database, Planning and Building Department, Available online at http://maps.smcgov.org/planning/. Accessed on November 15, 2016.</p>				
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is a vacant, unpaved lot. There are no forest or agricultural resources on or near the site nor is the site used for agricultural purposes. Therefore, the project would not involve changes in the existing environment that would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				

<p>d. For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in the Coastal Zone. The project site is located on urban land and does not contain any Class I or Class II Agricultural Soils, or Class II Soils rated for artichokes or Brussels sprouts. As a result, no impact would occur.</p> <p>Sources: California Coastal Commission, 2015, California Coastal Zone Map, May 20. U.S. Department of Conservation, 2016, Web Soil Survey, Available online at http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx, Accessed on November 15, 2016.</p>				
<p>e. Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is located on urban and built up land, and is currently characterized by a vacant, unpaved lot. The proposed project would not result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land, and no impact would occur.</p>				
<p>f. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The site is zoned Neighborhood Mixed-Use District (NMU). The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production, and no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: County of San Mateo, 2016, GIS Database, Planning and Building Department, Available online at http://maps.smcgov.org/planning/, Accessed on November 15, 2016.</p>				
<p>*In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<h3>3.3 AIR QUALITY</h3>				
<p>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (Bay Area), which is currently designated as a nonattainment area for State and national ozone standards, State particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) standards, and federal PM_{2.5} (24-hour) standard. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) 2010 Clean Air Plan is the applicable Clean Air Plan (CAP) that has been prepared to address ozone and particulate matter nonattainment issues.</p> <p>The 2010 and 2012 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines identify a three-step methodology for determining a project’s consistency with the current CAP. If the responses to these three questions can be concluded in the affirmative, and those conclusions are supported by substantial evidence, then BAAQMD considers the project to be consistent with air quality plans prepared for the Bay Area, and the impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>The first question to be assessed in this consistency methodology is: “does the project support the primary goals of the air quality plan (currently the 2010 CAP)?” The primary goals of the 2010 CAP are to attain air quality standards, reduce population exposure and protect public health in the Bay Area, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As indicated in the following discussion with regard to air quality impacts in Section 3.3 (b) and (c), below, both construction and operation of the project, with mitigation incorporated, would result in less than significant air quality impacts. Therefore, the project would be considered to support the primary goals of the 2010 CAP and would be consistent with the 2010 CAP.</p> <p>The second question to be assessed in this consistency methodology is: “does the project include applicable control measures from the CAP?” The 2010 CAP contains 55 control measures aimed at reducing air pollution in the Bay Area. These measures have been developed primarily for projects that involve existing traffic or would generate new vehicle trips, and other projects involving transit and other non-automobile transportation options. However, the general focus of the CAP is to reduce emissions through, among other measures, improved efficiency of the transportation network. The proposed project would not be expected to generate new vehicle trips because it would not serve any new trip-generating uses and ultimately would replace lost parking. Therefore, the transportation control measures identified in the 2010 CAP are not applicable to this project.</p> <p>The third question to be assessed in this consistency methodology is: “does the project disrupt or hinder implementation of any control measures from the CAP?” Examples of how a project may cause the disruption or delay of control measures include a project that precludes an extension of a transit line or bike path, or proposes excessive parking beyond parking requirements. The project would not create any barriers or impediments to planned or future improvements to transit or bicycle facilities.</p>				

The proposed project would construct a parking lot for up to 43 spaces; however, the purpose of the parking lot is to offset parking lost due to the Middlefield Road Redesign Project and alleviate existing parking demand issues, and would not create excessive parking facilities compared to existing conditions.

The responses to all three of the questions with regard to CAP consistency are affirmative and the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2010 CAP, and thus would have a less-than-significant impact.

Source:

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2010, Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan, Adopted September 15, 2010, Available online at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2010-clean-air-plan/cap-volume-ii_sections-a-f.pdf?la=en. Accessed on January 4, 2017.

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The project would consist of a surface parking lot for up to 43 spaces. Construction activities would involve the use of equipment that would emit ozone precursor emissions (i.e., reactive organic gases [ROGs] and oxides of nitrogen [NO_x]), which are included in the 2010 CAP’s emission inventories and plans for achieving attainment of air quality standards. Construction of the parking lot would also result in fugitive dust emissions from loose soil.

Criteria pollutant emissions of ROG and NO_x from these emission sources would incrementally add to the regional atmospheric loading of ozone precursors during project development. Emissions were estimated using CalEEMod and default construction phasing from the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District’s Road Construction Emissions Model was used estimating a two-month construction period.

Construction of the parking lot would result in 0.16 pounds per day of ROG and 1.32 pounds per day of NO_x, as outlined in Table 2, Construction-Related Pollutant Emissions. Construction of the project would also result in 0.16 pounds per day of PM₁₀ and 0.11 pounds per day of PM_{2.5}. Construction of the project would be well below the BAAQMD’s construction-related thresholds of significance for air quality.

Table 2. Construction-Related Pollutant Emissions (tons per year)

	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
2017 (Unmitigated Emissions)	0.16	1.32	0.16	0.11
BAAQMD Construction Threshold	10	10	15	10
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No

Although the project would not generate emissions during the short-term construction phase that would exceed the BAAQMD thresholds, due to the non-attainment status of the air basin with respect to ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}, the BAAQMD recommends that projects implement a set of Basic Construction Mitigation Measures as best management practices regardless of the significance determination. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, BAAQMD’s Basic Construction

Mitigation Measures, would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: BAAQMD’s Basic Construction Mitigation Measures

The County shall require construction contractors to implement all the BAAQMD’s Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below:

- Dust control watering shall be implemented, as necessary, for all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) up to two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All roadways to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible following grading.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Operation of the project would not result in additional mobile source emissions because the project would not generate new vehicle trips and any associated emissions. The purpose of the parking lot is to offset parking lost along Middlefield Road and relieve existing parking demand issues; therefore, because the same cars would now park in the proposed parking lot as opposed to Middlefield Road or other neighborhood streets, no new traffic would occur.

The proposed project would not violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, air quality impacts would be less than significant.

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

<p>Discussion: According to the BAAQMD, no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project’s individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. In addition, according to the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, if a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region’s existing air quality conditions. Alternatively, if a project does not exceed the identified significance thresholds, as would be the case with the proposed project, then the project would not be considered cumulatively considerable and would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts on the air quality environment.</p> <p>Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2012, California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2012, Available online at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/baaqmd-ceqa-guidelines_final_may-2012.pdf?la=en. Accessed on January 4, 2017.</p>				
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as defined by BAAQMD?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Sensitive receptors along Second Avenue in the vicinity would be subject to short-term diesel exhaust emissions, which are toxic air contaminants (TACs), from on-site heavy-duty equipment. In addition, particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) would be generated during site grading. The generation of TAC and particulate matter emissions from construction would be temporary, given the limitation on the hours during which construction is allowed to occur and the short construction period. Although project construction would emit particulate matter and TAC pollutants, these emissions would be well below the BAAQMD’s construction thresholds of significance as presented in Table 2, Construction-Related Pollutant Emissions, above. In addition, construction equipment would be subject to the California Air Resources Board’s In-Use Off-Road Diesel Regulation that limits idling to five minutes and requires that all equipment is running in proper condition prior to construction and properly maintained and tuned in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications during equipment operations. These measures would reduce pollutant concentrations associated with construction activities to less-than-significant levels.</p> <p>There is no incremental change to the existing operational source emissions because no additional vehicle trips and associated emissions would occur. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to increased levels of traffic-generated emissions and operational emissions would not result in significant risks and hazards at sensitive receptor locations.</p> <p>Sources: California Air Resources Control Board, 2016, In-Use Off-Road Diesel Fueled Fleets Regulation, Overview, Revised October 2016. Available online at https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/faq/overview_fact_sheet_dec_2010-final.pdf. Accessed on January 4, 2017. California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Article 4.8, Section 2485.</p>				
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: As a general matter, the types of land uses that pose potential odor problems include wastewater treatment plants, refineries, landfills, composting facilities, and solid waste transfer stations. No such uses would occupy the project site.</p>				

<p>Although some odors may occur during construction due to the use of diesel-fueled engines and asphalt paving, construction activities would be temporary and would only affect a few nearby receptors for a limited period of time. Upon completion of construction, objectionable odors could occur intermittently from vehicle emissions in the parking lot. These odors would be temporary and not likely to be noticeable much beyond the project site boundaries. Therefore, the project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people and this impact would be considered less-than-significant.</p>				
<p>f. Generate pollutants (hydrocarbon, thermal odor, dust or smoke particulates, radiation, etc.) that will violate existing standards of air quality on-site or in the surrounding area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: As discussed in Section 3.3 (b), above, the project would not cause a violation of air quality standards. Also, as discussed for Section 3.3 (d) and (e), above, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors. The project would be consistent with the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Thus, the project would not generate pollutants that would violate existing standards of air quality on-site or in the surrounding area. This impact would be considered less than significant.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:				
a. Have a significant adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is a vacant, unpaved, and undeveloped lot. There are no trees or vegetation present on the site. Given the undeveloped condition of the site and absence of biological resources, no impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species either directly or through habitat modification would occur. As a result, no impact would occur.				
b. Have a significant adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is located on an unpaved lot with no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities. The project site is surrounded by residential and commercial uses. As a result, no impact would occur.				
c. Have a significant 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is a vacant, dirt lot that does not contain any federally-protected wetlands. As a result, no impact would occur.				

<p>d. Interfere significantly 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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: There are no trees or other vegetation present on the project site and the proposed project would not affect resident or migratory fish, or interfere with a wildlife corridor. As a result, no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: County of San Mateo, 2011, North Fair Oaks Community Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, p. 2-14, August 5.</p>				
<p>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: There are no trees or vegetation present on the site. The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				
<p>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is not within the boundaries of any conservation plan and would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				
<p>g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				
<p>h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other nontimber woodlands?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: There are no oak woodlands or other nontimber woodlands on or near the project site, and the project would not result in the loss of these resources. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:				
a. Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site contains no structures or other historic resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The nearest identified historic architectural resource is located at 3600 Middlefield Road, approximately 0.33 mile from the project site. The proposed project would not create adverse change in the significance of the property at 3600 Middlefield Road. As a result, no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: County of San Mateo, 2011, North Fair Oaks Community Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, p. 8-4, August.</p>				
b. Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is an unpaved, vacant lot and was previously occupied by residences, which have since been demolished. According to the Northwest Information Center, the North Fair Oaks Community Plan Area contains three recorded archaeological resources. Given the location of the Community Plan Area within valley lands approximately 0.5 mile from the historic San Francisco Bay shoreline near the location of former intermittent and perennial watercourses, there is a moderate to high potential for the presence of additional unrecorded Native American resources within the Community Plan area. Construction of the proposed project could disrupt, alter or eliminate as-yet undiscovered prehistoric or historic-period archaeological sites, potentially including Native American remains. This possibility represents a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Because there is the potential to encounter prehistoric or historic archaeological resources during construction, the proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1, Disturbance of Prehistoric or Historic Archaeological Resources.</p> <p>CUL-1: Disturbance of Prehistoric or Historic Archaeological Resources</p> <p>If prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work shall be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated, recorded, and determined appropriate treatment of the resource, in consultation with the County. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. Cultural resources shall be recorded on DPR 523 historic resource recordation forms. Native American resources include chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, and pestles; and dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human burials. Historic-period resources</p>				

include stone or adobe foundations or walls; structures and remains with square nails; and refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often located in old wells or privies. If it is determined that the proposed development could damage a unique archaeological resource, mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, with a preference for preservation in place.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, impacts on archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant.

Source:
County of San Mateo, 2011, North Fair Oaks Community Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, p. 2-15 and 2-16, August 5.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: No specific paleontological resources have been recorded in the project area and there are no unique geologic features on site. Project construction would involve minor excavation to a depth of approximately one foot and paving at surface level. Ground-disturbing activities during previous development of the area would likely have disturbed, altered, or eliminated paleontological resources that may have existed within the area. Despite the history of disturbance, the project could potentially disrupt, alter or eliminate as-yet undiscovered paleontological resources. This possibility represents a potentially significant impact. Because there is potential to encounter paleontological resources during construction, the proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure CUL-2, Disturbance of Paleontological Resources.

CUL-2: Disturbance of Paleontological Resources.

If paleontological resources are encountered during grading or excavation at the project site, work shall avoid altering the resource and its stratigraphic context until a qualified paleontologist has evaluated, recorded, and determined appropriate treatment of the resource, in consultation with the County. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. Appropriate treatment may include collection and processing of "standard" samples by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils; preparation of significant fossils to a reasonable point of identification; and depositing significant fossils in a museum repository for permanent curation and storage, together with an itemized inventory of the specimens.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2, impacts on paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant.

Source:
County of San Mateo, 2011, North Fair Oaks Community Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, p. 8-17, August 5.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
<p>Discussion: There are no formal cemeteries located within North Fair Oaks. However, at the time of Euro-American contact, Native Americans in the Bay Area typically lived along alluvial terraces and the historic margins of San Francisco Bay. Despite the history of disturbance within the area, the project could potentially disrupt, alter, or eliminate as-yet undiscovered archaeological sites, potentially including Native American remains. This would represent a potentially significant impact. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, described above, impacts on archaeological resources, including human remains, would be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p>Source: County of San Mateo, 2011, North Fair Oaks Community Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, p. 2-15 and 2-16, August 5.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential significant adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest active fault is the San Andreas Fault located approximately 5 miles southwest of the site. Thus, the potential for surface fault rupture at the site is low. As a result, impacts would be considered less than significant.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, 1974, Special Studies Map, Palo Alto Quadrangle, July 1, Available online at http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/quad/PALO_ALTO/maps/PALOALTO.PDF. Accessed on November 16, 2016.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in the highly seismic San Francisco Bay Region and the site is likely to experience very strong to violent ground shaking during the life of the project. Potential risks to life and property from seismic hazards would be adequately mitigated by existing laws, regulations and policies, including the California Building Code, site-specific geotechnical investigations required by the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act due to liquefaction hazards, and the County's development review procedures. In addition, the proposed project is a surface parking lot that would not have the same risk of loss, injury, or death as a structure or occupied building. Impacts from strong seismic ground shaking would be considered less than significant.</p>				

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is mapped in a State of California Seismic Hazard Zone for potential earthquake-induced liquefaction. Therefore, the project could be exposed to soil conditions that could create risks to property. The risk to life is considered low because the proposed project would be a surface parking lot with minimal hazards during an earthquake.</p> <p>The County’s established development review and permitting procedures for individual development projects involve characterization and consideration of site-specific geologic and soils conditions, and required implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs). State and County planning, building and engineering regulations have been specifically formulated to address soil and geotechnical factors as they apply to structures, excavation, foundations, retaining walls and grading activities. State and County-specific geotechnical investigation and design-level specification requirements would adequately address potential soil-related hazards. With existing laws, regulations, standards, and practices in place, impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, 2006, Seismic Hazards Zone Map, Palo Alto Quadrangle, October 18.</p>				
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is located on level topography and is not located in an area mapped for earthquake-induced landslides. As a result, no impact associated with landslides would occur.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, 2006, Seismic Hazards Zone Map, Palo Alto Quadrangle, October 18.</p>				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion? <i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is discussed in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project is located inland and would not induce or be subject to coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would involve minor excavation and surface leveling, potentially exposing site soils to erosion from heavy winds, rainfall or runoff. Because the project would necessitate a Grading Permit from San Mateo County, the project would need to submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit by the County. The Plan would outline BMPs to minimize soil erosion. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				
<p>Discussion: The project site is underlain by urban fill and Holocene alluvium deposits. The soil and geologic units are not considered unstable and would not become unstable as a result of the project. As a result, no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: U.S. Geological Survey and California Department of Conservation, 2006, Geologic Map of the San Francisco Bay Region, Available online at https://pubs.usgs.gov/sim/2006/2918/sim2918_geolposter-stdres.pdf. Accessed on November 16, 2016.</p>				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is underlain by urban fill and Holocene alluvium deposits, and would not involve the construction or habitation of structures that would create substantial risk to life or property. For these reasons, impacts associated with expansive soils would be less than significant.</p>				
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project would not include the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. As a result, there would be no impact related to soils incapable of supporting wastewater systems.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Greenhouse gases would be emitted during construction from heavy equipment, haul trucks, and construction worker vehicles. Greenhouse gas emissions were estimated using CalEEMod and default construction phasing from the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District’s Model was used, estimating a two-month construction period. Construction of the proposed project would result in 25.23 metric tons per year of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e). Thus, construction of the project would not exceed the BAAQMD’s most stringent greenhouse gas threshold of 1,100 metric tons per year of CO₂e and the impact would be considered less than significant.</p> <p>Since the project would not result in new vehicle trips because it would be offsetting parking spaces lost along Middlefield Road and alleviate existing parking demand issues, no operational greenhouse gas emissions would occur. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>				
b. Conflict with any applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Although construction of the project would result in greenhouse gas emissions, they would be below the BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines’ thresholds of significance, as discussed in Section 3.7 (a).</p> <p>Because the project’s purpose as a parking lot is to provide compensation for parking spaces lost along Middlefield Road and alleviate existing parking demand issues, it would not result in new vehicle trips and associated emissions of greenhouse gases. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. As a result, impacts related to conflicts with applicable plans would be a less than significant.</p>				
c. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>Discussion: The project site is a dirt lot with no vegetation. The project would not result in the loss of forestland or the conversion of forestland to non-forest use. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				
<p>d. Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project is located inland and would not expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure to cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				
<p>e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in an upland area, approximately 1.14 miles west of the San Francisco Bay, and approximately 30 feet above sea level. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving sea level rise. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				
<p>f. Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project would not be located in a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map. As a result, no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: FEMA, 2012, Flood Insurance Rate Map, San Mateo County and Incorporated Areas, Panel 302 of 510, Effective October 16.</p>				
<p>g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: As described in the previous impact statement Section 3.7 (f), the project would not be located in a 100-year flood hazard area, and would thus not impede or restrict flood flows. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Project construction would require temporary storage and use of certain hazardous materials such as fuels and oils. Inadvertent release of these materials into the environment could adversely affect soil or groundwater quality. This could be a significant impact. The potential for such release would be minimized through Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, Hazardous Materials Handling, Storage, and Disposal.</p> <p>HAZ-1: Hazardous Materials Handling, Storage, and Disposal.</p> <p>The San Mateo County Department of Public Works shall require the construction contractor to use the following BMPs to minimize potential adverse effects of the project to groundwater and soils from chemicals used during construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow the manufacturer’s recommendations on use, storage and disposal of chemical products used in construction; • Avoid overtopping construction equipment fuel gas tanks; • Provide secondary containment for any hazardous materials temporarily stored onsite; • During routine maintenance of construction equipment, properly contain and remove grease and oils; and, • Perform regular inspections of construction equipment and materials storage areas for leaks and maintain records documenting compliance with the storage, handling and disposal of hazardous materials. <p>With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, impacts from the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be reduced to less than significant.</p>				
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) have been completed at the project site. The purpose of the Phase I ESA was to investigate the potential for hazardous materials at</p>				

or around the site. Based on the initial findings, a Phase II ESA was completed to investigate the presence of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and other materials that may be in the soil as a result of previous uses at the site. Previous uses that may have adversely effected soil and groundwater conditions include a machine shop, spray booth, and automotive repair. Soil results were compared to Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs). Soil ESL exceedances of diesel, aldrin, dieldrin, endrin, and lead were noted at several locations. Additionally, a soil gas exceedance of carbon tetrachloride was detected in one location. The contaminated soil and soil gas do not currently have exposure pathways. However, it was recommended in the Phase II ESA that an Environmental Site Management Plan be prepared if the excavation of soils were to occur. Mitigation Measures HAZ-2 Environmental Site Management Plan, and HAZ-3, Health and Safety Plan, have been recommended by the Phase II ESA to minimize impacts from the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

HAZ-2: Environmental Site Management Plan.

The contractor shall, prior to construction, prepare an environmental site management plan that specifies the method for handling and disposal of contaminated soil and building debris, should any be encountered during construction. Contract specifications shall mandate full compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations related to identifying, transporting, and disposing of hazardous materials, including those encountered in excavated soil, and demolition debris. The contractor shall provide San Mateo County Department of Public Works with copies of hazardous waste manifests documenting that disposal of all hazardous materials has been performed in accordance with the law.

HAZ-3: Health and Safety Plan.

The construction contractor shall, prior to construction, prepare a site-specific health and safety plan in accordance with federal OSHA regulations (29 Code of Federal Regulations Section 1910.120) and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations (8 California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 5192) to address worker health and safety issues during construction. The health and safety plan shall identify the potentially present chemicals, health and safety hazards associated with those chemicals, all required measures to protect construction workers and the general public from exposure to harmful levels of any chemicals identified at the site (including engineering controls, monitoring, and security measures to prevent unauthorized entry to the work area), appropriate personal protective equipment, and emergency response procedures. The health and safety plan shall designate qualified individuals responsible for implementing the plan and for directing subsequent procedures in the event that unanticipated contamination is encountered.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-2 and HAZ-3, impacts from the accidental release

<p>of hazardous materials would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Sources: AEI Consultants, 2016, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for 3060, 3070, 3080 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, San Mateo County, California, Prepared for County of San Mateo, June 14. AEI Consultants, 2016, Limited Phase II Subsurface Investigation for 3060, 3070, 3080 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, San Mateo County, California, Prepared for County of San Mateo, July 26.</p>				
<p>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The nearest school is Everest Public High School, located at 455 Fifth Avenue, approximately 600 feet east of the project site. As noted previously, the project would involve the handling of hazardous materials, such as fuels and oils, which could present a health hazard. The potential also remains for encountering soil or groundwater contamination during construction activities. Emissions of such hazardous materials in close proximity to a school would be a potentially significant impact. The potential for such release would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3.</p>				
<p>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project would not occur within or near any sites listed as hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result, no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Toxic Substance Control, 2016, Envirostor. Available online at http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/-Accessed on November 21, 2016.</p>				
<p>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is approximately 3.3 miles southwest of the San Carlos Airport and within its Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan area. No people or workers would reside or work at the project site, and the project would not result in a safety hazard. The proposed project is consistent with the Airport Land Use Computability Plan as the parking lot would be well below height restrictions, and no impact would occur.</p> <p>Sources: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, 2015, Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the San Carlos Airport, October, Available online at http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-</p>				

content/uploads/2015/11/SQL_FinalALUCP_Oct15_read.pdf. Accessed on November 23, 2016.				
Code of Federal Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 1, Subchapter E, Part 77, Section 77.17.				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is not near a private airstrip, would not result in a safety hazard for people in the project area, and no impact would occur.				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: As the proposed project would not result in new traffic or impacts to circulation, it would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. As a result, no impact would occur.				
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is located in North Fair Oaks, which is characterized by dense urban land uses. There is no risk of wildland fire threatening the project site, and no impact would occur. Source: California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2003, Wildland and Urban Interface – Fire Threatened Communities, Available online at http://planning.smcgov.org/sites/planning.smcgov.org/files/documents/files/Fire_Threat_ABAG.pdf . Accessed on November 21, 2016.				
i. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project does not include the construction of housing. As a result, no impact would occur.				
j. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: As described in Section 3.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the project would not be located in a 100-year flood hazard area and no structures are proposed; therefore, the project would not impede or redirect flood flows. As a result, no impact would occur.				

<p>k. 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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site not located in an area that is subject to flood hazards or inundation due to dam or levee failure. As a result, no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County, Dam Failure Inundation Areas – San Mateo County, 2005, Available online at http://planning.smcgov.org/sites/planning.smcgov.org/files/documents/files/Dam_Failure_Inundation.pdf. Accessed on November 23, 2016.</p>				
<p>l. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is well inland, has no large water bodies nearby, and is well above any elevation that would be impacted by a seiche or tsunami. The project is located on flat land, east of existing landslide areas. As a result, no impacts from seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows would occur.</p> <p>Sources: County of San Mateo, 2005, Existing Landslides, Available online at http://planning.smcgov.org/sites/planning.smcgov.org/files/documents/files/Existing_Landslides.pdf. Accessed on November 21, 2016. County of San Mateo, 2005, Tsunami Evacuation Planning, Available online at http://planning.smcgov.org/sites/planning.smcgov.org/files/documents/files/Tsunami_Evac.pdf. Accessed on November 21, 2016.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen demanding substances, and trash)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is comprised of a vacant, graded, dirt lot. Sheetflow from the project site flows into storm drains located on Second Avenue that drain to San Francisco Bay. The San Francisco Bay RWQCB and San Mateo County Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program requirements apply to projects that create or replace more than 10,000 square feet of impervious area. Project applicants must prepare and implement an Erosion Control Plan containing treatment and source control measures that meet the "maximum extent practicable" standard as specified in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and the Guidebook.</p> <p>The project would implement post-construction BMPs to control runoff volumes and urban pollutants as part of the project design in compliance with the San Mateo Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit. The County or its contractor will prepare and submit a drainage plan for compliance with requirements of the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit for review by County planning staff. Compliance with the County's requirements would reduce potential water quality impacts from erosion of disturbed project soils and non-source pollution impervious surfaces to less than significant.</p> <p>Source: California Regional Water Quality Control, 2015, San Francisco Bay Region, Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit, Order No. R2-2015-0049, NPDES Permit No. CAS612008, November 19. Available online at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb2/water_issues/programs/stormwater/Municipal/R2-2015-0049.pdf. Accessed on January 17, 2017.</p>				
b. Significantly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere significantly 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>Discussion: The project would not require groundwater supplies for construction or operation and would not increase demand for groundwater. As such, groundwater supplies would not be depleted. While the project would increase the area of impervious surfaces, the biotreatment measures (i.e., landscaped areas) would capture stormwater runoff and provide for infiltration, allowing for groundwater recharge. The project’s impact with respect to depletion of groundwater supplies or aquifer volumes would, therefore, be less than significant.</p>				
<p>c. Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in significant erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would involve minor resurfacing of an existing paved lot that is generally flat. No streams or rivers are in the vicinity of the project site. Site drainage would remain similar to existing conditions. Stormwater flows would drain through biotreatment measures, permeate into an underground filtration system, and then flow into a storm drain located on Second Avenue. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>d. Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or significantly increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would involve minor resurfacing of an existing unpaved lot that is generally flat. As part of the proposed project, stormwater would now flow through bio-treatments prior to exiting the site and flowing into an inlet, resulting in slightly lower surface runoff rates and volumes. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide significant additional sources of polluted runoff?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: As discussed above, the proposed project would result in slightly lower surface runoff rates and volumes because stormwater would flow through bio-treatments. These landscape areas would reduce runoff rates and volumes by directing flow through vegetation, and promoting infiltration into the groundwater. No impacts on existing or planned stormwater drainage systems would occur.</p>				
<p>f. Significantly degrade surface or groundwater water quality?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Refer to the discussion in Section 3.9 (a), above.</p>				
<p>g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Refer to the discussion in Section 3.9 (c) and (d), above.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING				
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project would enhance a vacant lot with a parking lot. The parking lot would not divide an established community. No impacts would occur.				
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is located in a Neighborhood Mixed-Use (NMU) District. Parking lots are permitted uses in an NMU District. The project conforms to the North Fair Oaks Community Plan and San Mateo County Zoning Regulations. Therefore, no impact from the proposed project would occur. Sources: County of San Mateo, 2011, North Fair Oaks Community Plan, December. County of San Mateo, 2016, Zoning Regulations, Planning and Building Department, p. 21C.9, January.				
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is not located in a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. As a result, no impact would occur.				
d. Result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: In addition to providing public off-street parking, the Middlefield Road parking lot may also be used occasionally for community-based events, such as seasonal festivals, and crafts or farmers markets. It is assumed that any of these events could attract more than 50 people. However, such events would not be expected to occur on a regular basis (e.g., monthly). Any uses beyond providing public parking may be subject to applicable County Codes and Ordinances. For the purposes of this CEQA analysis, it is assumed that farmers and crafts markets would occur intermittently and would not conflict with existing County Codes and Ordinances for such activities.				

<p>Community events at the parking lot would occur next to a residence at 380 Second Avenue, located along the western boundary of the parking lot. However, the proposed project includes design features to minimize noise and visual effects on the adjacent residence from parking lot operations and event activities. These design features include landscaping and an 8-foot fence along the rear portion of the parking lot bordering the residence. This analysis assumes that any market or community events would be infrequent (monthly basis), and therefore, would not create significant land use conflicts with nearby residences as a result of a large gathering of people typically associated with such events. The establishment of a farmers’ market and/or any community events in the parking lot would not conflict with other neighboring land uses, as other uses adjacent to the project site are primarily commercial uses along Middlefield Road.</p> <p>Further, a neighborhood farmers’ market along Middlefield Road, or another convenient location, along with the expansion of access to affordable fresh fruit and produce, was a stated goal and policy in the North Fair Oaks Community Plan. While the Mitigated Negative Declaration did not analyze the establishment of a farmers’ market in the community or at the project site, any uses beyond providing public parking may be subject to applicable County Codes and Ordinances. For the purposes of this CEQA analysis, it is assumed that farmers and crafts markets would occur intermittently and would not conflict with existing County Codes and Ordinances for such activities and their frequency. Because community events are not anticipated to occur on a regular basis, and would not conflict with neighboring land uses or County Codes and Ordinances, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
e. Result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: As noted in Section 3.10 (d), above, the project would include an occasional farmers’ market and other community events that are not currently located in the neighborhood. Although the farmers’ market is not currently located in the community, it is a stated goal and policy in the North Fair Oaks Community Plan. The introduction of a farmers’ market at the project site would likely be a well-received addition to the community, as it would provide an increase in the availability of fruit, vegetables, and other locally-sourced foods. As demonstrated in Section 3.10 (d), the new activity would not conflict with existing land uses in the area, as landscaping would minimize adverse noise and aesthetic effects on the nearby residences. Impacts from the introduction of a farmers’ market on the community would be less than significant.</p>				
f. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project involves the construction of a parking lot in a developed urban environment that would be replacing parking lost due to street improvements along Middlefield Road from the Middlefield Road Redesign Project. The parking lot would also serve existing residents experiencing parking demand issues. The proposed project would not increase the development intensity of the area or introduce new infrastructure. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				

g. Create a significant new demand for housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project does not include the provision of new services or employment that would attract new residents or otherwise increase demand for housing within the area. As a result, no impact would occur.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: No known mineral resources that would be of value or importance locally or regionally, or to the residents of the State, occurs within the project area. As a result, no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, 1983, Mineral Resource Zones and Resource Sectors, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties, Available online at: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_146-2/SR-146_Plate_2.3.pdf. Accessed on January 17, 2017.</p>				
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Refer to the discussion in Section 3.11 (a), above.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.12 NOISE				
Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Project construction would involve the use of heavy equipment including dump trucks, back hoes, graders, rollers, and trucks. Sensitive receptors in the project area include residences located along Second Avenue, the closest of which is adjacent to the project site, approximately 15 feet from the property line. A second residence is located across the street at 393 Second Avenue.</p> <p>The San Mateo County Municipal Code Section 4.88.360 states that project activities are exempt from the provision of the County Code if: “noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading, of any real property, provided said activities do not take place between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. weekdays, 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays, Thanksgiving and Christmas.” None of the proposed construction activities would occur during the above periods.</p> <p>Moreover, operation of the project as a parking lot and event space would be in accordance with applicable noise-related policies outlined in the County of San Mateo General Plan. The project would not result in land use/noise incompatibilities.</p> <p>As a result, impacts related to exceedance of local noise standards would be less than significant.</p>				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Use of heavy equipment for project construction would generate vibration levels of up to 0.12 peak particle velocity (PPV) at a distance of approximately 20 feet from the project boundary at the sensitive receptor located at 380 Second Avenue. The 0.12 PPV vibration levels would be from the use of a backhoe and grader, other construction equipment would have lower vibration levels. Vibration levels at the next closest sensitive receptor at 393 Second Avenue would range from 0.01-0.02 PPV.</p> <p>The California Department of Transportation uses a conservative vibration limit of 0.2 PPV for buildings that are found to be structurally sound but for which structural damage is a major concern. Because ground-borne vibration during construction would be below the California Department of Transportation’s conservative vibration limit, impacts associated with ground-borne vibration would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: SWCA, 2017, Middlefield Road Parking Lot Vibration Impact Assessment.</p>				

c. A significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: A significant operational noise impact would occur if noise levels increase substantially at existing noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residences) due to the project land use changes and associated traffic noises. Noise from operation of the proposed project could include tire squealing, engines starting and accelerating, doors slamming, car alarms, music from cars, and people talking.

Operational hours for the Middlefield Road parking lot would be determined by the County Board of Supervisors, with input from the surrounding North Fair Oaks community and the County Planning Department. Typically, daily operating hours for such facilities are 6:00 am to 10:00 pm daily. The County is currently preparing a Parking Study as part of the future redesign of Middlefield Road that will help determine the appropriate operational hours for the parking lot.

A project-related increase in noise levels of 3 dBA in residential areas where existing noise levels exceed 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA) would constitute a significant impact. Existing ambient noise levels in the area are 65 dBA (San Mateo County, 2011).

The maximum flow of traffic would be approximately 23 cars per hour with an average speed of 5 miles per hour. Noise levels from the parking lot would result in approximately 41 dBA at the residence at 380 Second Avenue, and 36 dBA at the residence at 393 Second Avenue. The combined existing ambient noise and proposed project noise would not result in any increase in noise levels at the sensitive receptor locations compared to existing conditions (SWCA, 2016). Landscaping around the perimeter of the parking lot would provide additional sound attenuation for nearby receptors.

The parking lot would be intermittently used as an event space for festivals and markets. Events would create temporary and periodic noise increases from a variety of sources such as music, human voices, performances, and other miscellaneous entertainment. Because the parking lot would only be used for community events and farmers’ markets sporadically and because these events would not continue beyond 10 p.m. at night, it would not represent a permanent increase in noise at the project site.

Therefore, the project would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Source:
SWCA, 2016, Middlefield Road Parking Lot Noise Impact Assessment.

d. A significant temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: Construction activity noise levels at and near the project construction sites would fluctuate depending on the particular type, number, and duration of uses of various pieces of construction equipment. Construction-related material haul trips would raise ambient noise levels along haul routes, depending on the number of haul trips made and types of vehicles used. The combined ambient noise levels would increase at nearby sensitive receptor locations to 82 dBA at 393 Second Avenue and 93 dBA at 380 Second Avenue. The noise level increase would be approximately 17 dBA and 28 dBA higher at 393 Second Avenue and 380 Second Avenue compared to existing conditions, respectively (SWCA, 2016). Construction noise at these sensitive receptor locations would be substantially greater than existing noise levels. However, construction would be short-term and intermittent. The use of diesel-powered construction equipment would be temporary and episodic, affecting only a few nearby receptors for a limited period of time.

<p>For these reasons, and because such work would not violate the County’s noise standards (San Mateo County Municipal Code Section 4.88.360), the temporary increases in ambient noise levels would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: SWCA, 2016, Middlefield Road Parking Lot Noise Impact Assessment.</p>				
<p>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in Area A of the San Carlos Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan area. No residents or workers would reside at the proposed project. In addition, the project site is outside of the noise contours for the San Carlos Airport. As a result, no impact would occur.</p> <p>Source: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, 2015, Initial Study for Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan San Carlos Airport, September, Available online at http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Final_SQL_ALUCP_IS_NegativeDeclaration_read.pdf. Accessed on November 23, 2016.</p>				
<p>f. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a parking lot with no permanent employees. No permanent population or housing would be generated as a result of the project. As a result, no impact would occur.				
b. Displace existing housing (including low- or moderate-income housing), in an area that is substantially deficient in housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is a vacant lot. The proposed project would not displace existing housing, and no impact would occur.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES				
Would the project result in significant adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Fire protection and emergency services in North Fair Oaks are provided by the Menlo Park Fire District. The project site is approximately 1 mile from Menlo Park Fire District’s Station 5, located at 4101 Fair Oaks Avenue in Menlo Park. The proposed project would not induce new residents or employees to the area. Traffic volumes would not be affected by the project, as no new vehicle trips would be generated. The introduction of a parking lot to the site would not impact the fire department’s ability to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. No new or expanded fire protection facilities would be required and no impact would occur.</p>				
c. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Police service in the project area is provided by the County of San Mateo Office of the Sheriff. The deputy-to-population ratio is approximately 1 officer per 1,000 residents. For the same reasons stated in Section 3.14 (i), the introduction of a parking lot to the site would not impact the police department’s ability to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives, and would not result in the need for new or expanded police facilities. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				
d. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would neither directly nor indirectly increase the demand for public services, such as schools, because the project would not cause an increase in area population or population densities. As a result, the project would have no impacts on schools.</p>				
e. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: See response to Section 3.14 (d), above.</p>				
f. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: See response to Section 3.14 (d), above.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.15 RECREATION				
Would the project:				
a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project does not include any recreational facilities, is not in the vicinity of existing recreational facilities, and would not cause an increase in population or population densities or any other change that would result in an increase in the use of nearby parks, including Hoover Park. Therefore, the project would have no impact on recreation or recreational facilities.				
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See response to Section 3.15 (a).				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Roads in the project vicinity include Second Avenue and Middlefield Road, both local streets. The intersection of Second Avenue and Middlefield is un-signalized. Second Avenue and Middlefield Road are two-lane and four-lane roadways, respectively.</p> <p>The nearest intersection that was studied as part of the North Fair Oaks Community Plan Environmental Impact Report was the intersection at Middlefield Road and Fifth Avenue. The intersection had a level-of-service of C during the AM peak period and a level-of-service of E during the PM peak period. The level-of-service standard for the County of San Mateo is C per the City/County Association of Governments’ Congestion Management Program. Therefore, Middlefield Road currently has a level-of-service that is at, or below, the County’s measure of effectiveness.</p> <p>Project construction would be short-term (30-45 days) and would include a small crew of workers. The impact of adding construction traffic trips to and from the project site is not expected to result in a significant change to the performance of the local circulation system.</p> <p>As described in the Chapter 1, Project Description, portions of parking along Middlefield Road would be removed as part of Measure A, the Middlefield Road Redesign Project. The Middlefield Road Redesign Project is anticipated to cause the loss of approximately 40 or more parking spaces (County of San Mateo, 2016). The intention of the proposed project is to provide a balance of parking that would be lost as part of the Middlefield Road redesign and alleviate existing parking demand issues. The proposed project would not include any new commercial or residential uses. As such, the proposed project would not generate additional vehicle trips because the same vehicles would be driving and parking under existing conditions. In other words, the parking lot would not create a new use that vehicles would drive to. The proposed project would have no effect on mass transit or non-motorized travel.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, and the impact would be less than significant.</p>				

<p>Sources: County of San Mateo, 2016, E-mail correspondence with Jenifer Logia, North Fair Oaks Outreach Coordinator, December 14. City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, 2015, San Mateo County Congestion Management Program, November. Available online at http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2015-CMP_Final_rev.pdf. Accessed on November 23, 2016.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: See response to Section 3.16 (a).</p>				
<p>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in significant safety risks?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project consists of construction and operation of a parking lot. As a result, the project would have no effect on air traffic patterns or volumes.</p>				
<p>d. Significantly increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The parking lot would introduce a new driveway along Second Avenue for ingress and egress. The new driveway would be subject to County driveway standards and an encroachment permit would be filed with San Mateo County to ensure compliance. The driveway would be located approximately 90 feet south of the intersection of Middlefield Road and Second Avenue. Second Avenue is a local, two-way street in a residential neighborhood with limited traffic and a speed limit of 25 miles-per-hour. Similar driveways and parking lots are located in the area that serve commercial businesses fronting Middlefield Road. For example, a driveway is located directly across the street on Second Avenue. Thus, the driveway would not substantially increase hazards due to the design feature. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would have no impact on emergency access.</p>				

f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would not generate new traffic or alter traffic patterns in a way that would decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. As a result, no impact would occur.</p>				
g. Cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Because the parking lot with up to 43 spaces would be replacing much of the parking lost due to Middlefield Road Redesign Project (approximately 40 or more parking spaces), the parking lot would not result in the generation of additional pedestrian activity. Pedestrians would utilize the adjacent sidewalk to walk to their destination along Middlefield Road. The farmers’ market and any community events may result in additional pedestrians in the vicinity. However, the farmers’ market would be infrequent (no more than monthly) and would be similar to the existing commercial uses in the vicinity. Therefore, the project would not cause a notable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns. As a result, the impact would be less than significant.</p>				
h. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project is a parking lot with up to 43 spaces and would thus increase parking capacity. As a result, no impact on parking capacity would occur.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: As part of the CEQA process, the County has initiated outreach with Native American tribes in an effort to request information from the tribes regarding the potential for sensitive Native American resources, including TCRs. The Federal and state registers were also reviewed in order to identify any TCRs already formally listed. Results of the records searches indicate that no Native American cultural resources that might be TCRs are known within or in the immediate vicinity of the study area. Cultural resources background research, surveys, and Native American outreach did not identify Native American affiliated resources that may be considered TCRs within or adjacent to the project site. As a result, the County is not aware of any TCRs that will be impacted by the project and no impact would be expected.</p>				
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: See response to Section 3.17 (a).</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS				
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project would not generate additional wastewater and would not increase the capacity of the area's sanitary sewer system. As a result, no impact on wastewater treatment requirements would occur.				
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project would not generate additional wastewater and would not require the construction or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects. As a result, no impact would occur.				
c. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project includes on-site stormwater drainage facilities. The stormwater would be treated through bio-treatments that would reduce run-off and improve water quality. The project would reduce stormwater runoff compared to existing conditions because the site is currently paved with no stormwater treatment. Therefore, the project would not require the construction or expansion of stormwater facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects. As a result, no impact would occur.				
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project would not induce water demand, as there would be no water or wastewater facilities on the site. New or expanded entitlements for water resources would not be necessary. As a result, no impact would occur.				

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The project would not require a determination by the Fair Oaks Maintenance District, West Bay Sanitary District, City of Redwood City, or the South Bayside System Authority wastewater treatment plant because the project would not result in the creation of wastewater. According to the North Fair Oaks Community Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, the aforementioned wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities, have adequate capacity to serve the area, and no impact would occur.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed parking lot is not anticipated to generate any solid waste. Occasional farmers’ markets and community events may generate solid waste, but these would be infrequent (no more than monthly). The project area is served by Recology and solid waste is transported to Shoreway Environmental Center. Shoreway Environmental Center has a 10-year contract with San Mateo County as of 2011. Impacts associated with solid waste generation would be less than significant.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: As described in Section 3.17 (f), the project is not anticipated to generate solid waste, except for occasional farmers’ markets and community events. Solid waste service is provided by Recology of San Mateo County, which is assumed to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. As a result, no impact would occur.

h. Be sited, oriented, and/or designed to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy; incorporate water conservation and solid waste reduction measures; and incorporate solar or other alternative energy sources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The project site would include green techniques (bio-treatments) to reduce and capture runoff from the proposed parking lot and include low water use plants. The project is not anticipated to generate solid waste. Transportation energy is not expected to be wasted by the operation of the project, as vehicles that would have parked along Middlefield Road or neighboring streets would now park in the proposed parking lot. As a result, the project would minimize energy waste, and no impact would occur.

i. Generate any demands that will cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project would result in no new demand for wastewater and infrequent and limited, solid waste, and not cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity. As a result, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts on public facilities and utilities.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: No significant impacts were identified for biological resources and the project would not be expected to degrade environmental quality, or substantially reduce the habitat or affect populations of any wildlife, fish, or plant species. It has been determined that construction of the proposed project would not have an impact on any examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would be implemented to ensure that any impacts resulting from the incidental discovery of cultural or paleontological resources during construction. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Consideration of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the project area and vicinity indicate that implementation of the proposed parking lot would have a less-than-significant impact. Foreseeable future projects in the vicinity include implementation of the North Fair Oaks Community Plan, including the Middlefield Road Redesign Project. Impacts from the cumulative projects would be expected to be similar to the proposed parking lot, including effects to biological and cultural resources. The North Fair Oaks Community Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report includes mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant. The proposed project’s contribution to cumulative effects would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, CUL-1, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3. All impacts identified in this document would be less-than-significant, or reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures, and the project’s incremental contribution to potential cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project’s impact would be considered less than significant with mitigation.</p>				

<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would not cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and cultural resources impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures AQ-1, CUL-1, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-3). The project would not impact housing, mineral resources, agricultural or forestry resources, public services, recreation, and/or utilities.</p>				

4.0 REPORT PREPARERS

County of San Mateo

Department of Public Works:

James C. Porter, Director of Public Works

Planning and Building Department:

Michael Schaller – Senior Planner

SWCA Environmental Consultants

60 Stone Pine Road, Suite 100

Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

www.swca.com

Dennis Kearney – Project Manager

Barbara Sahn – Quality Assurance/Quality Control

Ian Todd – Project Planner

Emily Creel – Air Quality Analyst

Carlos Villareal – Noise Analyst

5.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN (MMRP)

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) has been prepared pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, which state:

In order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the EIR or negative declaration are implemented, the public agency [the County of San Mateo] shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. (§15097(a)).

The public agency may choose whether its program will monitor mitigation, report on mitigation, or both. “Reporting” generally consists of a written compliance review that is presented to the decision making body or authorized staff person. A report may be required at various stages during project implementation or upon completion of the mitigation measure. “Monitoring” is generally an ongoing or periodic process of project oversight. There is often no clear distinction between monitoring and reporting and the program best suited to ensuring compliance in any given instance will usually involve elements of both. (§15097 (c)).

Table 1, below, lists the potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Middlefield Road Parking Lot Project. Table 1 also describes the timing of and responsibility for implementing the mitigation measures related to the Middlefield Road Parking Lot Project. The mitigation measures listed here will be implemented by the County of San Mateo, or by its appointee.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (a)(2), “Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally-binding instruments. In the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other public project, mitigation measures can be incorporated into the plan, policy, regulation, or project design.” Therefore, the County of San Mateo will consider whether to adopt the mitigation measures when it considers whether to approve the project.

This page intentionally left blank

Mitigation Measure	Timing of Implementation	Implementation Responsibility	Verified for Compliance by:
<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: BAAQMD’s Basic Construction Mitigation Measures. The County shall require construction contractors to implement all the BAAQMD’s Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust control watering shall be implemented, as necessary, for all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) up to two times per day. • All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. • All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. • All roadways to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible following grading. • Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. • All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. • Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. 	<p>Prior to approval of final design plans</p>	<p>Lead Agency</p>	<p>DPW</p>

Mitigation Measure	Timing of Implementation	Implementation Responsibility	Verified for Compliance by:
<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Disturbance of Prehistoric or Historic Archaeological Resources. If prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work shall be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated, recorded, and determined appropriate treatment of the resource, in consultation with the County.</p> <p>Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. Cultural resources shall be recorded on DPR 523 historic resource recordation forms. Native American resources include chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, and pestles; and dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human burials. Historic-period resources include stone or adobe foundations or walls; structures and remains with square nails; and refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often located in old wells or privies.</p> <p>If it is determined that the proposed development could damage a unique archaeological resource, mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, with a preference for preservation in place.</p>	<p>Prior to ground clearing, subsurface earthwork and ongoing during construction</p>	<p>Contractor and Qualified Archaeologist (if necessary)</p>	<p>DPW</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Disturbance of Paleontological Resources. If paleontological resources are encountered during grading or excavation at the project site, work shall avoid altering the resource and its stratigraphic context until a qualified paleontologist has evaluated, recorded, and determined appropriate treatment of the resource, in consultation with the County. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources.</p> <p>Appropriate treatment may include collection and processing of "standard" samples by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils; preparation of significant fossils to a reasonable point of identification; and depositing significant fossils in a museum repository for permanent curation and storage, together with an itemized</p>	<p>Prior to approval of final plans; prior to ground clearing, subsurface earthwork and ongoing during construction</p>	<p>Lead Agency and Contractor</p>	<p>DPW</p>

Mitigation Measure	Timing of Implementation	Implementation Responsibility	Verified for Compliance by:
inventory of the specimens.			
<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Hazardous Materials Handling, Storage, and Disposal. The San Mateo County Department of Public Works shall require the construction contractor to use the following BMPs to minimize potential adverse effects of the project to groundwater and soils from chemicals used during construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow the manufacturer’s recommendations on use, storage and disposal of chemical products used in construction; • Avoid overtopping construction equipment fuel gas tanks; • Provide secondary containment for any hazardous materials temporarily stored onsite; • During routine maintenance of construction equipment, properly contain and remove grease and oils; and • Perform regular inspections of construction equipment and materials storage areas for leaks and maintain records documenting compliance with the storage, handling and disposal of hazardous materials. 	Prior to approval of final plans	Lead Agency and applicable regulatory agency	DPW
<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Environmental Site Management Plan. The contractor shall, prior to construction, prepare an environmental site management plan that specifies the method for handling and disposal of contaminated soil and building debris, should any be encountered during construction.</p> <p>Contract specifications shall mandate full compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations related to identifying, transporting, and disposing of hazardous materials, including those encountered in excavated soil, and demolition debris. The contractor shall provide San Mateo County Department of Public Works with copies of hazardous waste manifests documenting that disposal of all hazardous materials has been performed in accordance with the law.</p>	Prior to ground clearing, subsurface earthwork and ongoing during construction	Lead Agency and Contractor	DPW
<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Health and Safety Plan. The construction</p>	Prior to ground	Lead Agency and	DPW

Mitigation Measure	Timing of Implementation	Implementation Responsibility	Verified for Compliance by:
<p>contractor shall, prior to construction, prepare a site-specific health and safety plan in accordance with federal OSHA regulations (29 Code of Federal Regulations Section 1910.120) and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations (8 California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 5192) to address worker health and safety issues during construction. The health and safety plan shall identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially present chemicals, • Health and safety hazards associated with those chemicals, • All required measures to protect construction workers and the general public from exposure to harmful levels of any chemicals identified at the site (including engineering controls, monitoring, and security measures to prevent unauthorized entry to the work area), and • Appropriate personal protective equipment, and emergency response procedures. <p>The health and safety plan shall designate qualified individuals responsible for implementing the plan and for directing subsequent procedures in the event that unanticipated contamination is encountered.</p>	<p>clearing, subsurface earthwork and ongoing during construction</p>	<p>Contractor</p>	