

INITIAL STUDY  
AND  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

---

1555 WEST MIDDLEFIELD ROAD  
RESIDENTIAL PROJECT  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA

---

PREPARED BY THE



JANUARY 2020

## Initial Study of Environmental Significance

<b>Project Title</b>	1555 West Middlefield Road Residential Project
<b>Lead Agency Name and Address</b>	City of Mountain View 500 Castro Street, Mountain View, CA 94039
<b>Contact Person</b>	Margaret Netto
<b>Phone Number</b>	(650) 903-6306
<b>Project Location</b>	1555 W. Middlefield Road (APN:150-15-006)
<b>Applicant's Name</b>	John Hickey, Summerhill Homes, LLC
<b>Zoning</b>	R3-2 Multiple Family Residential
<b>General Plan</b>	Medium Density Residential
<b>Other Public Agencies whose approval is required</b>	N/A

### **BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Request for a Planned Unit Development Permit, Development Review Permit and Tentative Map to demolish an existing 116-unit apartment complex to construct a 115-unit rowhouse development and a Heritage Tree Removal Permit to remove 55 Heritage trees on a 5.44-acre site.

### **DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

#### Surrounding Uses and Setting:

The project site is located on the west side of W. Middlefield Road, between Burgoyne Street and San Pierre Way, in the R3-1 (Multiple Family Residential) zoning district on a 5.44-acre site. The project would demolish the existing apartment buildings/structures and construct 20 rowhouse buildings with 115 residential units with vehicle access via two full-access driveways on San Ramon Avenue. This area contains a mix of multi-family, single-family residential and office and Crittenden Middle School across W. Middlefield Road. The site currently contains 13 two-story apartment buildings with 116 existing apartment units. Adjacent uses include the following:

- (west) existing two-story apartments;
- (south across San Ramon Avenue) existing single-family homes;
- (east, across San Pierre Way) two-story apartments; and
- (north, across W. Middlefield Road) existing offices, Crittenden Middle School.

The project site is located in the "medium density residential" portion of General Plan. This area is characterized by a mix of single- and multi-family housing with a residential character appropriate to a range of densities and a broad mix of housing types. The General Plan limits most development to three stories in this area.

The proposed project is a three-story, 115 rowhouses, in 20 separate buildings. The project proposes three and four bedroom units, with an average living area of 1,672 square feet. Materials include stucco, tile roofs, metal railings, balconies in a “Spanish California” style.

Currently, there are four driveways along Middlefield Road and four along San Ramon Avenue. The project will reduce the number of driveways so there will be none on Middlefield Road. Vehicle entrance to the project is provided by two 20-foot wide driveways from San Ramon. The applicant is proposing 230 parking spaces (43 parking spaces are tandem), 2 covered spaces per unit plus 35 guest spaces, and 5 spaces for temporary tandem parking for a total of 270 parking spaces. The guest spaces are located on the western portion of the site. Including four parking spaces for electric vehicle charging stations not included in the total spaces. Each unit will have one bicycle storage space in the garage and 24 guest bike spaces located adjacent to the guest parking area. Centrally located community space with, communal fire pit, built-in barbeque, and tables and chairs for casual dining are adjacent to San Ramon Avenue.

The project is within proximity of several bus stops, VTA route 32 and the Mountain View City shuttle, and within a ten-minute walk of bus stops for VTA route 185 and the MVgo Shuttle. The busses and shuttles provide service to the North Bayshore employment hub, downtown Mountain View, El Camino Real Hospital, and Mountain View and Sunnyvale Caltrain stations. In addition, the Permanente Creek Bike Trail is within ¼ mile of the site, providing access to the North Bayshore area.

#### On-site Development:

The project proposes the removal of the existing buildings and improvements, the removal of 55 Heritage trees, and the construction of 115 rowhouses in 20 separate buildings, and associated site improvements. Fifty-five Heritage trees per Mountain View Municipal Code are proposed to be removed. Protected size trees are required to be replaced per City’s Tree Replacement Policy.

The project currently contains 116 rental apartments, which is consistent with the Medium Density Zoning designation of the General Plan but exceeds the maximum number of units that are allowed by the R3-2 zoning.

#### Construction Activities and Schedule:

Construction activities include full demolition of the existing structures and paving on the project site, grading, and utility improvements. The project will be subject to MVMC requirements for construction noise and hours of construction contained in Chapter 8.06 of the Code.

Construction of the project is estimated to span 18-24 months including demolition and grading activities. Construction will not include deep pile foundations or pile driving or other extremely high noise generating activities or significant vibrations.

#### Off-site improvements:

Existing curb cuts and driveways would be removed, and new curb gutter, sidewalks, driveway approaches, street trees and streetlights will be installed in the public right-of-way per City standard specifications. Standard water, sewer, storm drain, and dry utilities upgrades will be provided as required by the Municipal Code.

## **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 off-site as well as on-site, 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: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5.** Earlier analysis 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:
- 6.** Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
- 7.** 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.
- 8.** Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project
- 9.** 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.

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

**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (see checklist for further information):**

Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?  Yes  No

Mandatory Findings of Significance? Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?  Yes  No

Mandatory Findings of Significance? Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  Yes  No

**MITIGATION MEASURE:**

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1:** The project would implement the mitigation measure listed below to reduce to minimize emissions during construction. Such equipment selection would include the following:

The project shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment used onsite to construct the project would achieve a fleet-wide average 55-percent reduction in DPM exhaust emissions or greater. One feasible plan to achieve this reduction would include the following:

- All diesel-powered off-road equipment, larger than 25 horsepower, operating on the site for more than two days continuously shall, at a minimum, meet U.S. EPA particulate matter emissions standards for Tier 4 Interim engines or equivalent. The use of other diesel equipment with CARB-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters<sup>15</sup> or equipment that includes electric or alternatively-fueled equipment (i.e., non-diesel) would also meet this requirement.

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

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed 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.

**FINDINGS:**

Based on the findings of the Initial Study, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons

A. As discussed in the preceding sections, the proposed project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, including effects on animals or plants, or to eliminate historic or prehistoric sites.

B. As discussed in the preceding sections, both short-term and long-term environmental effects associated with the proposed project will be less than significant.

C. When impacts associated with the adoption of the proposed project are considered alone or in combination with other impacts, the project-related impacts are insignificant. D. The above discussions do not identify any substantial adverse impacts to people as a result of the proposed project. E. This determination reflects the independent judgment of the City.

---

Prepared By: Margaret Netto

Date: January 17, 2020

---

Title: Senior Planner

City of Mountain View

Signature:



---

## 1. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant	Less than significant with Mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X		Mountain View General Plan Map, Planning Areas Chapter 2, Land Use and Design Chapter 3 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X		Mountain View General Plan Map, Planning Areas Chapter 2, Land Use and Design Chapter 3 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? Would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X		Mountain View General Plan Map, Planning Areas Chapter 2, Land Use and Design Chapter 3 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		Mountain View General Plan Map, Planning Areas Chapter 2, Land Use and Design Chapter 3 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>

### Discussion

The project site is zoned R-3 Multiple Family and is located in an urban area with a mix of multi-family, single-family residential and office and Crittenden Middle School across W. Middlefield Road that has no designated scenic vistas or resources. The project would result in the removal of 140 existing trees, including 55 Heritage sized trees. A City of Mountain View tree removal permit would



be required before any trees could be removed from the site under a development permit. To reduce impacts due to loss of Heritage trees, and to reduce the impacts to trees to remain in place, the project would be required to off-set the loss of each Heritage tree with a minimum of two new trees, for a total of 104 replacement trees and the project would be required to protect the remaining trees with tree protection measures. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on scenic resources at the project site.

Construction of the project will alter the visual character of the site and neighboring properties, which include removing the existing single-story apartment buildings and improvements, the removal of 55 Heritage trees, and the construction of 115 three-story rowhouses in 20 separate buildings, and associated site improvements. The proposed architectural style of the rowhouse buildings is “Spanish California” style with stucco, tile roofs, metal railings, and balconies.

The project site carries a "Medium Density Residential" General Plan designation, and the project vicinity is characterized by a mix of single- and multi-family housing with a residential character appropriate to a range of low to medium density development and a broad mix of housing types. The General Plan limits most development to three stories in this area, although most of the existing residential buildings are one- to two-stories tall in the form of single-family and multi-family development.

The buildings are configured to provide an activated street presence with front entries along West Middlefield Road, San Ramon Avenue and San Pierre Way and a central common open space for residents. Each rowhouse building would be three stories in height, with a maximum building height of 36 feet and 11 inches. The scale and building height of the proposed buildings would be greater than the existing buildings on site. The project would include a range of architectural features and a variety of landscaping not present with the existing development on the site. The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, and therefore, development of the proposed project would have a less than significant visual and aesthetic impact.

The project will be subject to the Development Review approval process prior to submittal of construction drawings for a building permit. This review and approval process includes a Development Review Committee (DRC) public hearing to receive a recommendation on the design, followed by public hearings before the Zoning Administrator and City Council. This review would ensure that the proposed design and construction materials are consistent with community standards for multi-family development, including consistency with site design, building orientation, architectural design and setbacks, as contained in the City’s Rowhouse Guidelines.

The project design proposes to retain 18 of the 158 existing trees on-site (including eight Heritage-sized street trees). The tree canopy coverage at full grown will encompass 18% of the site which is 2% more than the existing coverage. Any trees removed for the project would be replaced per City standards. A final landscape plan would be reviewed and approved by the City prior to project construction. Implementation of an approved landscape plan would further preserve and enhance the visual quality of the project site and its surroundings. For these reasons, the proposed project would not detract from or degrade the visual character of the immediate area.

Existing light sources on the project site includes exterior lighting from the buildings and street lights. Sources of daytime glare include building windows and vehicles. The proposed project would remove the existing uses and redevelop the site with 115 three-story rowhouses, which would include exterior lighting for safety.

The City’s design guidelines for multi-family residential uses call for exterior lighting that does not produce glare and is not of intensity inappropriate for a residential environment. At the time of building permit review, a lighting plan will be reviewed by the Community Development Department to ensure that lighting is directed downward and will not spill over onto adjacent properties or otherwise be highly visible, while providing adequate lighting for safety.

The level of lighting associated with residential development would likely be slightly increased compared to existing conditions; however, it would be similar in extent and intensity to that of surrounding residential development and would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. For these reasons, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## 2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant	Less than significant with Mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X	California Department of Conservation. Santa Clara County Important Farmland 2016 Map. September 2018.
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	California Department of Conservation. Santa Clara County Important Farmland 2016 Map. September 2018.
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				X	California Department of Conservation. Santa Clara County Important Farmland 2016 Map. September 2018.
d. Result in a loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	California Department of Conservation. Santa Clara County Important Farmland 2016 Map. September 2018.
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland				X	California Department of Conservation. Santa Clara County Important Farmland 2016 Map. September 2018.

to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?					
---	--	--	--	--	--

**Discussion**

The project proposes a 5.44-acre 115-unit rowhouse development at the project site. The site is designated by the California Resources Agency Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as *Urban and Built-Up*, and therefore, would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.

The project site is not zoned for agricultural use. The project site is not subject to the Williamson Act contract. The project would, therefore, not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

The project site is not zoned for forest land or timberland. For this reason, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

The project site is not designated as forest land. For this reason, the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

The project site is not designated agricultural or forest land and is located in an urban area with no agricultural or forestry land nearby. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest uses.

### 3. AIR QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant	Less than significant with Mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X		Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared by Illingworth and Rodkin dated December 23, 2019
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X		Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared by Illingworth and Rodkin dated December 23, 2019
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X			Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared by Illingworth and Rodkin dated December 23, 2019
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X		Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared by Illingworth and Rodkin dated December 23, 2019

#### Discussion

As discussed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b), the determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment calls for judgment on the part of the lead agency and must be based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data. The City of Mountain View has considered the air quality thresholds updated by BAAQMD in May 2017 and regards these thresholds to be based on the best information available for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and conservative in terms of the assessment of health effects associated with TACs and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality thresholds referenced in this analysis are identified in Table 1.

**Table 1 – BAAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds**

Table 4.3-2: BAAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds			
Pollutant	Construction Thresholds	Operation Thresholds	
	Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day)	Annual Daily Emissions (pounds/year)	Annual Average Emissions (tons/year)
<b>Criteria Air Pollutants</b>			
ROG, NO <sub>x</sub>	54	54	10
PM <sub>10</sub>	82 (exhaust)	82	15
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	54 (exhaust)	54	10
CO	Not Applicable	9.0 ppm (eight-hour) or 20.0 ppm (one-hour)	
Fugitive Dust	Dust-Control Measures/Best Management Practices	Not Applicable	
<b>Health Risks and Hazards for New Sources (within a 1,000-foot Zone of Influence)</b>			
Health Hazard	Single Source	Combined Cumulative Sources	
Excess Cancer Risk	10 per one million	0.3 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
Hazard Index	1.0	10.0	
Incremental Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub>	0.3 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	0.8 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (average)	
Notes: ROG = reactive organic gases, NO <sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides, PM <sub>10</sub> = coarse particulate matter with a diameter of 10 micrometers (µm) or less, and PM <sub>2.5</sub> = fine particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 µm or less.			

The proposed project would construct a 5.44-acre site with 115 rowhouses. The project would not conflict with the 2017 CAP because the units proposed would not exceed the screening size shown in Table 3-1 of the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, is considered urban infill, and would be located near bike paths and transit with regional connections. The project, with the implementation of Standard Condition of Approval listed below, would not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance and would result in less than significant criteria air pollutant emissions. Thus, the project is not required to incorporate project-specific control measures listed in the 2017 CAP. Furthermore, implementation of the project would not inhibit BAAQMD or partner agencies from continuing progress toward attaining state and federal air quality standards and eliminating health-risk disparities from exposure to air pollution among Bay Area communities, as described within the 2017 CAP.

**Operational Criteria Pollutants**

As shown in Table 3-1 of the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, the screening size for “Condominiums/Townhouses, general” is 451 dwelling units. The project proposes 115 dwelling units. As a result, the proposed project’s operational criteria pollutant emission is screened to be below the BAAQMD thresholds shown in Table 2. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of operational criteria pollutants in the region

**Construction Emissions**

CalEEMod provided annual emissions for construction. CalEEMod provides emission estimates for both on-site and off-site construction activities. On-site activities are primarily made up of construction equipment emissions, while off-site activity includes worker, hauling, and vendor traffic. A construction build-out scenario, including equipment list and schedule, was based a construction data worksheet provided by the project applicant. The proposed project land uses and demolition/earthwork volumes were entered in CalEEMod as follows:

- 115 dwelling units and 246,220-sf entered as “Condo/Townhouse” on 0.544-acres,
- 40 spaces entered as “Parking Lot”,

- 93,240-sf of existing building demolition,
- 10 tons or 2 one-way truck trips of pavement demolition and hauling,
- 4,500 cubic yards of soil export during grading,
- 800 one-way cement truck trips during building construction, and
- 543 tons or 110 one-way asphalt truck trips during paving.

Construction was assumed to begin November 2020 and last 27 months. There were an estimated 561 construction workdays. Average daily emissions were computed by dividing the total construction emissions by the number of construction days. Table 2 shows average daily construction emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> exhaust, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> exhaust during construction of the project. As indicated in Table 2, predicted the construction period emissions would not exceed the BAAQMD significance thresholds.

**Table 2-Construction Period Emissions**

Scenario	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub> Exhaust	PM <sub>2.5</sub> Exhaust
Total Construction Emissions (tons)	2.0 tons	2.1 tons	0.1 tons	0.1 tons
Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day) <sup>1</sup>	7.1 lbs./day	7.7 lbs./day	0.3 lbs./day	0.3 lbs./day
<i>BAAQMD Thresholds (pounds per day)</i>	54 lbs./day	54 lbs./day	82 lbs./day	54 lbs./day
<b>Exceed Threshold?</b>	No	No	No	No
Note: Assumes 561 construction workdays				

BAAQMD considers construction emissions that are below the thresholds of significance (such as those of the project) less than significant, if Best Management Practices (BMPs) are implemented.

**Standard Condition of Approval.** The project will implement the following measures to control dust and exhaust during construction.

**BASIC AIR QUALITY CONSTRUCTION MEASURES:** The applicant shall require all construction contractors to implement the basic construction mitigation measures recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to reduce fugitive dust emissions. Emission reduction measures will include, at a minimum, the following measures. Additional measures may be identified by the BAAQMD or contractor as appropriate, such as:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered 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 vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

- 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.

The project, with the implementation of the above Standard Condition of Approval, would reduce construction criteria air pollutant emissions to a less than significant level by controlling dust and exhaust, limiting exposed soil surfaces, and would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria air pollutants from construction emissions.

Temporary project construction activity would also generate dust and equipment exhaust on a temporary basis that could affect nearby sensitive receptors. A construction community health risk assessment was prepared to address project construction impacts on the surrounding off-site sensitive receptors. Operation of the project is not expected to be a source of TAC or localized air pollutant emissions, as the project would not generate substantial truck traffic or include stationary sources of emissions, such as generators powered by diesel engines. Auto traffic generated by the project would be spread out over a broad geographical area and not localized.

The project would introduce new residents that are sensitive receptors. There are several sources of TACs and localized air pollutants in the vicinity of the project. The impact of the existing sources of TAC upon the existing sensitive receptors and new incoming sensitive receptors was assessed. Community risk impacts are addressed by predicting increased lifetime cancer risk, the increase in annual PM2.5 concentrations and computing the Hazard Index (HI) for non-cancer health risks.

Additionally, modeling was conducted to predict the cancer risks, non-cancer health hazards, and maximum PM2.5 concentrations associated with the nearby Crittenden Middle School and Theuerkauf Elementary School. Children attending the middle school were assumed to be 10 to 13 years old and 5 to 10 years old at the elementary school. The maximum increased cancer risks were adjusted using child exposure parameters. Results of this assessment indicated that the maximum cancer risks (without any mitigation or construction emission controls) would be 0.8 per million at the middle school and 1.4 per million at the elementary school for child exposure. The maximum-modeled annual PM2.5 concentration, which is based on combined exhaust and fugitive dust emissions, would be 0.01µg/m3 at the middle school and 0.02 µg/m3 at the elementary school and the HI based on the DPM concentration would be less than 0.01 at both schools. These risk values at the schools do not exceed the BAAQMD single-source significance threshold for annual cancer risk, PM2.5 concentration, or HI.

**Table 3- Construction Risk Impacts at the Offsite Residential MEI**

Source		Cancer Risk (per million)	Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	Hazard Index
<i>Project Construction</i>	Unmitigated	<b>21.3 (infant)</b>	0.14	0.02
	Mitigated	1.0 (infant)	0.05	<0.01
<b><i>BAAQMD Single-Source Threshold</i></b>		<b>&gt;10.0</b>	<b>&gt;0.3</b>	<b>&gt;1.0</b>
<i>Exceeds Threshold?</i>	Unmitigated	<b>Yes</b>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
	Mitigated	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>



## Combined Community Health Risk at Off-site MEI

Table 4 reports the both the project and cumulative community risk impacts at the sensitive receptors most affected by construction of the project (i.e. the MEI). Without mitigation, the project's community risk from project construction activities would exceed the maximum cancer risk single-source significance threshold. The combined annual cancer risk, PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration, and Hazard risk values, which includes unmitigated and mitigated, would not exceed their respective cumulative thresholds. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, the project construction's single-source risks would no longer exceed the significance threshold.

**Table 4- Impacts from Combined TAC Sources at Residential MEI**

Source		Maximum Cancer Risk (per million)	Maximum Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	Maximum Hazard Index
<b>Single-Source Risk</b>				
<i>Project Construction</i>	Unmitigated	<b>21.3 (infant)</b>	0.14	0.02
	Mitigated	1.0 (infant)	0.05	<0.01
<b>BAAQMD Single-Source Threshold</b>		<b>&gt;10.0</b>	<b>&gt;0.3</b>	<b>&gt;1.0</b>
<i>Exceed Threshold?</i>	Unmitigated	<b>Yes</b>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
	Mitigated	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
<b>Cumulative-Source Risks</b>				
W. Middlefield Road (east-west) at 325 feet south ADT 15,000		1.6	0.06	<0.03
N. Shoreline Boulevard (north-south) at 1,000 feet west ADT 20,000		0.4	0.01	<0.03
Plant #19676 (Generator) at 1,000 feet		1.5	<0.01	<0.01
Plant #1127 (Multiple) at 1,000 feet		--	--	0.02
Plant #103690 (GDF) at 1,000 feet		<0.1	--	<0.01
Plant #107155 (GDF) at 1,000 feet		<0.1	--	<0.01
Plant #23588 (Generator) at 1,000 feet		0.2	<0.01	<0.01
Cumulative Total	Unmitigated	<25.2	<0.23	<0.14
	Mitigated	<4.9	<0.14	<0.13
<b>BAAQMD Cumulative Source Threshold</b>		<b>&gt;100</b>	<b>&gt;0.8</b>	<b>&gt;10.0</b>
<i>Exceed Cumulative Threshold?</i>	Unmitigated	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
	Mitigated	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1:** The project would implement the mitigation measure listed below to reduce to minimize emissions during construction. Such equipment selection would include the following:

The project shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment used onsite to construct the project would achieve a fleet-wide average 55-percent reduction in DPM exhaust emissions or greater. One feasible plan to achieve this reduction would include the following:

- All diesel-powered off-road equipment, larger than 25 horsepower, operating on the site for more than two days continuously shall, at a minimum, meet U.S. EPA particulate matter emissions standards for Tier 4 Interim engines or equivalent. The use of other diesel equipment with CARB-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters<sup>15</sup> or equipment that includes electric or alternatively-fueled equipment (i.e., non-diesel) would also meet this requirement.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 using Tier 4 Interim would reduce on-site diesel exhaust emissions from construction equipment by 95 percent. With mitigation, the computed maximum increased lifetime residential cancer risk from construction at the MEI location, assuming infant exposure, would be 1.0 in one million or less. The mitigated cancer risk would no longer exceed its respective significance threshold.

The project would generate localized emissions of diesel exhaust during construction equipment operation and truck activity. These emissions may be noticeable from time to time by adjacent receptors; however, the odors would be localized and temporary and would not affect people off-site. For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant long-term or short-term odor impacts, affecting a substantial number of people.

### **Non-CEQA Impact: Exposure of Project Residents to Existing TACs Sources**

Per *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*, 62 Cal. 4th 369 (*BIA v. BAAQMD*), effects of the environment on the project are not considered CEQA impacts. The following discussion is included for informational purposes only because the City of Mountain View has policies that address existing air quality conditions affecting a proposed project.

### **Operational Community Risk Effects**

The project would introduce new residents that are sensitive receptors. While the project would not introduce any new TAC sources that could affect on-site receptors, there are several sources of TACs and localized air pollutants in the vicinity of the project. The effects of these sources upon the project were assessed.

#### Operational Community Health Risk Impacts – New Project Residences

In addition to evaluating health impact from project construction, a health risk assessment was completed to assess the impact that existing TAC sources would have on the new proposed sensitive receptors that the project would introduce. The same TAC sources identified above were used in this health risk assessment. All health risk results are listed in Table 5.

#### Local Roadways – W. Middlefield Road and N. Shoreline Boulevard

The roadway analysis was conducted for the new project sensitive receptors in the same manner as described above for the MEI. The project receptors would be 35 feet south of W. Middlefield Road and 950 feet west of N. Shoreline Boulevard. The health risk results from the roadways at the project's receptors are provided in Table 5.

#### Stationary Sources

The stationary source screening analysis for the new project sensitive receptors was conducted in the same manner as described above for the project MEI. Table 5 shows the health risk assessment results from the individual stationary sources at the project's receptors.

#### Combined Community Health Risk at Project Site

Community risk impacts from the single and combined sources upon the project site are reported in Table 6. As shown, the annual cancer risks, annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations, and Hazard Indexes are all below their respective BAAQMD single-source and cumulative significance thresholds.

**Table 5- Impacts from Combined TAC Sources at Residential MEI**

Source	Maximum Cancer Risk (per million)	Maximum Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	Maximum Hazard Index
W. Middlefield Road (east-west) at 35 feet south ADT 15,000	5.7	0.21	<0.03
N. Shoreline Boulevard (north-south) at 950 feet west ADT 20,000	0.4	0.01	<0.03
Plant #19676 (Generator) at 840 feet	1.9	<0.01	<0.01
Plant #1127 (Multiple) at 900 feet	--	--	0.02
Plant #103690 (GDF) at 740 feet	<0.1	--	<0.01
Plant #107155 (GDF) at 950 feet	<0.1	--	<0.01
Plant #23588 (Generator) at 840 feet	0.2	<0.01	<0.01
<b><i>BAAQMD Single-Source Threshold</i></b>	<b>&gt;10.0</b>	<b>&gt;0.3</b>	<b>&gt;1.0</b>
<i>Exceed Threshold?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Cumulative Total	13.7	0.36	0.14
<b><i>BAAQMD Cumulative Source Threshold</i></b>	<b>&gt;100</b>	<b>&gt;0.8</b>	<b>&gt;10.0</b>
<i>Exceed Threshold?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>

A screening health risk assessment that evaluated sources of TACs and air pollutants within 1,000 feet of the project shows that annual cancer risks, annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations, and Hazard Indexes are all below their respective BAAQMD single-source and cumulative significance thresholds.

#### 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?			X		Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code-Trees, Shrubs and Plants <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL</a>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?				X	Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code-Trees, Shrubs and Plants <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL</a>  Biological Resource Survey prepared by Live Oak Associates dated January 2, 2019
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X	Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code-Trees, Shrubs and Plants <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=</a>

					<a href="#">PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL</a> Biological Resource Survey prepared by Live Oak Associates dated January 2, 2019
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish and wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X	Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code-Trees, Shrubs and Plants <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL</a> Biological Resource Survey prepared by Live Oak Associates dated January 2, 2019
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X	Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code-Trees, Shrubs and Plants <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL</a> Tree Report prepared by Hort Science dated May 2019
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X	Chapter 32 of the Municipal Code-Trees, Shrubs and Plants <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountainview/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH32T_RSHPL</a>

## **Discussion**

The site does not support habitats for most wild animal species since the entire site is comprised of occupied buildings with managed landscaping in the middle of a densely developed urban area. Although unlikely, urban-adopted raptors (birds of prey) or other birds could use the mature trees on or near the site for nesting and foraging habitat.

Raptors and nesting birds are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) code. The project proposes to remove 140 on-site trees. Raptor or other migratory bird nests present in these trees during construction activities could result in the loss of fertile eggs or nestlings, or otherwise lead to nest abandonment. Disturbance that causes any loss of fertile eggs, death or injury to nesting raptors, or any activities causing nest abandonment are considered a taking by the CDFW and would also constitute a significant impact under CEQA. In compliance with the MBTA and the CDFW code, the proposed project shall implement the following City Standard Conditions of Approval, to reduce or avoid construction-related impacts to nesting raptors and their nests.

### **Standard Condition of Approval**

**NESTING BIRD AVOIDANCE:** To the extent practicable, vegetation removal and construction activities shall be performed from September 1 through January 31, to avoid the general nesting period for birds. If construction or vegetation removal cannot be performed during this period, pre-construction surveys shall be performed by a qualified biologist no more than two days prior to these activities, to locate any active nests. The applicant shall be responsible for the retention of a qualified biologist to conduct a survey of the project site and surrounding 500 feet of active nests—with particular emphasis on nests of migratory birds— if construction (including site preparation) will begin during the bird nesting season, from February 1 through August 31.

If active nests are observed on either the project site or the surrounding area, the project applicant, in coordination with City staff as appropriate, shall establish no-disturbance buffer zones around the nests, with the size to be determined in consultation with CDFW (usually 100 feet for perching birds and 300 feet for raptors). The no-disturbance buffer will remain in place until the biologist determines the nest is no longer active or the nesting season ends. If construction ceases for two days or more and then resumes during the nesting season, an additional survey will be necessary to avoid impacts on active bird nests that may be present.

The project proposes to remove 140 trees, 55 of which are Heritage trees, in order to construct the proposed project. Eighteen remaining trees would be preserved in place. To reduce impacts due to the loss of Heritage trees, and reduce the potential for impacts to trees to remain in place, the project will be required to offset the loss of the existing protected trees in accordance with Mountain View Municipal Code Chapter 32, Articles I and II, and the City's Tree Replacement Policy and implement adequate preservation measures for the trees to remain on site. The removal of the existing onsite trees is therefore a less than significant impact. The following measures are included in the project as standard City conditions of approval.

### **Standard Conditions of Approval**

**REPLACEMENT:** The applicant shall offset the loss of each Heritage tree with a minimum of two new trees, for a total of 280 replacement trees. Each replacement tree shall be no smaller than a 24-inch box, and shall be noted on the landscape plans submitted for building permit review as Heritage replacement trees. The project would plant a total of 293 new trees on site.

**TREE PROTECTION MEASURES:** Tree protection measures shall be included as notes on the title sheet of all grading and landscape plans. These measures shall include, but may not be limited to, six-foot chain-link fencing at the drip line, a continuous maintenance and care program, and protective grading techniques. Also, no materials may be stored within the dripline of any tree to be retained on or immediately adjacent to the project site.

**TREE MITIGATION AND PRESERVATION PLAN:** The applicant shall develop a tree mitigation and preservation plan to avoid impacts on regulated trees and mitigate for the loss of trees that cannot be avoided. The plan shall outline measures to be taken to preserve off-site trees, such as a non-continuous footing near trees or shifting the proposed wall location to avoid trees and tree roots. Routine monitoring for the first five years and corrective actions for trees that consistently fail the performance standards shall be included in the tree mitigation and preservation plan. The tree mitigation and preservation plan shall be developed in accordance with Chapter 32, Articles I and II, of the City Code, and subject to approval of the Zoning Administrator prior to removal or disturbance of any Heritage trees resulting from project activities, including site preparation activities.

## 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?			X		Holman and Archeological Consultants, dated January 14, 2019
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X	Holman and Archeological Consultants, dated January 14, 2019
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside the formal cemeteries?				X	Holman and Archeological Consultants, dated January 14, 2019

### Discussion

The project construction will include grading, excavation, and land disturbance. A records search by the California Historical Resources Information System/Northwest Information Center of Sonoma State University (CHRIS/NWIC) was conducted for the project area. Review of the NWIC base maps that reference cultural resources records and reports, historic-period maps and literature for Santa Clara County indicates that there has been no record of any cultural resources (includes both archeological resources and historical buildings and/or structures studies that include fieldwork of the proposed project area. Although the likelihood of encountering buried cultural resources is low, the disturbance of these resources, if they are encountered during excavation and construction, could create an impact. The project will be required to comply with the City’s Standard Conditions of Approval, which include measures to avoid or reduce impacts to unknown cultural resources.

No known tribal cultural resources are presented on-site. No tribes have sent written requests for notification of projects to the City of Mountain View under AB 52. As discussed in Section 5 Cultural Resources, in the unlikely event that human remains or other TCRs are discovered during construction activities, implementation of Standard Condition of Approval listed under Cultural Resources would reduce the project’s impact to a less than significant level.

The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is 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. As discussed, there are no known tribal cultural resources on-site, and no tribes have sent written requests for notification of projects to the City of Mountain View under AB 52. As discussed in Section 5 Cultural Resources, in the unlikely event that human remains or other TCRs are discovered during construction activities, implementation of Standard Condition of Approval listed under Cultural Resources would reduce the project’s impact to a less than significant level.



## **Standard Condition of Approval**

**DISCOVERY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** If prehistoric, or historic-period cultural materials are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, it is recommended that all work within 100 feet of the find be halted until a qualified archaeologist and Native American representative can assess the significance of the find. Prehistoric materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks and artifacts; stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered-stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and wall, filled wells or privies, and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse.

If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American representative, will develop a treatment plan that could include site avoidance, capping, or data recovery.

**DISCOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS:** In the event of the discovery of human remains during construction or demolition, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site within a 50 foot radius of the location of such discovery, or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The Santa Clara County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his/her authority, he/she shall notify the NAHC, which shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the landowner shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance. A final report shall be submitted to the City's Community Development Director prior to release of a Certificate of Occupancy. This report shall contain a description of the mitigation programs and its results, including a description of the monitoring and testing resources analysis methodology and conclusions, and a description of the disposition/curation of the resources. The report shall verify completion of the mitigation program to the satisfaction of the City's Community Development Director.

**DISCOVERY OF PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** In the event a fossil is discovered during construction of the project, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or delayed until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The City shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. If the find is determined to be significant and if avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall design and carry out a data recovery plan consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards.

**6. ENERGY**

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X		California Energy Consumption Data Management System. "Electricity Consumption by County." Accessed December 10, 2019. <a href="http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbycounty.aspx">http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbycounty.aspx</a> . Silicon Valley Clean Energy. "Frequently Asked Questions" December 10, 2019. Available at: <a href="https://www.svcleanenergy.org/faqs">https://www.svcleanenergy.org/faqs</a> .
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X	California Energy Consumption Data Management System. "Electricity Consumption by County." Accessed December 10, 2019. <a href="http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbycounty.aspx">http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbycounty.aspx</a> . Silicon Valley Clean Energy. "Frequently Asked Questions" December 10, 2019. Available at: <a href="https://www.svcleanenergy.org/faqs">https://www.svcleanenergy.org/faqs</a> .

**Discussion**

Energy would be consumed during the construction and operational phases of the proposed project. The construction phase would require energy for the manufacture and transportation of building materials, preparation of the site for grading, and the actual construction of the buildings. Petroleum based fuels such as diesel fuel and gasoline would be the primary sources of energy for these tasks.

Once operational, the proposed development would consume energy (in the form of electricity and natural gas), primarily from heating and cooling, lighting, and water heating.

The anticipated construction schedule assumes that the project will be built over a period of approximately 18-24 months including demolition, possibly starting in January 2021 and concluding in May 2022. The project would require site preparation, grading and excavation, trenching, paving, and building of interior and exterior. Energy would not be wasted or used inefficiently by construction equipment, as the proposed project would include several measures to improve efficiency of the construction (e.g., limiting idling time or use U.S. EPA tiered equipment). In addition, construction waste management methods and processes will be employed to reduce the amount of construction waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the project would consume energy for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, building heating and cooling, lighting, appliances, and electronics. Operational energy would also be consumed during each vehicle trip generated by future residents. The rowhomes will meet or exceed the requirements of the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards and the Mountain View Green Building Code. The proposed project would be built according to the Mountain View Green Building Code. In addition, the proposed project would include GreenPoint Rated energy and emissions reduction features, such as:

- Low-water landscaping
- Water efficient plumbing fixtures
- Title 24 compliance
- Low-emission flooring material
- Use of recycled insulation material
- Energystar appliances

Electricity for the proposed project would be provided by Silicon Valley Clean Energy (SVCE). The proposed development would be completed in compliance with the current energy efficiency standards set forth in Mountain View Green Building Code, Title 24, and CALGreen. For these reasons, the project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**7. GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERALS**

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
<p>a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</p> <p>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</p> <p>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p>iv. Landslides?</p>			X		<p>Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan  <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702</a></p>
<p>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p>			X		<p>Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan  <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702</a></p>
<p>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</p>			X		<p>Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan  <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702</a></p>

					<a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">oad.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the current California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?			X		Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X	Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
e. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?				X	Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
f. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X	Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
g. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X	Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>

**Discussion**

The project site is located within the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area which has a 72 percent probability of experiencing at least one magnitude 6.7 earthquake during the next 30 years. The project site would experience intense ground shaking in the event of a large earthquake. No known faults occur

beneath the project site. The project site is not located within an earthquake fault zone on an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map and, therefore, the potential for fault rupture at the site is low.

The project site is not located within a state-designated liquefaction hazard zone; thus, liquefaction susceptibility is very low, and no liquefiable soils are present on-site. Since the soils on site are not prone to liquefaction, the probability of lateral spreading is low.

A site-specific, design-level geotechnical report would be prepared prior to construction in order to ensure project safety and compliance with local and state policies. Additionally, the project would implement the following Standard Condition of Approval.

### **Standard Condition of Approval**

**GEOTECHNICAL REPORT:** The applicant shall have a design-level geotechnical investigation prepared which includes recommendations to address and mitigate geologic hazards in accordance with the specifications of California Geological Survey Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards, and the requirements of the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act. The report will be submitted to the City prior to the issuance of building permits, and the recommendations made in the geotechnical report will be implemented as part of the project.

Recommendations may include considerations for design of permanent below-grade walls to resist static lateral earth pressures, lateral pressures caused by seismic activity, and traffic loads; method for back-draining walls to prevent the buildup of hydrostatic pressure; considerations for design of excavation shoring system; excavation monitoring; and seismic design.

By conforming to standard engineering and seismic safety design techniques outlined in the City of Mountain View's Building Division and California Building Code, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects; nor would the project exacerbate existing geological hazards on the project site such that it would impact (or worsen) off-site geotechnical and soil conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Grading, trenching, and construction of the proposed project would result in ground disturbance at the site. Ground disturbance would expose soils and increase the potential for wind or water related erosion and sedimentation at the site until construction is complete. As discussed in Section 10 Hydrology and Water Quality, the project shall be required to implement Standard Condition of Approval by completing a Construction Sediment and Erosion Control Plan. Through the implementation of Standard Condition of Approval, the proposed project would avoid soil erosion and would not cause a significant loss of topsoil. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

With the implementation of the standard engineering and seismic safety design techniques outlined in the California Building Code (refer to Standard Condition of Approval listed above), the project site would not be located on an unstable geological unit that would result in subsidence or collapse of the proposed infrastructure. The project site and area are not subject to landslides and have a low potential for liquefaction or lateral spreading. Therefore, compliance with Standard Permit Condition would ensure that the project would not exacerbate existing geological hazards on the site such that it would impact off-site geological and soil conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Surface soils on the site have a high expansion potential. Fluctuations in soil moisture can cause expansive soils to shrink and swell, thereby compromising the integrity of foundations, pavements, and exterior flatwork. The project would comply with Standard Condition of Approval as noted above. Standard engineering practices, including the standard permit condition outlined above, would ensure that the future site improvements are designed properly to account for soils related hazards on the site. With implementation of the standard permit condition, expansive soils onsite would not exacerbate risks to life and property, and the project would result in a less than significant impact. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The project site is located within an urbanized area of Mountain View where sewers are available to dispose of wastewater from the project site. The site would not need to support septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

The project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Therefore, no impact would occur. No paleontological resources have been identified. The proposed project would excavate to a maximum depth of approximately six feet below ground surface to install utilities. Given that the proposed project would not require excavation beyond six feet below ground surface and surface soils are relatively young deposits typically devoid of paleontological resources, paleontological resources would not likely be discovered during construction. The project would, therefore, not result in a significant impact to paleontological resources.

The project will not 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, therefore no impact would occur.

## 8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X		Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared by Illingworth and Rodkin dated December 23, 2019
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions?			X		Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared by Illingworth and Rodkin dated December 23, 2019

### Discussion

GHG emissions associated with development of the proposed project would occur over the short-term from construction activities, consisting primarily of emissions from equipment exhaust and worker and vendor trips. There would also be long-term operational emissions associated with vehicular traffic within the project vicinity, energy and water usage, and solid waste disposal. Emissions for the proposed project are discussed below and were analyzed using the methodology recommended in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. CalEEMod was used to predict GHG emissions from operation of the site assuming full build-out of the project. The project land use types and size and other project-specific information were input to the model, as described above within the operational period emissions.

#### Service Population Emissions

The project service population efficiency rate is based on the number of future residents. For this project, the number of future residents was estimated by multiplying the total number of residential units by the persons per household rate for Mountain View found in the California Department of Finance Population and Housing Estimate report. Using the 2.39 persons per household 2019 estimate for Mountain View, the number of future residents and the project service population is estimated to be 275.

#### Construction Emissions

GHG emissions associated with construction were computed to be 518 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e for the total construction period. These are the emissions from on-site operation of construction equipment, vendor and hauling truck trips, and worker trips. Neither the City nor BAAQMD have an adopted threshold



of significance for construction-related GHG emissions, though BAAQMD recommends quantifying emissions and disclosing that GHG emissions would occur during construction. BAAQMD also encourages the incorporation of best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction where feasible and applicable.

Operational Emissions

The CalEEMod model, along with the project vehicle trip generation rates, was used to estimate daily emissions associated with operation of the fully-developed site under the proposed project. As shown in the table below, the net annual emissions resulting from operation of the proposed project are predicted to be 188 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e for the year 2023 and 155 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e for the year 2030. Both the 2023 and 2030 emissions would not exceed the 2030 “Substantial Progress” threshold of 660 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr. The Service Population Emissions for the year 2023 would be 3.8 and 3.2 for the year 2030, which both exceed the “Substantial Progress” efficiency metric of 2.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year/service population.

**Annual Project GHG Emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>e) in Metric Tons**

Source Category	Existing Land Use in 2023	Existing Land Use in 2030	Proposed Project in 2023	Proposed Project in 2030
Area	7	7	6	6
Energy Consumption	124	124	124	124
Mobile	675	560	870	722
Solid Waste Generation	27	27	27	27
Water Usage	11	11	5	5
Total (MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/year)	844	729	1,032	884
Net Emissions			188 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/year	155 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/year
<i>Significance Threshold</i>			<i>660 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year</i>	
Service Population Emissions (MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/year/service population)			3.8	3.2
<i>Significance Threshold</i>			<i>2.8 in 2030</i>	
<i>Exceeds both thresholds?</i>			<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>

To be considered significant, the project must exceed both the GHG significance threshold in metric tons per year and the service population significance threshold. This project does not exceed the metric tons bright-line significance threshold.

Greenhouse gas emissions from project construction and operation were modeled using CalEEMod. There are no emission-based thresholds that apply to project construction. Modeled operational emissions of GHG would be similar, but slightly higher than existing emissions. This increase is considered less than significant because it is well below the significance threshold recommended in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. The proposed project would be subject to new 2019 Title 24 building code standards that take effect in 2020 and are anticipated to achieve 30 percent or greater energy efficiency for residential dwellings.

According to the California Energy Commission, single-family homes built with the 2019 standards are anticipated to use about 7 percent less energy due to energy efficiency measures versus those built under the 2016 standards. Once rooftop solar electricity generation is factored in, homes built under the 2019 standards will use about 53 percent less energy than those under the 2016 standards. This effect was not factored into the modeling since CalEEMod has not been updated since 2016. The proposed project’s operational emissions would not exceed the City’s GGRP threshold of 4.5 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year per service population; therefore, would be consistent with state and local plans and policies pertaining to GHG emission reductions and impacts would be considered less than significant.

**9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X	Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/flash/ilebank/blobload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/flash/ilebank/blobload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X		Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/flash/ilebank/blobload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/flash/ilebank/blobload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X		Mountain View Zoning Map
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X		State of California Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List (Cortese List), Department of Toxic Substance Control  Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Prepared by ENGE Consulting,

					dated February 11, 2019
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
g. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X	Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>

**Discussion**

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared by ENGEO Consulting, dated February 11, 2019. This assessment has revealed no evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs), Historical RECs (HREC), or Controlled RECs (CREC) associated with the subject property. Based upon historical research conducted for this investigation, the property was originally occupied by open space with intermittent agricultural use until redeveloped with the existing residential buildings in 1960s to early 1970s. This assessment included a review of local, state, tribal, and federal environmental record sources, standard historical sources, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps and physical setting sources. A reconnaissance of the property was conducted to review site use and current conditions to check for the storage, use, production or disposal of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials and interviews with persons knowledgeable about current and past site use.

The site reconnaissance and records review did not find documentation or physical evidence of soil, groundwater, or soil gas impairments associated with the use or past use of the property. A review of regulatory databases maintained by county, state, tribal, and federal agencies found no documentation of hazardous materials violations or discharge on the property and did not identify contaminated facilities within the appropriate American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) search distances that would reasonably be expected to impact the site.

Given the past agricultural use at the property, a total of 32 soil samples were collected from approximately 3 to 9 inches and 12 to 18 inches below the existing ground surface across the site.

Low-level concentrations of metals and organochlorine pesticides were detected. The reported concentrations are below respective screening levels for residential soil and/or within typical background levels and are not expected to represent a concern to human health or environment.

An offsite Superfund case is located across Middlefield Road to the north; Spectra-Physics (1250 West Middlefield Road) and Teledyne Semiconductor (1300 Terra Bella Avenue). This Superfund site is well characterized, and based on recent publicly available groundwater monitoring data as well as the case's latest Five-Year Review dated September 2014, groundwater flow is to the north, away from the property, and groundwater contamination does not extend beneath the property of 1555 West Middlefield Road. However, soil gas sampling at the property did identify impact.

Based on the findings of this assessment, the following RECs were identified for the property. A review of the laboratory data found detectable concentrations of several volatile organic compounds and TPH-gasoline exceeding respective RWQCB Tier 1 ESLs and/or USEPA RSLs for soil gas.

As part of the project and Standard Condition of Approval, the applicant prior to the issuance of any grading plans, or approval of improvement plans in lieu of grading plans, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City's Public Works Director, that a soil remediation and management plan for the project site has been approved by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The soil remediation and management plan shall include a description of cleanup activities for soil and soil gas containing chemicals in concentrations exceeding cleanup goals established by the California Environmental Protection Agency California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs) and the RWQCB Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs). Therefore, impacts would be considered less than significant. In addition, the project will implement the City's Standard Conditions of Approval, described below, to ensure the project does not result in significant hazardous material impacts.

### **Standard Condition of Approval**

**DISCOVERY OF CONTAMINATED SOILS:** If contaminated soils are discovered, the applicant will ensure the contractor employs engineering controls and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize human exposure to potential contaminants. Engineering controls and construction BMPs will include, but not be limited to, the following: (a) contractor employees working on-site will be certified in OSHA's 40-hour Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) training; (b) contractor will stockpile soil during redevelopment activities to allow for proper characterization and evaluation of disposal options; (c) contractor will monitor area around construction site for fugitive vapor emissions with appropriate field screening instrumentation; (d) contractor will water/mist soil as it is being excavated and loaded onto transportation trucks; (e) contractor will place any stockpiled soil in areas shielded from prevailing winds; and (f) contractor will cover the bottom of excavated areas with sheeting when work is not being performed.

**TOXIC ASSESSMENT:** A toxic assessment report shall be prepared and submitted as part of the building permit application. The applicant must demonstrate that hazardous materials do not exist on the site, or that construction activities and the proposed use of this site are approved by: the City's Hazardous Materials Division of the Fire Department; the State Department of Health Services; the Regional Water Quality Control Board; and any Federal agency with jurisdiction. No building permits will be issued until each agency and/or department with jurisdiction has released the site as clean or an approved site toxics mitigation plan has been approved.

**SOIL MANAGEMENT PLAN:** Prepare a soil and groundwater management plan for review and approval by the Santa Clara County Department of Environmental Health (SCCDEH). Proof of approval or actions for site work required by the SCCDEH must be provided to the Building Inspection Division prior to the issuance of any demolition or building permits. With the implementation of the City Standard Conditions of Approval, the impacts would be less than significant.

Given the age of the development, it is conceivable that potential asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paints exist onsite. Prior to demolition or redevelopment an appropriate survey should be performed to determine if special handling is required. The project will, however, be required to comply with local, state, and federal laws, which require an asbestos building survey and a LBP survey will be completed by a qualified professional to determine the presence of ACMs and/or LBP on the structures proposed for demolition. Demolition activities will be undertaken in accordance with Cal/OSHA standards, contained in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations Section 1529, to protect workers from exposure to asbestos. Materials containing more than one percent asbestos are also subject to BAAQMD regulations. To comply with these regulatory requirements, a registered asbestos abatement contractor will be retained to remove and dispose of all potentially friable ACMs, in accordance with the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants guidelines, prior to building demolition that may disturb the materials. Materials containing LBP will be removed in accordance with Cal/OSHA Lead in Construction Standard, Title 8, CCR 1532.1, including employee training, employee air monitoring and dust control. Any debris or soil containing lead-based paint or coatings will be disposed of at landfills that meet acceptance criteria for the waste being disposed. Therefore, any potential impact would be less than significant.

As discussed above, the Phase I and modified Phase 1 ESA reports prepared for the project site concluded that some releases of chemical pollutants were identified in soil and groundwater samples performed onsite. The reports concluded that the pollutants were likely the result of the historical uses onsite related to the property's connection to the Spectra-Physics and Teledyne Semiconductor. Implementation of the Standard Conditions of Approval would reduce potential impacts from concentrations of several volatile organic compounds and TPH-gasoline, in the soil and groundwater because it requires the project applicant to prepare a soil and groundwater management plan to address these and potential additional industrial constituents encountered during project development activities. Crittenden Middle School is located across the street from project site, however, as noted above with the implementation of Standard Conditions of Approval would reduce impacts, from hazardous emissions.

The proposed project site is approximately two miles from Moffett Federal Airfield, the closest airport to the project site. The project site is not within the safety zones or planning areas for this airport. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing in the project area.

The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project would be constructed in accordance with current building and fire codes to ensure structural stability and safety in the event of a seismic or seismic-related hazard. The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City of Mountain View Emergency Operations and Evacuation Plans.

The project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The project site is within the City limits and is not within a State of California Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone or the City's wildland and urban interface. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to wildfire hazards.

## 10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			X		California Building Code, Chapter 8 (Building) of the Mountain View Municipal Code <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH8BU_ARTIXDRFL_CO">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH8BU_ARTIXDRFL_CO</a>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		California Building Code, Chapter 8 (Building) of the Mountain View Municipal Code <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH8BU_ARTIXDRFL_CO">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH8BU_ARTIXDRFL_CO</a>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</li> <li>ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;</li> <li>iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the</li> </ul>				X	California Building Code, Chapter 8 (Building) of the Mountain View Municipal Code <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH8BU_ARTIXDRFL_CO">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH8BU_ARTIXDRFL_CO</a>

iv. capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows?					
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map Effective 10/2/19 <a href="https://msc.fema.gov/portals/home">https://msc.fema.gov/portals/home</a>
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X	California Building Code, Chapter 8 (Building) of the Mountain View Municipal Code <a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH8BU_ARTIXDRFL_CO">https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH8BU_ARTIXDRFL_CO</a>

**Discussion**

The California Building Code contains a series of building code requirements to address safety issues regarding seismic shaking, flooding, and soil types. In addition, Chapter 8 Article IX of the Mountain View Municipal Code requires a series of measures for provisions to reduce flood-related hazards to buildings. These standards are suggested by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and required by code by the City of Mountain View. These standards must be met for a building permit to be issued. Construction Water Quality Impacts Implementation of the project would require demolition, paving, and grading of the site. These are activities that would temporarily increase the amount of unconsolidated materials.

Grading activities could increase erosion and sedimentation that could be carried by runoff into natural waterways, which could increase sedimentation impacts to local creeks or the San Francisco Bay. The project is over one acre; therefore, a SWPPP would be required. Stormwater will be treated on-site as to meet the stormwater requirements. Stormwater will be treated with bioretention areas and other low impact treatment measures before being discharged to either the 51-inch public storm drain in Middlefield Road or the existing 18-inch public storm drain main that parallels the west property. With implementation of the following measures, which are required by the City as Conditions of Approval and are based on RWQCB requirements, impacts to water quality during construction would be less than significant.

**Standard Conditions of Approval**

**CONSTRUCTION SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN:** The applicant shall submit a written plan acceptable to the City which shows controls that will be used at the site to minimize sediment runoff and erosion during storm events. The plan should also include routine street sweeping and storm drain catch basin cleaning. The plan should include installation of the following items where

appropriate: Silt fences around the site perimeter; Gravel bags surrounding catch basins; Filter fabric over catch basins; Covering of exposed stockpiles; Concrete washout areas; Stabilized rock/gravel driveways at points of egress from the site; and Vegetation, hydroseeding or other soil stabilization methods for high-erosion areas.

Post-Construction Construction of the project would result in the replacement of more than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface area. As a result, the project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (MRP). In order to meet these requirements, the proposed project would include LID- and non-LID-based stormwater treatment controls (e.g., bioretention treatment areas, mechanical filters, etc.). Stormwater runoff from the site would drain into the stormwater treatment controls. The proposed treatment controls would be numerically sized and would have sufficient capacity to treat the runoff from the roofs, podium decks, hardscape, and driveway areas entering the storm drainage system consistent with the NPDES requirements.

The following measures, based on RWQCB requirements and required as Standard Conditions of Approval, have been included in the project to reduce stormwater runoff impacts from project implementation:

### **Standard Condition of Approval**

**STORMWATER:** The project shall comply with the requirements of the MRP, as well as other local, state, and federal requirements. The project shall comply with provision C.3 of the MRP, which provides performance standards for the management of stormwater for new development, and any new requirements. The installation of on-site trash capture devices will also be required.

**LANDSCAPE DESIGN:** Landscape design shall minimize runoff and promote surface filtration. Examples include: No steep slopes exceeding 10 percent; Using mulches in planter areas without ground cover to avoid sedimentation runoff; Installing plants with low water requirements; and Installing appropriate plants for the location in accordance with appropriate climate zones.

**EFFICIENT IRRIGATION:** Common areas shall employ efficient irrigation to avoid excess irrigation runoff. Examples include: Setting irrigation timers to avoid runoff by splitting irrigations into several short cycles; Employing multi-programmable irrigation controllers; Employing rain shutoff devices to prevent irrigation after significant precipitation; Use of drip irrigations for all planter areas which have a shrub density that will cause excessive spray interference of an overhead system; and Use of flow reducers to mitigate broken heads next to sidewalks, streets and driveways.

**OUTDOOR STORAGE AREAS (INCLUDING GARBAGE ENCLOSURES):** Outdoor storage areas (for storage of equipment or materials which could decompose, disintegrate, leak or otherwise contaminate stormwater runoff), including garbage enclosures, shall be designed to prevent the run-on of stormwater and runoff of spills by all of the following: Paving the area with concrete or other nonpermeable surface; Covering the area; and Sloping the area inward (negative slope) or installing a berm or curb around its perimeter. There shall be no storm drains in outdoor storage areas.

With the implementation of the Standard Conditions of Approval, based on RWQCB requirements, the impacts would be less than significant.

The project site is located in a confined area of the Santa Clara Plain Subbasin. The project does not include installation of new groundwater wells and would not deplete groundwater supplies. The project would comply with MRP requirements to include LID- and non-LID-based stormwater treatment controls (e.g., bioretention treatment areas, mechanical filters, etc.), which would support groundwater recharge. For these reasons, impacts related to groundwater recharge would be less than significant.

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage



systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows. For these reasons, impacts related to existing drainage pattern would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area through the alteration of any waterway. While the project would slightly increase the impervious surfaces on-site, it would be required to comply with stormwater treatment requirements for on-site treatment and retention of surface runoff using numerically sized treatment measures, as described above. As a result, the project would not substantially change drainage patterns such that off-site impacts or flooding would occur.

The existing stormdrain system has sufficient capacity to support the existing development on-site. Runoff would be routed directly from the treatment facilities to the storm drainage system and would not flow off-site, except during large and infrequent storm events. The project would be required to implement the construction-related standard permit conditions to minimize erosion, as well as postconstruction requirements to minimize and treat stormwater runoff (per the requirements of Provision C.3 of the RWQCB's MRP).

With implementation of standard City conditions of approval and compliance with Provision C.3 of the RWQCB's MRP the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to existing stormwater drainage systems. The project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

The project site is not located within a designated tsunami inundation zone. The proposed project would, therefore, not risk release of pollutants due to tsunami, or seiche zones. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

The project would comply with the City's Stormwater Management Guidance Manual for Low Impact Development and Post-Construction Requirements. The project would not impact groundwater recharge and would not conflict with the SCVWD's 2016 Groundwater Management Plan. For these reasons, the project would not conflict with implementation of a water quality or groundwater management plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

## 11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Physically divide an established community?				X	Mountain View General Plan Map <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=10701">https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=10701</a>
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X	Land Use and Transportation Chapter 3 of the Mountain View General Plan, Title 36 (Zoning) of the Mountain View Municipal Code

### Discussion

Examples of projects that have the potential to physically divide an established community include new freeways and highways, major arterial streets, and railroad lines. The project proposes to construct a 115 unit rowhouse development, similar to the surrounding land use, and would not include the construction of dividing infrastructure. Thus, development of the rowhouse would not physically divide an established community. The project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Land use conflicts can arise from a new development or land use that would cause impacts to persons or the physical environment in the vicinity of the project site or elsewhere. Potential incompatibility may arise from placing a particular development or land use at an inappropriate location, or from some aspect of the project's design or scope. Depending on the nature of the impact and its severity, land use compatibility conflicts can range from minor irritations and nuisance to potentially significant effects on human health and safety.

The proposed project conforms to the General Plan and would not require a rezoning. The proposed 115 rowhouses would be consistent with the R-3 zoning district. However, a Planned Unit Development and Development Review Permit would be requested to construct the rowhouse units would not result in substantial adverse effects on the compatibility of surrounding land uses. Therefore, the project would not result in a fundamental conflict with any applicable land use plan or policy.

## **12. MINERAL RESOURCES**

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that will be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X	USGS Maps <a href="https://www.usgs.gov/products/maps/overview">https://www.usgs.gov/products/maps/overview</a>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X	USGS Maps <a href="https://www.usgs.gov/products/maps/overview">https://www.usgs.gov/products/maps/overview</a>

### **Discussion**

Based on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) map of mines and mineral resources, the project site is not comprised of known mineral resources or mineral resource production areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the residents in the state or region.

### 13. NOISE AND VIBRATION

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project result in:					
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X		Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by Charles M Salter dated March 12, 2019
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by Charles M Salter dated March 12, 2019 Vibration Impacts prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin dated December 20, 2019
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X		Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by Charles M Salter dated March 12, 2019

#### Discussion

The project proposes to construct 115 residential rowhouse units. The construction of rowhouses would result in the generation of temporary noise during construction and occupancy of the site. Permanent noise sources would be subject to the requirements of the City's Noise Ordinance, which hourly

average noise levels generated by construction are about 72 to 88 dBA Leq for residential buildings measured at 50 feet from the center of a busy construction site. Construction generated noise levels drop off at a rate of about six dBA per doubling of the distance between the source and receptor. Shielding by buildings or terrain often result in lower construction noise levels at distant receptors; however, ambient levels at the surrounding uses would potentially be exceeded by five dBA Leq or more throughout construction. The project will implement the following Standard Condition of Approval during construction to ensure that impacts from construction noise would be less than significant.

### **Standard Condition of Approval**

**CONSTRUCTION NOISE REDUCTION:** The following noise reduction measures shall be incorporated into construction plans and contractor specifications to reduce the impact of temporary construction-related noise on nearby properties: (a) comply with manufacturer's muffler requirements on all construction equipment engines and ensure exhaust mufflers are in good condition; (b) turn off construction equipment when not in use, where applicable; (c) locate stationary equipment, such as air compressors or portable power generators, construction staging areas, and construction material areas, as far as practical from sensitive receptors; (d) use temporary sound barriers or sound curtains around loud stationary equipment if the other noise reduction methods are not effective or possible and when located near adjoining sensitive land uses; (e) shroud or shield impact tools and use electric-powered rather than diesel-powered construction equipment; and (f) route all construction traffic via designated truck routes where possible and prohibit construction related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible.

With the implementation of Standard Condition of Approval, the short-term construction-noise impacts will be less than significant.

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

### **Standard Condition of Approval**

No construction activity shall commence prior to 7:00 a.m., nor continue later than 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, nor shall any work be permitted on Saturday or Sunday or holidays unless prior written approval is granted by the building official. The term "construction activity" shall include any physical activity on the construction site or in the staging area, including the delivery of materials. In approving modified hours, the building official may specifically designate and/or limit the activities permitted during the modified hours.

At any time before commencement of or during construction activity, the building official may modify the permitted hours of construction upon 24-hour written notice to the contractor, applicant, developer or owner. The building official can reduce the hours of construction activity below the 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. time frame or increase the allowable hours. If the hours of construction activity are modified, then the general contractor, applicant, developer, or owner shall erect a sign at a prominent location on the construction site to advise subcontractors and material suppliers of the working hours. The contractor, owner, or applicant shall immediately produce any written order or permit from the building official pursuant to this section upon the request of any member of the public, the police, or City staff.

Construction-related noise levels are normally highest during demolition, grading, and excavation phases, including installation of project infrastructure, such as underground utility lines. These phases of construction require heavy equipment (e.g., earth moving equipment and impact tools) that normally generate the highest noise levels during site redevelopment. Construction-related noise levels are normally less during building erection, finishing, and landscaping phases.

### **Standard Condition of Approval**

**CONSTRUCTION NOISE REDUCTION:** The following noise reduction measures shall be incorporated into construction plans and contractor specifications to reduce the impact of temporary construction-related noise on nearby properties: (a) comply with manufacturer's muffler requirements on all construction equipment engines and ensure exhaust mufflers are in good condition; (b) turn off construction equipment when not in use, where applicable; (c) locate stationary equipment, such as air compressors or portable power generators, construction staging areas, and construction material areas, as far as practical from sensitive receptors; (d) use temporary sound barriers or sound curtains around loud stationary equipment if the other noise reduction methods are not effective or possible and when located near adjoining sensitive land uses; (e) shroud or shield impact tools and use electric-powered rather than diesel-powered construction equipment; and (f) route all construction traffic via designated truck routes where possible and prohibit construction related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible.

With the implementation of Standard Condition of Approval, the short-term construction-noise impacts will be less than significant.

### **Permanent Ambient Noise Levels**

A significant impact would be identified if traffic generated by the project would substantially increase noise levels at sensitive receivers in the vicinity. A substantial increase would occur if the noise level increase is three dBA Ldn. or greater, as existing noise levels are projected to exceed 60 dBA Ldn. Traffic volumes must double to result in a perceptible (three dB) noise increase. The project proposes 115 rowhouse units in a developed residential neighborhood. Project-generated traffic would not double traffic volumes in the project area; therefore, project-generated traffic would not increase ambient noise levels by three dBA Ldn or more. For this reason, the project-generated traffic noise would result in a less than significant impact.

Mechanical Equipment Residential rowhouse structures such as those proposed for the project typically include mechanical equipment such as air conditioning, heating systems, exhaust fans, etc. The project will implement the following Standard Condition of Approval to ensure that impacts from mechanical equipment noise would be less than significant. This condition will be implemented during the building permit process where a project-specific acoustical analysis will be required as part of the permit application.

### **Standard Condition of Approval**

**MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT:** The noise emitted by any mechanical equipment shall not exceed a level of 55 dBA during the day or 50 dBA during the night, 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., when measured at any location on the adjoining residentially used property.

With implementation of Standard Condition of Approval, project mechanical equipment would not substantially increase noise levels in the project area. The project would not result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

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

The level of groundborne vibration that could reach sensitive receptors would depend on the distance to the receptor, what equipment is used, and the soil conditions surrounding the construction site. The nearest sensitive receptor are the four single-family homes located northwest along Burgoyne Street. The project boundary is about 20 feet of the adjacent residences. At 25 feet, vibration levels due to construction activities would be up to 0.210 in/sec PPV, which would be below the 0.3 in/se PPV

threshold. The impact from construction related vibration would be temporary and short-term and confined to only the immediate area, and therefore the impact would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not result in the construction or operation of a facility that would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. While the proposed 115 new rowhouses would generate project-related traffic, the number of trips in comparison to the existing would be similar, and therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project and less than significant impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

The proposed project would result in the construction of 115 new rowhouses, surface parking and site improvements. The use of construction equipment, necessary to complete the construction, would generate a substantial increase in the ambient noise levels near the project. However, construction related noise would be short term and temporary. By adhering to the City of Mountain View Municipal Code, Chapter 8.06, Noise, the construction-related noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of an airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, there would be no environmental impact associated with an airport and use plan or proximity to an airport or private airstrip.

Future Interior Noise Environment General Plan policies and the CBC's interior noise level standard of 45 dBA Ldn apply to the proposed rowhouse project. Interior noise levels would vary depending upon the design of the buildings (relative window area to wall area) and the selected construction materials and methods. Standard residential construction provides 15 dBA of exterior-to-interior noise reduction, assuming the windows are partially open for ventilation. Standard construction with the windows closed provides approximately 20 to 25 dBA of noise reduction in interior spaces. Given the estimated future noise levels of up to 66 dBA Ldn in the project area, the interior noise levels of the buildings could exceed 45 dBA Ldn when windows are partially open. In order to reduce the interior noise at the proposed rowhouse units, the following Conditions of Approval are included in the project.

#### **Standard Condition of Approval**

**SITE-SPECIFIC BUILDING ACOUSTICAL ANALYSIS:** A qualified acoustical consultant will review final site plans, building elevations, and floor plans prior to construction to calculate expected interior noise levels as required by State noise regulations. Project-specific acoustical analyses are required by the California Building Code to confirm that the design results in interior noise levels reduced to 45 dBA Ldn or lower. The specific determination of what noise insulation treatments are necessary will be completed on a unit-by-unit basis. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, will be submitted to the City along with the building plans, and approved prior to issuance of a building permit. Building sound insulation requirements will include the provision of forced-air mechanical ventilation for all residential units as recommended by the qualified acoustical consultant, so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control noise. Special building techniques (e.g., sound-rated windows and building facade treatments) will be implemented as recommended by the qualified acoustical consultant, to maintain interior noise levels at or below acceptable levels. These treatments will include, but are not limited to, sound-rated windows and doors, sound-rated wall construction, acoustical caulking, protected ventilation openings, etc.

The project would not result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

## 14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigations	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X		Land Use and Design Chapter 3, and the Housing Chapter of the Mountain View General Plan <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X		Land Use and Design Chapter 3, and the Housing Chapter of the Mountain View General Plan <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>

### Discussion

The project includes the demolition of 116 apartment units and the construction of 115 new rowhouses within 20 buildings. Construction of the project, including site preparation, building demolition phase, and excavation would temporarily increase construction employment. Given the relatively common nature and scale of the construction associated with the project, the demand for construction employment would likely be met within the existing and future labor market in the City and the County. The size of the construction workforce would vary during the different stages of construction, but a substantial quality of workers from outside the City or County would not be expected to relocate permanently. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly and there would be a less than significant impact related to population growth as a result of this project.



The proposed project would demolish the existing 116 residential units, upon which 115 new rowhouses would be constructed. However, the project proposes to construct one less unit. Since less unit would be built than would be demolished, construction of replacement housing would not be required. The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any impacts in displacing housing units or persons.

## 15. PUBLIC SERVICES

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigations	No Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
<p>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</p>					
a. Fire protection?			X		Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
b. Police protection?			X		Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
c. Schools?			X		Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
d. Parks?			X		Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdownload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>

e. Other public facilities?			X	Public Safety Chapter 8 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civica/x/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
-----------------------------	--	--	---	---

**Discussion**

The project site is in an area currently served by the Mountain View Fire Department (MVFD). The MVFD does not anticipate the need to construct a new fire station to accommodate growth anticipated in the General Plan. The project would be constructed to current Fire Code standards, would not increase the urban area already served by the MVFD, and would not require expansion of existing or construction of new facilities. There would be a less than significant impact related to fire protection as a result of this project.

The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental 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 police protection services.

The proposed project would not substantially increase demand for police services in the project area. Mountain View Police Department (MVPD) maintains a staffing ratio of approximately 1.3 officers per 1,000 residents. The General Plan EIR concluded that buildout of the General Plan would increase the demand for police services; however, the city has policies would ensure that the City maintains adequate police staffing to serve the needs of the community. The proposed project would not intensify the use of the site; therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would require the construction or expansion of police facilities. In addition, the project design shall be reviewed by MVPD to ensure safety features are incorporated to minimize the opportunity for criminal activity.

The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental 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 schools.

The project proposes 115 new residential rowhouses replacing 116 apartment units. It is estimated that the project would not significantly generate additional school aged children. As required by state law (Government Code Section 65996), the project proponent shall pay the appropriate school impact fees to offset the increased demands on school facilities caused by the project. No expansion of existing school facilities or construction of new school facilities would be needed as a result of the proposed project.

The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental 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 parks.

The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental 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 other public facilities.

Implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to an incremental increase in demand for public facilities because it would not add new residents to the City. Therefore, no increased population associated with the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the increase in use of existing facilities near the project site that would potentially lead to physical deterioration of the public facilities and overcrowding.

**16. RECREATION**

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigations	No Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X		Parks, Open Space and Community Facilities Chapter 6 of the Mountain View General Plan.  <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X		Parks, Open Space and Community Facilities Chapter 6 of the Mountain View General Plan.  <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>

**Discussion**

As discussed in Section 14 Public Services, the proposed project would include development of residential units that would have a demand on parks. However, the project would not result in a substantial increase in the use of existing neighborhood parks or recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. The project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

However, the project provides common useable open space, centrally located with dining tables, trellis feature, barbeque pits, gas fire pits and landscaping. The project would not result in a substantial increase in the use of recreational facilities such that the facilities would need to be expanded or newly constructed. Therefore, no significant impact would occur.

## 17. TRANSPORTATION

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigations	No Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities?			X		Traffic Operations Analysis prepared by Hexagon dated November 25, 2019
b. For a land use project, conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				X	Traffic Operations Analysis prepared by Hexagon dated November 25, 2019
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		Traffic Operations Analysis prepared by Hexagon dated November 25, 2019
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X	Traffic Operations Analysis prepared by Hexagon dated November 25, 2019

### Discussion

The proposed project would demolish 116 apartment units in order to construct 115 rowhouses. The VTA's (Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority) CMP requires a transportation impact analysis when a project would add 100 or more peak hour trips to the roadway network. Projects that generate less than 100 net new peak hour (AM or PM peak hour) trips are presumed to not add congestion to the roadway network; therefore, comply with the CMP. Because the project would generate a small number of net new trips (31 new AM peak hour trips and 49 new PM peak-hour trips) a full Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is typically not required according to the VTA guidelines; therefore per CMP, the project would not be required to make any physical roadway improvements to reduce delay or congestion, which may result in a significant impact on the environment.

VMT is identified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 as the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. The City has not yet adopted a standard approach or guidelines to evaluate a project's VMT impact. Per the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, agencies have until July 1, 2020 to adopt a VMT-based threshold. The VMT per capita for the project area was compared with the City and the County average VMT per capita. The zone containing the proposed project is estimated to have an average VMT per capita of 15.90, which is greater than the average VMT per capita for both the City of Mountain View (14.37) and Santa Clara County (15.11).

However, the project is an infill development, accessible to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel, which would result in an average VMT per capita lower than the average VMT for the zone. Since the City does not have an established VMT threshold to evaluate impacts, the project would not result in a VMT impact.

Two 20-foot wide, driveways from San Ramon Avenue would provide vehicular access to the site. The internal drive would extend to the northern end of the site, and would provide access to all units and parking on-site. As the project plans are further advanced the project site access driveway would be designed to the satisfaction of City of Mountain View standards. The project does not include sharp curves or incompatible uses. Therefore, the project would not increase hazards due to its geometric design.

The proposed project site would be accessible through two private drives onto San Ramon Avenue. By adhering to the City of Mountain View's standards and requirements for emergency access, the proposed site access points would be adequate to accommodate circulation of emergency vehicles. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigations	No Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
<p>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:</p>					
<p>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)?</p>			X		<p>Holman and Archeological Consultants, dated January 14, 2019</p>
<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.</p>			X		<p>Holman and Archeological Consultants, dated January 14, 2019</p>

**Discussion**

No known tribal cultural resources are presented on-site. No tribes have sent written requests for notification of projects to the City of Mountain View under AB 52. As discussed in Section 5 Cultural Resources, in the unlikely event that human remains or other TCRs are discovered during construction activities, implementation of Standard Condition of Approval listed under Cultural Resources would reduce the project’s impact to a less than significant level.

The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is 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. As discussed, there are no known tribal cultural resources on-site, and no tribes have sent written requests for notification of projects to the City of Mountain View under AB 52. As discussed in Section 5 Cultural Resources, in the unlikely event that human remains or other TCRs are discovered during construction activities, implementation of Standard Condition of Approval listed under Cultural Resources would reduce the project’s impact to a less than significant level.



**19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigations	No Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
Would the project:					
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X		Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
b. Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X		Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X		Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
d. Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X		Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>

					<a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">obdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>
e. Be noncompliant with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		Infrastructure and Conservation Chapter 5 of the Mountain View General Plan. <a href="https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702">https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702</a>

**Discussion**

The project would connect to the existing sanitary sewer manholes in West Middlefield Road and San Ramon Avenue. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, and electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.

The project would not have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. The City of Mountain View water service has sufficient existing water supply to support the proposed project under normal, single dry, or multiple dry water years. Under normal conditions, the City is not projected to experience supply shortfalls. Shortfalls of up to 12 percent are projected for single dry years and up to 14 percent for multiple dry years. Under all dry conditions, the City may need to impose water conservation measures, to achieve 10 to 20 percent reductions, per Mountain View Municipal Code, Section 35.28.

The project proposes 115 new residential rowhouse units replacing 116 apartment units which is not an increase to the number of units onsite therefore no increase in demand for water. In 2015, the City of Mountain View was projected to have a water supply of approximately 8,610 AFY. The proposed project would include sustainable and green building design features, as required by Mountain View policies and regulations. The Mountain View City Council adopted Water Conservation in Landscaping Regulations and CalGreen. These regulations include water efficiency requirements for new and renovated landscapes and construction. Since the project intends to incorporate GreenPoint Rated energy and emissions reduction features, water efficiency will be achieved through the use of low-water landscaping and water efficient plumbing fixtures.

The City of Mountain View water service has sufficient existing water supply to support the proposed project under normal, single dry, or multiple dry water years. Under normal conditions, the City is not projected to experience supply shortfalls. Shortfalls of up to 12 percent are projected for single dry years and up to 14 percent for multiple dry years. Under all dry conditions, the City may need to impose water conservation measures, to achieve 10 to 20 percent reductions, per Mountain View Municipal Code, Section 35.28.

There would be no increase in demand generated by the proposed therefore the project would not have a significant demand on water usage. The proposed project would include sustainable and green building design features, as required by Mountain View policies and regulations. The Mountain View City Council adopted Water Conservation in Landscaping Regulations and CalGreen. These regulations include water efficiency requirements for new and renovated landscapes and construction. Since the project intends to incorporate GreenPoint Rated energy and emissions reduction features, water efficiency will be achieved through the use of low-water landscaping and water efficient plumbing fixtures.

Therefore, with no increase in water demand anticipated by the project on the overall water demand in the City and the conservation measures required of the project, the project would not result in a significant impact on water services or system demand.

The project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Sanitary sewer services would be provided for the project by connecting new sanitary sewer laterals to the existing ten-inch public sanitary sewer main located in San Ramon Avenue.

The project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Solid waste generated by the project would be transported to Kirby Canyon Landfill, where the City of Mountain View has secured landfill disposal capacity for the City's solid waste until 2063.

The City of Mountain View is working to maintain a waste diversion goal of 50 percent. In addition, 65 percent of construction and demolition waste must be diverted in compliance with the Green Building Code. The proposed project would comply with the City's diversion requirements and Green Building Code construction debris diversion requirements.

Because the project can be served by a landfill with capacity and would be required to comply with existing local and State programs and regulations, the project's impacts related to solid waste and landfill capacity would be less than significant. The project would not be noncompliant with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no significant impact would occur.

**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigations	No Significant Impact	No Impact	Source other than project description and plans
<p>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 an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>			X		
<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 considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>			X		
<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>			X		

**Discussion**

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

The proposed project would create 115 new rowhouses, which would be surrounded by other single-family and multi-family residences in a suburban area, and would not result in significant cumulative environmental impacts. Therefore, the proposed project results in less than significant impacts that are both individually and cumulatively limited.

The proposed project would have less than significant impact effects on human beings during construction activities since the project would adhere to standard requirements and procedures.

## **REFERENCES**

### Project Specific Information

#### Project Description

Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by Charles Salter dated March 12, 2019

Vibration Impacts prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, INC dated December 20, 2019

Traffic Operations Analysis prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, INC dated November 25, 2019

Modified Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by ENGEO dated February 11, 2019

Historical Resources/Archaeological Archival Research and Report prepared by Holman dated January 14, 2019

Air Quality and Green House Gas Assessment prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin dated December 23, 2019

Tree Report prepared by Hort Science dated May 2019

Biological Assessment prepared by Live Oak Associates, INC dated January 2, 2019

**LEAD AGENCY**

City of Mountain View

Community Development Department

**ERRATA – MINOR EDITS TO POPULATION AND HOUSING SECTION**  
**1555 W. Middlefield Road**

The following are minor edits to the Population and Housing Section and does not constitute “significant new information” requiring recirculation. (See Public Resources Code Section 21092.1; State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.)

**14. Population and Housing**

**Discussion**

The project includes the demolition of 116 apartment units and the construction of 115 new rowhouses within 20 buildings. Construction of the project, including site preparation, building demolition phase, and excavation would temporarily increase construction employment. Given the relatively common nature and scale of the construction associated with the project, the demand for construction employment would likely be met within the existing and future labor market in the City and the County. The size of the construction workforce would vary during the different stages of construction, but a substantial quality of workers from outside the City or County would not be expected to relocate permanently. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly and there would be a less than significant impact related to population growth as a result of this project.

The proposed project would demolish the existing 116 residential units, upon which 115 new rowhouses would be constructed. However, the project proposes to construct one less unit. Conservatively assuming that project residents would all be new to the City, and based on the City’s average persons per household size of 2.4, the project would generate 276 new residents, bringing the City’s population to 79,701, a 0.3 percent increase. According to the EIR for the City’s 2030 General Plan, buildout under the General Plan would theoretically allow for development of 8,790 new housing units for a total of 42,240 housing units in the City by 2030. As stated above, currently, there are approximately 35,595 housing units in the City. ABAG also developed household forecasts through 2040 for Mountain View (ABAG 2017). According to the ABAG forecasts, the City would have 58,300 housing units by 2040, growth of 26,300 housing units from 2010 conditions. The addition of 115 housing units associated with the project would be within the anticipated housing growth through 2030 anticipated under the General Plan and housing growth through 2040 anticipated by ABAG. Since one less unit would be built than would be demolished, construction of replacement housing would not be required.

In addition, the 116 existing apartment units on-site are covered under the City’s Community Stabilization and Fair Rent Act (CSFRA) and Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance (TRAO). The units range from a one-bedroom/one-bathroom to a two-bedroom/two-bathroom, ranging in monthly rent from \$1,600 to \$3,100. The developer offered the standard benefits as required by the TRAO. Of the 116 households that are being displaced, it is estimated that 69 might be eligible for relocation assistance. The applicant is also offering an enhanced TRAO benefits. The enhanced benefit package is consistent with recent residential projects that included



displacement. The City also maintains approximately 15,000 CSFRA units that would be available to these individuals.

The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The displacement of individuals is considered a social impact but not an impact under CEQA. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any impacts in displacing housing units or persons.