



ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects 24 CFR Part 58

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name: Shorebreeze Apartments

Responsible Entity: City of Mountain View

Owner and Applicant: MP Shorebreeze Associates LP

State/Local Identifier: City of Mountain View

Preparer: Paula Bradley, MCP, AICP, Associate Planner

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Daniel H. Rich, City Manager, City of Mountain View

Consultant (if applicable): Michael Baker International, Inc.

Direct Comments to: Paula Bradley, Associate Planner, Community Development Department,
City of Mountain View, (650) 903-6306

Project Location: The project site is located at 460 North Shoreline Boulevard (Assessor's Parcel
Numbers [APNs] 150-26-006 and 150-26-005)

Proposed Project Description [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]: The project would consist of
two main components: (1) demolition of 12 existing affordable housing townhouse units; and
(2) construction of 62 new affordable housing units where the 12 units are currently located. This
would lead to a net gain of 50 new affordable housing units. The project would include a
Preliminary Map to create two lots from five existing lots.

The project site is located in an urbanized environment. The complex is bounded by commercial
development and residential development to the north, west and south, North Shoreline
Boulevard to the east.

The project applicant would implement applicable conditions of approval as outlined in the
Mountain View standard conditions of approval (Appendix CON) as project design features
during project construction and operation. Implementation of the project design features would
minimize or avoid potential project impacts.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]: The purpose of the project is to implement housing solutions that address local housing needs. The project responds to existing and projected needs for affordable senior and family housing in Mountain View and provides a mixed-income residential community with substantial amenities offering a high quality of life for residents.

Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]: The project site is a 5.34-acre triangular-shaped lot directly adjacent to North Shoreline Boulevard. The project site comprises two parcels, which are composed of five separate lots. The project site is currently developed with the existing Shorebreeze Apartment complex, consisting of 120 affordable apartments for families and seniors in five existing buildings, a recreation center, an asphalt parking lot, and paved walkways. The SFPUC property, owned by the City and County of San Francisco and managed by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), extends east to west under the parking lot on the northern portion of the project site.

Landscaping on the project site consists of mature trees along the southern and western boundaries and grass and shrubs surrounding the existing buildings. Hedges and trees separate the project site from the Barkley Square Apartments to the north.

The project site is located in an urbanized environment. The complex is bounded by commercial development and the Barkley Square Apartments to the north, North Shoreline Boulevard to the east and south, and residential development to the west.

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project financing would include City of Mountain View loans, 4 percent tax credits, and loans leveraging existing and new project-based vouchers (Mountain View 2016). MidPen expects future residents to use Section 8 vouchers to supplement their rental expenditure.

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$180,000

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]: **\$25,947,645**

Documentation

City of Mountain View. 2016. Community Development Department. *Notice of Funding Availability. MidPen Housing NOFA Proposal—460 North Shoreline Boulevard*. September 13, 2016.

COMPLIANCE WITH 24 CFR 50.4, 58.5, AND 58.6 LAWS AND AUTHORITIES RECORD

below the compliance or conformance determinations for each statute, executive order, or regulation. Provide credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority. Where applicable, complete the necessary reviews or consultations and obtain or note applicable permits of approvals. Clearly note citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references. Attach additional documentation as appropriate.

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance Determinations
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6		
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>HUD Guidance regarding compliance with 24 CFR 51 D states that additional information is necessary if a project site is within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civil airport.</p> <p>Airports designated by the Federal Aviation Administration as commercial service airports in the National Plan of Integrated Airports are considered civil airports subject to HUD Regulation 24 CFR 51D. The closest commercial service airport to the project site is Palo Alto Airport, located approximately 3.94 miles (20,803 feet) northeast of the site. Therefore, the project site is not within 2,500 feet of a civil airport and no further information is necessary per HUD Guidance.</p> <p>The closest military airport to the project site is Moffett Federal Airfield, located approximately 1.6 miles (8,448 feet) to the northeast, which is operated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Therefore, the project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport and no further information is necessary per HUD Guidance.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u> Google Maps. Search locations. Accessed July 18, 2017. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development: HUD Exchange. 2017. Airport Hazards. https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/airport-hazards.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

<p>Coastal Barrier Resources</p> <p>Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>In compliance with Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed in 24 CFR Section 58.5, there are no Coastal Barrier Resources Act (COBRA) buffer zones in California. Therefore, the project will not affect or be affected by any coastal barrier resources.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017. Coastal Barrier Resources System. Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper. Accessed July 18, 2017. http://www.fws.gov/CBRA/Maps/Mapper.html.</p>
<p>Flood Insurance</p> <p>Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Section 202 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 USC 4106) requires that projects receiving federal assistance and located in an area identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as being within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) be covered by flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). According to FEMA FIRM Community Panel Number 06085C0039H, the project site is designated Zone X (unshaded areas outside the 500-year floodplain) and is not within an SFHA.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2009. FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map Community Panel Number 06085C0039H.</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5</p>		
<p>Clean Air</p> <p>Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The proposed project will conform to the Federal Clean Air Plan. The project is infill development within an urban area. The project is consistent with the goals and policies of the City of Mountain View General Plan and the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Based on the location, service area, and objectives of the project, the project will not substantially increase traffic or air emissions in the project area.</p> <p>The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is tasked with regulating stationary sources of air pollution in the nine counties of the Bay Area and has developed project-level thresholds of significance to provide a conservative indication of whether a proposed project could result in potentially adverse air quality impacts. To meet the project-level threshold of significance for construction-related criteria air pollutant and precursor impacts, the proposed project must emit no more than 54 pounds per day (lbs/day) of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and/or exhaust-related</p>

		<p>PM_{2.5}, and no more than 82 lbs/day of exhaust-related PM₁₀. Concerning fugitive dust-related PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ emissions generated during construction, the BAAQMD states that implementation of its Basic Construction Mitigation Measures is necessary to reduce such emissions to a level that is considered less than significant. For operational-related criteria air pollutant and precursor impacts, the proposed project must emit no more than 54 lbs/day of ROG, NO_x, and/or PM_{2.5} and no more than 82 lbs/day of PM₁₀ to be considered less than significant.</p> <p>The project would generate short-term emissions from construction activities such as demolition, site grading, asphalt paving, building construction, and architectural coatings (i.e., painting). Common construction emissions include fugitive dust from soil disturbance, fuel combustion from mobile heavy-duty diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, and worker commute trips. During construction, fugitive dust, the dominant source of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions, would be generated when wheels or blades disturb surface materials. Uncontrolled dust from construction can become a nuisance and potential health hazard to those living and working nearby. Demolition can also generate PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions. Off-road construction equipment is often diesel-powered and can be a substantial source of NO_x emissions, in addition to PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions. Worker commute trips and architectural coatings are dominant sources of ROG emissions. The project would not exceed the operational standards; thus, it would not violate air quality standards during project operation.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="5">BAAQMD (Bay Area Air Quality Management District). 2017a. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines Table 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Long-Term Operational Emissions</td> </tr> <tr> <th>Construction Activities</th> <th>Reactive Organic Gas (ROG)</th> <th>Nitrogen Oxide (NO_x)</th> <th>Coarse Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</th> <th>Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5})</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Demolition</td> <td>1.06</td> <td>9.43</td> <td>2.45</td> <td>0.87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site Preparation</td> <td>0.79</td> <td>9.76</td> <td>0.49</td> <td>0.39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grading</td> <td>1.06</td> <td>9.43</td> <td>0.96</td> <td>0.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Building Construction</td> <td>1.08</td> <td>11.03</td> <td>0.71</td> <td>0.65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Paving</td> <td>0.92</td> <td>8.74</td> <td>0.51</td> <td>0.47</td> </tr> </table>	BAAQMD (Bay Area Air Quality Management District). 2017a. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines Table 1					Long-Term Operational Emissions					Construction Activities	Reactive Organic Gas (ROG)	Nitrogen Oxide (NO _x)	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	Demolition	1.06	9.43	2.45	0.87	Site Preparation	0.79	9.76	0.49	0.39	Grading	1.06	9.43	0.96	0.76	Building Construction	1.08	11.03	0.71	0.65	Paving	0.92	8.74	0.51	0.47
BAAQMD (Bay Area Air Quality Management District). 2017a. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines Table 1																																										
Long-Term Operational Emissions																																										
Construction Activities	Reactive Organic Gas (ROG)	Nitrogen Oxide (NO _x)	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})																																						
Demolition	1.06	9.43	2.45	0.87																																						
Site Preparation	0.79	9.76	0.49	0.39																																						
Grading	1.06	9.43	0.96	0.76																																						
Building Construction	1.08	11.03	0.71	0.65																																						
Paving	0.92	8.74	0.51	0.47																																						

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Painting</td> <td>8.05</td> <td>2.01</td> <td>0.15</td> <td>0.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>12.96</td> <td>50.4</td> <td>5.27</td> <td>3.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BAAQMD Potentially Significant Impact Threshold</td> <td>54 pounds/day</td> <td>54 pounds/day</td> <td>82 pounds/day</td> <td>54 pounds/day</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exceed BAAQMD Threshold?</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5">Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.1. See Appendix B for emission model outputs (Appendix AQ).</td> </tr> </table> <p>As shown in Table 1, the project would result in long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors (i.e., ROG and NO_x). Project-generated increases in emissions would be predominantly associated with motor vehicle use. However, all criteria pollutant emissions would remain below the BAAQMD significance thresholds.</p> <p>The project is consistent with the 2017 Clean Air Plan in that it supports the primary goals of the plan. The project conforms to applicable control measures from the plan and does not disrupts or hinder Clean Air Plan Control Measures.</p>	Painting	8.05	2.01	0.15	0.15	Total	12.96	50.4	5.27	3.29	BAAQMD Potentially Significant Impact Threshold	54 pounds/day	54 pounds/day	82 pounds/day	54 pounds/day	Exceed BAAQMD Threshold?	No	No	No	No	Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.1. See Appendix B for emission model outputs (Appendix AQ).				
Painting	8.05	2.01	0.15	0.15																							
Total	12.96	50.4	5.27	3.29																							
BAAQMD Potentially Significant Impact Threshold	54 pounds/day	54 pounds/day	82 pounds/day	54 pounds/day																							
Exceed BAAQMD Threshold?	No	No	No	No																							
Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.1. See Appendix B for emission model outputs (Appendix AQ).																											
<p>Coastal Zone Management Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP) is authorized by the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). Projects that can affect a coastal zone must be carried out in a manner consistent with the state CZMP under Section 307(c) and (d) of the CZMA.</p> <p>California's coastal zone generally extends 1,000 yards inland from the mean high tide line. In significant coastal estuarine habitat and recreational areas, it extends inland to the first major ridgeline or 5 miles from the mean high tide line, whichever is less. The project site is almost 50 miles east of the coast. As such, the project site is not within the coastal zone and does not involve the placement, erection, or removal of materials, or an increase in the intensity of use, in the coastal zone.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u> U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Ocean & Coastal Resource Management. 2012. <i>State Coastal Zone Boundaries</i>.</p>																									
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) &</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>AEI Consultants performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the project site in September 2016 (Appendix HAZ). The ESA was performed in compliance with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Standards and Practices</p>																									

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

58.5(i)(2)		<p>for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312) and in general accordance with the standards established under American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice E1527-13, "Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process." The purpose of the Phase I ESA is to identify and evaluate potential environmental issues and recognized environmental conditions (RECs) associated with the project site, and to assess the likelihood of off-site sources of environmental contamination that may adversely impact the project site. The Phase I ESA included a site reconnaissance visit that was performed by AEI representative Christopher Olsen on September 15, 2016.</p> <p><u>Project Site History</u></p> <p>Starting in 1939, the site was used for agricultural purposes and included a residence, and several buildings and greenhouses. From 1963 to 1968, most of the land was vacant except for a residential building. In 1974, the project site was vacant except for several parked vehicles. The current multi-family residential development on the project site, the Shorebreeze Apartment complex, was constructed in 1980.</p> <p><u>Database Results</u></p> <p>Under Government Code Section 65962.5, both the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) are required to maintain databases of sites known to have hazardous substances present in the environment. Both agencies maintain such databases on their websites, known as GeoTracker and EnviroStor, respectively. There are 19 sites identified on GeoTracker and EnviroStor within 0.5 mile of the project site.</p> <p>The Phase I ESA also includes a search of regulatory databases to identify potentially hazardous conditions on properties surrounding the project site. A property located at 1265 Montecito Avenue was found on two databases; the Registered Hazardous Waste Transporter (HWT) database and the Exclusive Dry Cleaners (EDR) database. This property is located on an adjacent parcel directly to the north of the project site. No spills or releases were found associated with this property, and therefore it is not considered a REC.</p> <p><u>Potential Site Contamination</u></p> <p>The Phase I report identified the possible presence</p>
------------	--	---

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) in the existing building. Areas observed for suspected ACMs at the project site were all in good condition at the time of the Phase I site reconnaissance and are not expected to pose a health and safety concern to the occupants of the property at present. The Phase I ESA determined that disposal of ACMs from the project site took place during a prior renovation, but this renovation did not remove all ACMs from the existing buildings. No RECs, controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs), or historically recognized environmental conditions (HRECs) were found on any surrounding properties. Release of ACMs during construction could be potentially harmful. However, the project would comply with the City's condition of approval PL-117, which requires the contractor to employ engineering controls and BMPs to minimize exposure containments. Additionally, the project would comply with condition of approval PL-125, which requires the compilation and approval of a toxic assessment report. There would be no adverse impacts resulting from exposure to contamination on the project site.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u> AEI Consultants. 2016. <i>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment</i>. California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2017. EnviroStor. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/. State Water Resources Control Board. 2017. GeoTracker. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/.</p>
<p>Endangered Species Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is an infill site with existing multi-family residential development in an urban environment. The project site has been highly disturbed, with about 68 percent of the site covered by impervious (developed or paved, non-vegetated) surfaces. The remaining 32 percent is landscaped with ornamental vegetation. A query of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) was conducted on July 11, 2017, to identify known processed and unprocessed occurrences for special-status species within the Mountain View quad. The results shown that no special-status plant or animals are expected to occur on the project site.</p> <p>The project site does not contain a sensitive habitat such as grasslands, woodlands, developed open space, wetlands, or open water (City of Mountain View 2012). The project site is not within</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>the 2013 Critical Linkages Map developed by SC Wildlands and referenced by the CDFW. Lastly, the project site is not in an area covered by a habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.</p> <p>Given that there is no critical habitat on the project site, the project will have no effect on any federally protected (listed or proposed) threatened or endangered species (plants, animals, fish, or invertebrates) and would not adversely modify their critical habitats.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2015. California Regional Conservation Plans [map]. http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps.</p> <p>California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2016. Summary of Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs). Accessed June 12, 2017. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=15329&inline.</p> <p>California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2017. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). https://map.dfg.ca.gov/bios/?tool=cnddbQuick.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. Mountain View 2030 General Plan. http://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=10702.</p> <p>SC Wildlands (Science & Collaboration for Connected Wildlands). 2013. Critical Linkages: Bay Area & Beyond. http://www.scwildlands.org/reports/CriticalLinkages_BayAreaAndBeyond.pdf.</p> <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017. ECOS Environmental Conservation Online System. https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77</p> <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017. National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper. https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77</p>
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</p> <p>24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Aboveground Stationary Storage Tanks</u></p> <p>Per 24 CFR 51 C Stationary aboveground storage tanks must be located at a distance of at least 1 mile from the project site. If no storage tanks are found, then no further compliance or documentation pertaining to aboveground stationary storage tanks is necessary. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix HAZ) does not identify any current or planned aboveground storage tanks within 1 mile of the project site.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

	<p><u>Hazardous Facilities Included in the Project</u></p> <p>As previously stated, the project consists of a residential development. The project does not include a facility that stores, handles, or processes flammable or combustible chemicals such as bulk fuel storage facilities and refineries.</p> <p>There would be no adverse impacts resulting from explosives or flammable hazards on the project site.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>AEI Consultants. 2016. <i>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment</i>.</p> <p>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development: HUD Exchange. 2016. <i>Explosive and Flammable Facilities</i>. https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/explosive-and-flammable-facilities.</p>
--	---

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

<p>Farmlands Protection</p> <p>Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Federal projects are subject to Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) requirements if they may irreversibly convert farmland to a nonagricultural use. According to 7 CFR 658.2(a), the FPPA does not apply to projects already in or committed to urban development, which includes lands identified as "urban/built-up" on the USDA Important Farmland Maps. The project site is developed with multi-family apartments and is not used for any type of agricultural activities. According to the California Department of Conservation (DOC) Important Farmland Map for Santa Clara County, the project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site and all adjacent properties are designated as Urban and Built-Up Land, which is defined as land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit per 1.5 acres. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>Because Important Farmland, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance regulated under the FPPA, does not occur on the project site and the site is in an area already committed to urban development, the project would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses. The project would not be subject to FPPA requirements.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>California Department of Conservation. 2014. Division of Land Resource Protection. Santa Clara County Important Farmland 2010 [map].</p> <p>California Department of Conservation 2016. Division of Land Resource Protection. Santa Clara County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016 [map].</p>
<p>Floodplain Management</p> <p>Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Compliance with Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, is required if a project involves property acquisition, land management, construction, or improvement within a 100-year floodplain or a "critical action" within a 500-year floodplain. According to FEMA FIRM Community Panel Number 06085C0039H, the project site is designated Zone X (unshaded areas outside the 500-year floodplain) and is not within the 100-year floodplain or Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). Therefore, the project complies with Executive Order 11988.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2009. FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel Number</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

<p>Historic Preservation</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>06085C0039H.</p> <p>To determine the presence of previously identified cultural resources, Michael Baker International staff conducted a records search (NWIC #16-2124) of the project site and a quarter-mile search radius. The Northwest Information Center (NWIC), as part of the California Historical Resources Information System, California State University, Sonoma, an affiliate of the California Office of Historic Preservation, is the official state repository of cultural resources records and reports for Santa Clara County.</p> <p>The project would demolish 12 residential units. The units were not deemed eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties (NRHP) by Michael Baker International. Eight potential cultural resources were identified within a quarter mile of the site. The sites include single-family residences that were evaluated and recommended ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP (Appendix CUL).</p> <p>Because the existing structure and other cultural resources are not listed on or eligible for the NRHP, the City determined, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.4 (d), that the project does not have the potential to adversely affect any historic or potentially historic properties, and a finding of "no historic properties affected" is appropriate.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>California Office of Historic Preservation. 1976. California Inventory of Historic Resources. Sacramento: California Department of Parks and Recreation.</p> <p>California Office of Historic Preservation. 1992. California Points of Historical Interest. Sacramento: California Department of Parks and Recreation.</p> <p>California Office of Historic Preservation. 1996. California Historical Landmarks. Sacramento: California Department of Parks and Recreation.</p> <p>California Office of Historic Preservation. 2012. Historic Property Data File for Santa Clara County. Last updated April 5, 2012. Sacramento: California Department of Parks and Recreation.</p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control</p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Short-Term Noise Generation/Exposure</u></p> <p>Project construction would temporarily increase noise levels at the project site for approximately 12 months. Groundborne noise and other types of construction-related noise impacts would typically occur during excavation activities. This phase of construction has the potential to create the highest levels of noise. The nearest sensitive receptors are the residential properties located</p>

		<p>approximately 75 feet south of the existing complex. It should be noted that the identified noise levels maximum sound levels (L_{max}), are the highest individual sounds occurring in an individual time period. Operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve 1 or 2 minutes of full power operation followed by 3 to 4 minutes at lower power settings. Other primary sources of acoustical disturbance would be due to random incidents, which would last less than 1 minute (such as dropping large pieces of equipment or the hydraulic movement of machinery lifts).</p> <p>Consistent with the City's noise requirements (Section 8.70 of the Mountain View City Code), construction would not occur between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on Monday through Friday, or on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays. Project construction would be temporary and would take place during the allowed times per the City's noise requirements. Additionally, the project would comply with the City's Standard Conditions PL-106 and PL-107 outlining noise-reduction measures. Therefore, there would be no adverse project impacts from short-term construction noise.</p> <p><u>Long-Term Noise Generation/Exposure</u></p> <p>The applicable noise regulations are contained in the City's General Plan Noise Element and City Code. Table 7.1 (Outdoor Noise Environment Guidelines) of the City's General Plan sets day/night average decibel (L_{dn}) standards for Multi-Family Residential Land Use Categories as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Normally Acceptable: 55–60 L_{dn} • Conditionally Acceptable: 60–70 L_{dn} • Normally Unacceptable: 70–75 L_{dn} • Clearly Unacceptable: 75–85 L_{dn} <p>The Mountain View General Plan shows the project site in a 60 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)/L_{dn} area. Based on the Mountain View General Plan EIR, the Shoreline Boulevard segment between Montecito Avenue and Central Expressway experiences an average daily traffic (ADT) volume of 26,800. The Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual has determined 342 additional daily trips would not be sufficient to generate a noticeable increase in traffic noise. The project would not expose people to noise levels outside of the normally acceptable day/night average decibel standards from the</p>
--	--	---

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>Mountain View General Plan.</p> <p>There would be no long-term, adverse operational noise impacts because the project site is identified as being located in a 60 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)/L_{dn} area.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>California Department of Transportation. 2013. Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol.</p> <p>Federal Transit Administration. 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Institute of Transportation Engineers. 2012. <i>Trip Generation Manual</i>, 9th ed.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. <i>Mountain View 2030 General Plan</i>.</p>
<p>Sole Source Aquifers</p> <p>Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>An aquifer is an underground body of rock that contains or can transmit groundwater. An underground source of drinking water is defined as an aquifer that supplies a public water system, or contains a sufficient quantity of groundwater to supply a public water system and currently supplies drinking water for human consumption or contains fewer than 10,000 milligrams per liter (mg/L) total dissolved solids.</p> <p>The project site is not located on a sole source aquifer or within a designated sole source aquifer watershed area per the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. There would be no impacts to drinking water from aquifers.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2016. <i>Sole Source Aquifers</i>. http://catalog.data.gov/dataset/epa-sole-source-aquifers.</p>
<p>Wetlands Protection</p> <p>Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wetlands Inventory, there are no wetlands or other riparian features within or immediately adjacent to the project site. The Wetlands Mapper from the USFWS does not identify any wetlands or riparian habitat on or in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would not cause an adverse impact to on- or off-site wetlands, marshes, wet meadows, mud flats, or natural ponds.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017. National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper. Accessed June 9, 2017. http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html.</p>
<p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p> <p>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>There are no National Wild and Scenic Rivers System rivers, including designated Wild and Scenic Rivers, study rivers, and Nationwide Rivers</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

<p>of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)</p>		<p>Inventory river segments, in the project vicinity. The closest designated Wild and Scenic River is the Feather River Middle Fork, approximately 223 miles north of Mountain View. Therefore, the project would not affect any wild or scenic rivers, nor will it alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of any wild or scenic river for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u> U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. 2017. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. https://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/online_books/anps/anps_6f.htm.</p>
---	--	--

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

<p>Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, was issued in 1994. Its purpose is to focus federal attention on the environmental and human health effects of federal actions on minority and low-income populations with the goal of achieving environmental protection for all communities. Mountain View falls within the EPA's Environmental Justice Region 9. The EJ Mapping Tool Data Set results show that the city is below state and national averages for All People's Block Groups for exposure to cancer-causing substances and hazardous materials.¹</p> <p>As documented in this report, the project site and the surrounding neighborhood would not suffer from adverse environmental conditions. Furthermore, the project would not result in adverse health or environmental effects. The redevelopment of an underutilized property with an affordable-income residential development would add additional affordable housing units in the city. The project would provide a high-quality housing option for lower-income households. Therefore, the project would not result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and/or low-income populations.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u> US Environmental Protection Agency. 2016. EJscreen Report EPA Region 9. Accessed July 21, 2017.</p>
--	---	---

¹ A block group is an area defined by the Census Bureau that usually has in the range of 600–3,000 people living in it. The United States is divided into more than 200,000 block groups.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/ejscreen_SOE.aspx
--	--	---

Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 & 1508.27]: Recorded below is the qualitative and quantitative significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features, and resources of the project area. Each factor has been evaluated and documented, as appropriate and in proportion to its relevance to the proposed action. Verifiable source documentation has been provided and described in support of each determination, as appropriate. Credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority has been provided. Where applicable, the necessary reviews or consultations have been completed and applicable permits of approvals have been obtained or noted. Citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references are clear. Additional documentation is attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation, or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

Impact Codes: Use an impact code from the following list to make the determination of impact for each factor.

- (1) Minor beneficial impact
- (2) No impact anticipated
- (3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation
- (4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
Conformance with Plans/ Compatible Land Use and Zoning/ Scale and Urban Design	2	<p><u>General Plan/Specific Plan</u></p> <p>The project site has a General Plan land use designation of High Density Residential and zoned as a Planned Community (P5). The zoning is outlined in the 460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan and development standards correspond with the Residential–Multiple-Family (R3) zoning district. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan land use designation (amended November 25, 2014) and the Community Development Block Grant Program Home Investment Partnership Program (March 2017).</p> <p>The maximum density in the 460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan area is up to 200 units of senior housing; 35 dwelling units per gross acre. The project would require a Precise Plan Amendment to allow an increase from 125 units to 170 units and a density increase from 37 dwelling units to 50 units on the 3.36 acres, or 32 units when including the Hetch-Hetchy lands in the total development envelope area.</p>

	<p>The project complies with General Plan policies LUD-3, LUD-3.1, and LUD-3.2. The project supports a balanced, diverse mix of land uses; is close to major transit corridors; and includes a strong mix of housing types. The project would comply with General Plan Policies LUD-9.5 and LUD-9.6, which address scenic views and light and glare impacts. Additionally, the project would comply with the following goals and policies outlined in the General Plan Housing Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Goal 1</u>: Support the production of new housing units serving a broad range of household types and incomes. • <u>Policy 1.5</u>: Support the development of both rental and ownership housing serving a broad range of incomes, particularly extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households. • <u>Goal 2</u>: Provide assistance to households at different income levels to address their housing needs. • <u>Goal 3</u>: Conserve and improve Mountain View's housing stock. • <u>Goal 6</u>: Promote environmentally sensitive and energy-efficient residential development, remodeling, and rehabilitation. <p>The project would be consistent with the City's goals and policies regarding development and increasing affordable housing stock.</p> <p>Because the project would comply with General Plan policies and goals for the project area, it would not have an adverse impact on policies.</p> <p><u>Scale and Urban Design</u></p> <p>The project would contribute to the City's stated General Plan goals of high-quality design concepts, with attractive, engaging building and public spaces that include pedestrian-friendly walkways, attractive streets, and efficient parking.</p> <p>The proposed project would include two main components: (1) demolition of 12 existing townhouse units and (2) construction of 62 new apartment units where the 12 townhouse units are currently located. In line with the density and scale of the buildings to remain, the new buildings would consist of three stories that would reach a maximum height of 45 feet. The site is currently occupied by a multi-family residential development. The new construction would be a denser multi-family development. The new buildings would not change the site's visual</p>
--	--

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>character. The new buildings would be set back at least 18 feet from the property line to the south, preserving a transitional area between the proposed project and the adjacent residences. The new buildings would also incorporate design and materials similar to the buildings that would remain on the project site. As such, the project would retain the quality and character of the existing site and would not have an adverse impact.</p> <p><u>Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan</u></p> <p>The project site is located within 2 miles of Moffett Federal Airfield; however, it is not located within the limits of the airfield's Aircraft Noise Contours, per Mountain View General Plan Figure 7.2. Therefore, the project conforms to the City's Airport Land Use Compatibility policies. The project would not have an adverse impact due to airport land use compatibility plans.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 1979. <i>460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan</i>.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 1999. <i>Below-Market Rate Housing Program Administrative Guidelines</i>. Adopted January 26, 1999; revised May 14, 1999.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. <i>City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan</i>.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2017. <i>Draft Action Plan: Community Development Block Grant Program Home Investment Partnership Program</i>.</p> <p>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2017. HOME Investment Partnerships Program. https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_of_fices/comm_planning/affordablehousing/programs/home/.</p>
Soil Suitability/Slope/Erosion/ Drainage/Storm Water Runoff	2	<p>Project construction would not affect slope stability, as the project site is on flat and heavily developed land. However, construction activities would disturb and expose soils to water erosion, potentially increasing the amount of silt and debris entering downstream waterways.</p> <p><u>Construction Impacts</u></p> <p>The project applicant would prepare and implement a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) in compliance with the Construction General Permit (Water Quality No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 2010-0014-DWQ). The SWPPP would include BMPs to reduce construction effects on water quality through the implementation of erosion control measures and</p>

		<p>the reduction or elimination of non-stormwater discharges. BMPs generally include storing materials and equipment to ensure that spills or leaks cannot enter the storm drain system or surface water, developing and implementing a spill prevention and cleanup plan, and installing sediment control devices such as gravel bags, inlet filters, fiber rolls, or silt fences to reduce or eliminate sediment and other pollutants from discharging to the drainage system or receiving waters.</p> <p>The project would also comply with conditions of approval FEP-03 and FEP-05. Condition FEP-03 requires the project applicant to provide proof of coverage under the state's stormwater permit. Condition FEP-05 requires the applicant to submit a construction sediment and erosion control plan to the City. This plan would describe the controls that would be used at the site to minimize sediment runoff and erosion during storm events.</p> <p><u>Operational Impacts</u></p> <p>New development operational BMPs are required under the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Permit (NPDES Permit No. CAS612008). Provision C.3 of the Municipal Stormwater Permit requires the quality and quantity of stormwater flow from new development and redevelopment sites to be controlled. Specifically, the City requires the implementation of treatment measures and other appropriate source control and site design measures, and requires that increases in runoff flows are managed to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>To comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit regulations, the project would construct bioretention basins to capture stormwater from the 85th percentile storm and pretreat it on-site to remove dirt, oil, and heavy metals. These bioretention areas would be designed to manage on-site drainage and allow runoff to infiltrate into the underlying soils, thus preventing water quality degradation, erosion, and flooding on and off the project site.</p> <p>The project would comply with Mountain View's standard conditions of approval FEP-10, FEP-22, FEP-23, and FEP-26, summarized below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FEP-10: Requires landscape design to minimize runoff and promote surface filtration. • FEP-22 and FEP-23: Requires the project to direct stormwater runoff to approved
--	--	---

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>permanent stormwater controls outlined in a Stormwater Management Plan. The plan must follow the City's guidelines and the state NPDES permit and be approved by a qualified engineer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FEP-26: Requires the Stormwater Management Plan to be certified by a qualified third-party engineer that it meets the City's guidelines and Provision C.3 of the NPDES permit. <p>Compliance with NPDES requirements, including both the Construction General Permit and the Municipal Stormwater Permit, would ensure that stormwater runoff during project construction and operation would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, there would be no significant, adverse effects to soil stability and drainage systems resulting from the project.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. <i>Mountain View 2030 General Plan</i>.</p> <p>Rockridge Geotechnical. 2016. Geotechnical Investigation: Proposed Apartment Buildings, Shorebreeze Apartment Complex. Prepared for MidPen Housing Corp.</p>
<p>Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>As with all residential development, the proposed project could increase the number of people potentially at risk for exposure to hazards associated with off-site accidental releases from land uses that routinely use, store, manufacture, and/or transport hazardous materials. However, the use, storage, manufacture, and transport of hazardous materials are highly regulated by local, state, and federal governmental agencies.</p> <p><u>Existing Conditions</u></p> <p>Under Government Code Section 65962.5, both the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) are required to maintain databases of sites known to have hazardous substances present in the environment. Both agencies maintain such databases on their websites, known as GeoTracker and EnviroStor, respectively. The project site is located in an urban, developed area; there are 19 sites identified on GeoTracker and EnviroStor within 0.5 mile of the project site. Neither the database searches nor the Phase I ESA found any recognized environmental conditions (RECs),</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs), or historically recognized environmental conditions (HRECs) on the surrounding properties.</p> <p><u>Construction Hazards</u></p> <p>Project construction could produce toxic pollutants and hazardous waste from demolition, building improvements, grading, paving, and operation of construction equipment, as well as transport and storage of construction equipment. Twelve existing residential units would be removed under the project; demolition activities could uncover toxic substances containing asbestos and lead. Sensitive receptors could be exposed to airborne hazards from carbon emissions and particulate matter. Project construction activities may also include refueling and minor maintenance of construction equipment on-site, which could lead to minor fuel and oil spills. Potential hazards resulting from the use and handling of hazardous materials during construction would be reduced because these activities would be in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, including California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) requirements. All construction activities would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit process that requires the preparation of a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), which would be reviewed and approved by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p>Construction excavation activities could result in hazardous waste exposure. The project site is not included on the list of hazardous waste sites (Cortese List) compiled by the DTSC pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; therefore, the project would not release known hazardous materials due to ground-disturbing activities. However, ground-disturbing activities during construction have the potential to disturb unknown contaminated soils. Under these conditions, the project applicant would comply with condition of approval PL-117, which requires the contractor to employ engineering controls and BMPs to minimize exposure to contaminants. (See Appendix CON for a full description of project conditions of approval.)</p> <p>The project would demolish existing residences on</p>
--	--	---

	<p>the property. Given the age of the existing units, it is possible that asbestos-containing materials would be present. Demolition would involve the potential release of hazardous materials into the environment. The project applicant would comply with condition of approval PL-125, which requires compilation and approval of a toxic assessment report.</p> <p>The storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials from construction could also produce an adverse impact. Potential exposure to hazardous waste would be substantially reduced because the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), Office of Hazardous Materials Safety prescribes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials, including containment rules that specify how shippers package hazardous materials safely and how drivers load, transport, and unload the material (Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 107.601). Compliance with local, state, and federal requirements would ensure that potential risks to public health and safety resulting from accidental hazardous substance releases would be effectively monitored and managed to minimize potential hazard impacts.</p> <p><u>Project Operations Hazards</u></p> <p>The project would include residential uses, which generally do not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Each home's occupants would be responsible for the proper handling and disposal of household materials.</p> <p>Exposure to hazardous materials and toxic pollutants would be low because multi-family residential units do not routinely transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials or present a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials. The exception would be the use of common residential-grade hazardous materials such as household cleaners, paint, etc. Santa Clara County regulates household hazard disposal, and each home's occupants would be responsible for the proper handling and disposal of household materials. The County currently operates a Household Hazardous Waste Program, where residents can drop off such waste for free at various locations around the county.</p> <p>Compliance with federal and state regulations related to the transport, use, and disposal of</p>
--	--

	<p>hazardous materials during construction and operation would avoid adverse impacts from project construction and operation.</p> <p><u>Emergency Response</u></p> <p>The City of Mountain View implements the policies outlined in Santa Clara County's Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP). The HMP serves as a regional guide to protect the public in the event of a major disaster and includes information on emergency medical services and evacuation routes. The plan was developed with the cooperation of the City's departments responsible for overseeing health and safety initiatives. These departments include Community Development, Public Works, and the Fire and Police departments. The HMP dictates when Mountain View's Emergency Plan will be activated and describes the phases of an emergency and the activities that should occur during these phases, The HMP also indicates the levels of emergencies, ranging from minor to a major natural and man-made disasters. These initiatives would apply to the project in the event of an emergency.</p> <p>The City's General Plan Safety Element includes policies and actions to protect the community from risks associated with earthquakes, floods, fires, toxic waste, crime, and other hazards. The General Plan includes building code enforcement, flood control programs, and storm drain facilities management. These policies include provisions to ensure emergency response personnel have access to roadways as needed.</p> <p>All new development in Mountain View is required to comply with existing fire codes and ordinances regarding emergency access, such as widths, surfaces, vertical clearance, brush clearance, and allowable grades. The project would include new driveways and emergency access that would be designed in compliance with City standards and would not encroach on or obstruct any existing evacuation routes. In compliance with regional and local policies, and conditions, the City would implement emergency response measures to address emergency management, including notifications, evacuations, and other necessary measures.</p> <p>No public roads would be closed during project construction, and no detours would be required in the event of an emergency. The project would not impede or conflict with any adopted</p>
--	--

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>emergency response or evacuation plans.</p> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>The Shorebreeze Apartment complex is bounded by commercial development and the Barkley Square Apartments to the north, North Shoreline Boulevard to the east and south, and residential development to the west. The major noise sources at the project site include vehicle traffic on North Shoreline Boulevard and activities associated with the adjacent commercial and residential land uses. The project site is located approximately 1.6 miles from Moffett Federal Airfield and approximately a quarter mile away from the Caltrain right-of-way.</p> <p>The applicable noise regulations are contained in the City's General Plan Noise Element and the City Code. Table 7.1 (Outdoor Noise Environment Guidelines) of the City's General Plan sets day/night average decibel (L_{dn}) standards for multi-family residential land use categories. The project site is in a 60 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)/L_{dn} area. Additionally, City Code Section 8.70 and condition of approval PL-103 limit construction to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and prohibit construction on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>AEI Consultants. 2016. <i>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment</i>.</p> <p>California Air Resources Board. 2004. Community Health Air Pollution Information System (CHAPIS). http://www.arb.ca.gov/gismo2/chapis_v01_6_1_04/.</p> <p>California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2016. EnviroStor. Accessed July 2016. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. <i>Mountain View 2030 General Plan</i>.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2017. <i>Capital Improvement Program</i>.</p> <p>Santa Clara County. 2012. <i>Hazard Mitigation Plan</i>.</p> <p>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2016. <i>National Air Toxics Program: Release Chemical Report</i>. http://iaspub.epa.gov/triexplorer/tri_release.chemical.</p> <p>SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). GeoTracker. Accessed July 2016). http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/.</p>
Energy Consumption	1	<p><u>Greenhouse Gases</u></p> <p>The project includes design features that would reduce project-related energy consumption, with</p>

	<p>resultant reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The project is required to exceed Title 24 of the California Building Code. Title 24 addresses the use of energy-efficient building standards.</p> <p>Greenhouse gas emissions in California are regulated by Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which is legislation requiring that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. Efficiency-based thresholds represent the rate of emissions reductions needed to achieve a fair share of California's GHG emissions reduction target established under AB 32.</p> <p>Greenhouse gas emissions from the project would result in a total of 548.4 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) per year, amortized over the life of the project (30 years). As such, the project would be consistent with all plans, policies, and regulations that apply to Mountain View and adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p><u>California GreenPoint Features</u></p> <p>The project would comply with GreenPoint features for new multi-family homes. The GreenPoint rating system tracks "green" features incorporated into homes as part of California's mission to promote energy and resource efficient buildings throughout the state.</p> <p><u>Transportation</u></p> <p>In addition, the project would not conflict with any adopted City policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Transit service in the project area is provided by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), light rail, Caltrain, and the Mountain View Community Shuttle. The Mountain View Transit Center is located approximately 0.6 mile southeast of the project site and is served by six different bus routes. The closest bus stop to the site is located on Shoreline Boulevard about 750 feet from the intersection of Shoreline Boulevard and Montecito Avenue. The Mountain View Light Rail station is located approximately 0.6 mile southeast of the project site. The project site is serviced by the Mountain View-Winchester line, which provides service between downtown Mountain View and Campbell/Los Gatos via downtown San Jose. The Mountain View Caltrain station is located approximately 0.6 mile southeast of the project site. Caltrain provides frequent passenger train service between San Jose and</p>
--	---

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>San Francisco seven days a week. The Mountain View Community Shuttle is a free public shuttle service that connects to transit, shopping, dining, and entertainment destinations.</p> <p>As described above, the area is served by bus lines, light rail, Caltrain, and the Mountain View Community Shuttle. The project-specific transportation impact analysis (TIA) found that new ridership generated by the project could be accommodated by the existing transit services in the project vicinity and that the project would have a negligible impact on transit travel times. Additional service lines to accommodate the project would not be required; therefore, these transit impacts would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances.</p> <p>Locating the project in a highly-connected area would lower the amount of vehicle trips, thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption. As such, the project would have no impact anticipated to energy consumption.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Build It Green. 2017. Build it Green GreenPoint Tracking System. Accessed July 27, 2017. https://www.builditgreen.org/greenpoint-rated.</p> <p>Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. 2017. <i>Shorebreeze Apartments Development Project, Traffic Impact Analysis</i>.</p>
--	--	---

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns	2	<p>Mountain View's population was 85,990, a 1.1 percent increase from 2016 (California Department of Finance 2017). The average number of persons per household in the city is 2.4. According to the 2007–2011 American Community Survey (ACS), the civilian labor force in Mountain View includes roughly 44,161 residents age 16 and older. Of this total, roughly 40,935 residents are employed, while approximately 3,226 are unemployed, resulting in an unemployment rate of 5.4 percent.</p> <p>Preferred Land Use and Transportation Investment Strategy for Plan Bay Area estimates that Mountain View had approximately 47,800 jobs in 2010. Employment in the city is concentrated in the information sector and the</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>professional, scientific, and technical services sector, each representing 20 percent of the city's jobs.</p> <p>The project site is currently developed with the existing Shorebreeze Apartment complex, consisting of 120 affordable apartments for families and seniors in five existing buildings and a recreation center. There is currently very little employment or income generated on-site, as the project site is developed with residential uses. The project would generate temporary jobs in construction and would adhere to union labor codes. Over the long term, there will be MidPen jobs associated with property management and on-site services.</p> <p>The project meets the City's General Plan Housing Element goals to offer a variety of housing types is essential to serve a variety of income levels and to protect the working and middle class, and to increase the number of affordable housing units as a community benefits requirement. The project itself would not create any significant, adverse effects to employment and income patterns.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>California Department of Finance. 2017. <i>E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State – January 1, 2011–2017</i>.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2014. <i>2015–2023 Housing Element</i>.</p> <p>U.S. Census Bureau. 2017. 2007–2011 American Community Survey. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/.</p>
<p>Demographic Character Changes, Displacement</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p><u>Demographic Character Changes</u></p> <p>The project consists of 120 affordable apartments for families and seniors in five existing buildings. The proposed project would demolish 12 existing townhouse units in two existing buildings and develop 62 affordable housing units on the western portion of the site, resulting in a net increase of 50 units. After project construction, the Shorebreeze Apartment complex would consist of a total of 170 affordable housing units, resulting in a net increase of 50 units.</p> <p>Assuming the California Department of Finance rate of 2.4 persons per household, the project is expected to increase the city's population by approximately 120 residents. The majority of residents of the affordable housing units are</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>anticipated to be existing low-income Mountain View residents in need of affordable housing options.</p> <p>The project would not introduce any barriers that would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group, nor would it destroy or harm any community institution. Rather, it would increase the number of affordable housing units in the city.</p> <p><u>Displacement</u></p> <p>AutoTemp developed a relocation plan to outline the relocation assistance program and evaluate the housing requirements of the existing tenants (Appendix REL). As part of the plan, AutoTemp conducted a survey of the nearby area and found sufficient available housing to accommodate the temporarily displaced households, including market-rate apartments and corporate housing. Relocation support would be mainly in the form of rental assistance vouchers.</p> <p>The tenants in the 12 existing townhouse units would be temporarily relocated for approximately 12 months during demolition and construction. After construction, the displaced tenants would have the right to return to a three-bedroom unit in one of the new buildings. The developer, in coordination with AutoTemp, the relocation firm, would provide all required relocation assistance to the displaced households.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>AutoTemp. 2016. <i>Shorebreeze Expansion Relocation Plan</i>. Prepared for MidPen Housing.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2014. <i>2015–2023 Housing Element</i>.</p> <p>U.S. Census Bureau. 2017. American Community Survey. Accessed August 9, 2017. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/.</p>
--	--	---

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation'
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	<p><u>Schools</u></p> <p>The Mountain View Whisman School District serves elementary and middle school students in the project area, while the</p>

		<p>Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District serves the project area's high school population.</p> <p>The Mountain View Whisman School District completed an annual enrollment projection report in 2016. Enrollment in 2017 was projected to be 5,142 students. The report projected enrollment to be over capacity every year until 2025 under a moderate population growth scenario.</p> <p>The Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District's student enrollment was 3,993 in 2016. Enrollment is projected to increase to 4,576 by the 2021–22 school year before falling to 4,242 by the 2025–26 school year.</p> <p>The Mountain View Whisman School District uses a student generation rate of 0.03 elementary and middle school students per multi-family residential unit. The Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District uses a student generation rate of 0.046 per apartment. Using these rates, the project would add approximately two students to the Mountain View Whisman School District and three students to the Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District. As mentioned above, the elementary school district is already operating above capacity.</p> <p>The project would comply with condition of approval BID-28, which requires school impact fees be paid to the school district(s).</p> <p>The new students, combined with other students from future residential development in the city, may ultimately require additional classroom and support services space at the schools. Expansion of an existing school or construction of a new school would have environmental impacts that would be addressed during site-specific environmental review once the school improvements were proposed. Additional students added to the project would be negligible and any potential impacts would be mitigated by payments to the school district. Under CEQA, payment of development fees is considered to provide full mitigation for the impact of a proposed project on public schools. California Government Code Section 65995(h) states that "the payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge or other</p>
--	--	---

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>requirement levied or imposed...[is] deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization as defined in Section 56021 or 56073, on the provision of adequate school facilities." The project would be required to pay the required school fees at the time of building permit issuance. As such, the project would not have an adverse effect on schools.</p> <p><u>Cultural Facilities</u></p> <p>The additional housing and population resulting from the project would increase the demand for cultural activities; however, the project alone would not require the construction or expansion of new facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2016. CEQA Data Table 2016.</p> <p>Mountain View Los Altos High School District. 2016. <i>Demographic Analysis & Enrollment Projections</i>.</p> <p>Mountain View Whisman School District. 2015. <i>Analysis of Enrollment Projections</i>.</p>
Commercial Facilities	2	<p>The project would not displace existing commercial development in the project vicinity. The project site is located in an urbanized environment; no commercial facilities are proposed. The project would replace current affordable housing units with a higher number of affordable housing units. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse impact on commercial facilities.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

<p>Health Care and Social Services</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>Health Care and Social Services in Mountain View are administered by the Santa Clara County Public Health Department, which oversees 11 hospitals and medical clinics in its jurisdiction. Major health centers in the city include El Camino Hospital, Kaiser Permanente, and Mountain View Center Palo Alto Medical Foundation. The community is serviced by numerous private and public clinics and specialists for people of all income levels.</p> <p>Additional housing and population resulting from the project would not substantially increase the demand for health care/social services. The project alone would not require the construction or expansion of new facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment.</p>
<p>Solid Waste Disposal/Recycling</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p>The proposed project would allow the development of 62 additional affordable housing units to the existing 120 residential units on the project site. Twelve existing townhouses would be demolished as part of the project, producing a net gain of 50 housing units.</p> <p>Recology Mountain View provides recycling, garbage, and electronic waste collection services for properties in the city. Solid waste is first conveyed to the SMaRT station in Sunnyvale for sorting. The majority of solid waste from Mountain View is hauled to the Kirby Canyon Recycling and Disposal Facility in San Jose. Solid waste from Mountain View is also disposed at 14 other landfills in Northern California:</p> <p>In total, the project would produce approximately 2,210,858 pounds of solid waste during demolition and construction. During project construction, construction debris would be hauled off-site and would be handled in accordance with state and local regulations.</p> <p>According to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, the statewide per unit disposal rate for multi-family residences was 0.46 tons per unit per year. Based on this statewide disposal rate, the project would generate approximately 23 tons of solid waste and recyclable materials annually. Solid waste generated by the</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>proposed project would be hauled to the Kirby Canyon Recycling and Disposal Facility, which is permitted to receive a maximum of 949,000 tons per year. The solid waste produced by the project would account for less than 0.01 percent of the annually permitted waste. Therefore, the proposed project would be served by a solid waste service provider and landfill with sufficient capacity. In addition, the project would comply with all applicable solid waste regulations. As such, the project would not have an adverse impact on solid waste and recycling.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2017. Facility/Site Summary Details: Kirby Canyon recycle & disposal facility (43-AN-0008) http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/43-AN-0008/Detail/</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. <i>Mountain View 2030 General Plan</i>.</p>
Waste Water/Sanitary Sewers	2	<p>Mountain View's wastewater, including domestic, commercial, and industrial sources, is treated at the Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant (PARWQCP). Sewage generated cleanup is conveyed through the collection system to the plant. Treated effluent is then discharged into San Francisco Bay</p> <p>Wastewater generated by the project would be conveyed to the PARWQCP via the city's existing wastewater system. The PARWQCP currently meets all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements for treated wastewater. As stated above, in 2009 Mountain View contributed 7.94 million gallons per day (mgd) to the plant and had a remaining capacity of 7.16 mgd.</p> <p>The City of Mountain View publishes wastewater flow rates for different residential, commercial, and institutional land uses. Multi-family residential development with more than 5 units produces 140 gallons per day per unit². The project would add 50 units and</p>

² Water usage rates for Residential Class 3 Multiple Family Housing daily flow rates are calculated at 70 percent of Residential Class 1 Single Family Detached flow rates (200 gpd x 70%=140 gpd) (City of Mountain View Sewer Master Plan 2011)

		<p>therefore would produce an additional 7,800 gallons of wastewater a day over existing conditions. As described above, Mountain View contributed 7.94 mgd to the PARWQCP, and the project's additional contribution would be minimal. The project would not substantially increase wastewater flow from the site and would not increase flows to the plant above Mountain View's capacity.</p> <p>Additionally, according to the City's Sewer System Management Plan, the wastewater facilities (pipes and storm drains) have adequate capacity. The project would comply with conditions of approval PW-10 and PW-35, summarized below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PW-10: Requires the project applicant to pay sewer development fees prior to the issuance of any building permits. • PW-35: Requires all proposed sewer laterals, cleanouts, and utility mains to be shown on the project plans. <p>The project would have no adverse effects to wastewater and sanitary sewer systems.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. <i>Mountain View 2030 General Plan</i>.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2014. <i>Sewer System Management Plan</i>.</p> <p>Palo Alto, City of. 2009b. <i>Regional Water Quality Control Plant Partner Allocations and Flow Rates</i>. http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/22153.</p>
Water Supply	2	<p>Mountain View maintains a diverse water supply portfolio to minimize the effects on customers during drought, natural disaster, and operational shutdowns. Potable supplies include a combination of locally pumped groundwater and purchased water from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD). Water infrastructure functions well during normal use, although minor upgrades are necessary for periods of high demand and to provide additional firefighting capacity. In addition to the city's potable water supply, there is a recycled water system in the City's North Bayshore Change Area. The City estimates that recycled water will be used for irrigation and will offset up to 10 percent of citywide</p>

		<p>potable water use by 2030.</p> <p>Water would be provided to the project site by the City of Mountain View. Mountain View's most recent Urban Water Management Plan anticipates adequate water supplies to meet demand through 2040 in normal years.</p> <p>The project would consume an additional 17,040 gallons per day over the current consumption levels. This would be 6,134,400 gallons per year, which converts to 18.8 acre-feet per year. Mountain View is projected to use 12,578 acre-feet per year, meaning the project would account for 0.1 percent of the projected 2020 water use. Furthermore, the project would comply with condition of approval PW-10 (which requires payment of fees for permitting). Therefore, the project would not create adverse impacts to the City's water system.</p> <p>The project would not have an adverse impact on water supplies.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. <i>Mountain View 2030 General Plan</i>.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2016. <i>2015 Urban Water Management Plan</i>.</p>
<p>Public Safety – Police, Fire and Emergency Medical</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>Fire and Police Protection</u></p> <p>The City's Police and Fire departments provide service to over 75,000 residents in a 12.3-square-mile area.</p> <p>The Mountain View Police Department has 135 sworn and non-sworn personnel.</p> <p>The Mountain View Fire Department operates out of five stations with five engine companies, one rescue unit, one ladder truck, and one Hazmat unit, with 86 full-time personnel, including Suppression Division, Fire & Environmental Protection Division, and Administrative Division employees. The department delivers fire suppression and rescue response, hazard prevention and education, and disaster preparedness, with a minimum on-duty daily staffing of 21 personnel. Each of the department's five engine companies is staffed with a paramedic.</p> <p>The project's net increase of 50 new housing units would not substantially burden existing</p>

public safety resources in the North Shore area, since it would lead to a net increase population of only 120 residents and is within a developed, urban area.

The project complies with General Plan Policies LUD-3, LUD-3.1, and LUD-3.2. It supports a balanced, diverse mix of land uses; is close to major transit corridors; and includes a strong mix of housing types.

The project site has a General Plan land use designation of High Density Residential. It is located in the 460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan with zoning of Planned Community (P5). The project would construct multi-family residential housing; therefore, the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan land use designation.

Because the project is consistent with long-range plans, the provision of public services (including fire and police) has been anticipated for the site. The project would not substantially change service ratios or the ability to provide adequate services with existing facilities. Therefore, the project would not trigger the need for additional fire protection or police facilities, the construction of which could result in impacts on the environment. Increased demand would be funded by relying on revenue increases from the project to the City's General Fund, which funds the Fire and Police departments.

The project would be consistent with the General Plan and Specific Plan land use designations for the site. Because the project is consistent with long-range plans, the provision of public services (including fire and police) has been anticipated for the site. The project would not substantially change services ratios or the ability to provide adequate services with existing facilities.

Emergency Medical

Mountain View Hospital provides medical emergency and trauma service for city residents. An additional 50 units would not substantially increase the number of residents in the project area. Therefore, the project would not result in the need for additional or altered medical services and would not alter acceptable medical service ratios.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2014. <i>Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014.</i></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2014. <i>Mountain View Police Department Annual Report.</i></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2014. <i>2015–2023 Housing Element.</i></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2016. <i>Fire Department Annual Report Fiscal Year 2014–2015.</i></p>
<p>Parks, Open Space and Recreation</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Mountain View has nearly 1,000 acres of parks and open space per 1,000 residents. It has a large, interconnected system of trails, community facilities owned by the City and shared with other organizations, and a variety of recreational and arts programs and services. The City's General Plan open space goals allocate 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. In 2010, Mountain View's 972 acres of parkland exceeded this standard, with about 13.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.</p> <p>One of the City's long-standing goals to equitably distribute open space throughout the community, so that all residents will be within a safe and comfortable walking distance of a park.</p> <p>The current project location is in a highly-urbanized area with a number of open space and recreational options in the project vicinity. The closest park to the project site is Stevenson Park, approximately 0.2 mile northwest of the Shorebreeze Apartment complex. Facilities at this park include basketball courts, a children's playground, a soccer/football field, a picnic area, a softball field, tennis courts, and restrooms. San Veron Park is located approximately 0.3 mile to the northeast. Facilities include a basketball court, a children's playground, a picnic area, and an outdoor volleyball court. Jackson Park is located approximately 0.2 mile to the southeast. Facilities include a children's play area and a picnic area.</p> <p>The project would comply with condition of approval PW-14, which requires the project to pay a park land dedication fee prior to the issuance of building permits. The fee would be used to construct additional park facilities in the city.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>The project alone would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 1978. <i>460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan</i>. Adopted by the City Council on October 16, 1978, and amended in 1979.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. <i>City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan</i>.</p>																																		
<p>Transportation and Accessibility</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <p>Traffic analysis for this EA is based on the traffic impact analysis (TIA) prepared for the project by Hexagon Transportation Consultants in 2017 (Appendix TRA).</p> <p>Regional access to the project site is via US Highway 101, State Route (SR) 237, SR 85, SR 82 (El Camino Real), and Central Expressway/Alma Street. Local access to the project site is provided via Middlefield Road, Montecito Avenue, Shoreline Boulevard, and Stierlin Road.</p> <p>AM and PM peak-hour intersection movement counts were collected in May 2017 at the six study area intersections (see Appendix TRA). Table 2 summarizes the existing AM and PM peak-hour intersection traffic conditions.</p>																																		
		<p align="center">TABLE 2</p> <p align="center">EXISTING PEAK-HOUR INTERSECTION CONDITIONS</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Intersection</th> <th rowspan="2">LOS Standard</th> <th colspan="2">AM Peak Hour</th> <th colspan="2">PM Peak Hour</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Delay</th> <th>LOS</th> <th>Delay</th> <th>LOS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. N Shoreline Boulevard and W Middlefield Road</td> <td align="center">D</td> <td align="center">47.1</td> <td align="center">D</td> <td align="center">51.7</td> <td align="center">D-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. N Shoreline Boulevard and Montecito Avenue</td> <td align="center">D</td> <td align="center">25.0</td> <td align="center">C</td> <td align="center">28.3</td> <td align="center">C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. N Shoreline Boulevard and Wright Avenue</td> <td align="center">D</td> <td align="center">16.0</td> <td align="center">B</td> <td align="center">20.7</td> <td align="center">C+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. N Shoreline Boulevard and Central</td> <td align="center">E</td> <td align="center">10.1</td> <td align="center">B+</td> <td align="center">8.1</td> <td align="center">A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Intersection	LOS Standard	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	1. N Shoreline Boulevard and W Middlefield Road	D	47.1	D	51.7	D-	2. N Shoreline Boulevard and Montecito Avenue	D	25.0	C	28.3	C	3. N Shoreline Boulevard and Wright Avenue	D	16.0	B	20.7	C+	4. N Shoreline Boulevard and Central	E	10.1	B+	8.1	A
Intersection	LOS Standard	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour																															
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS																															
1. N Shoreline Boulevard and W Middlefield Road	D	47.1	D	51.7	D-																															
2. N Shoreline Boulevard and Montecito Avenue	D	25.0	C	28.3	C																															
3. N Shoreline Boulevard and Wright Avenue	D	16.0	B	20.7	C+																															
4. N Shoreline Boulevard and Central	E	10.1	B+	8.1	A																															

		Expressway (east)						
		5. N Shoreline Boulevard and Central Expressway (west)	E	5.0	A	6.0	A	
		6. N Shoreline Boulevard and Terra Bella Avenue	D	17.2	B	20.9	C+	
<p><i>Source: Hexagon 2017</i></p> <p>As shown in Table 2, all study intersections currently operate at an acceptable level of service in both the AM and PM peak hours.</p> <p>Table 3 summarizes the forecast project trip generation for the proposed project, which was calculated using trip generation rates contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. The rates for apartment buildings were used to estimate the trips generated by the proposed project. The project is estimated to generate 412 daily trips, with 32 trips during the AM peak hour and 38 trips during the PM peak hour. Trips being generated by the existing 12 townhomes on the site can be subtracted from the project trip estimates. Based on the ITE trip generation rates, the townhouses are generating 5 trips during the AM peak hour and 6 trips during the PM peak hour. Crediting the existing trip generation, the proposed project is estimated to generate a net 27 trips during the AM peak hour and 32 trips during the PM peak hour.</p>								
<p>TABLE 3 TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES</p>								
		Daily		AM Peak Hour				
	Unit	Rate	Trips	Rate	In	Out	Total	Rate
	DU	6.65	412	0.51	6	26	32	0.62
	DU	5.81	(70)	0.44	(1)	(4)	(5)	0.52
			342		5	22	27	
<p><i>Source: Hexagon 2017</i></p> <p><i>Notes: DU = dwelling units</i></p> <p><i>1. Apartment (Land Use 220) ITE Trip Generation average rates are used</i></p>								

		<p>2. Residential Condominiums/Townhouse (Land Use Code 230) average rates are used</p> <p>The results of the intersection level of service (LOS) analysis indicate that based on the applicable significance criteria, all study intersections would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service during both the AM and PM peak hours for background plus project conditions (Appendix TRA). Therefore, the project would not result in adverse traffic conditions in the project area.</p> <p>The increase in traffic would not be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, as the project would have no significant impact on any of the study intersections. Furthermore, based on the applicable agency-established thresholds of significance, the addition of project-generated trips would result in no significant traffic impacts at the study intersections for the evaluated scenarios.</p> <p><u>Accessibility</u></p> <p>Two driveways along North Shoreline Boulevard would provide access to the project site. An existing driveway provides access to the parking lot on the north side of the project site and would remain in the same location. The driveway and the sidewalk in the vicinity of the driveway would be upgraded to meet City standards and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations.</p> <p>Under the project, emergency fire access routes would have entry and exit points off North Shoreline Boulevard. Fire access lanes would be marked with red paint and marked as no parking–fire lane areas. A second, new driveway would be constructed farther south along North Shoreline Boulevard and would connect to an existing walkway. The walkway would be widened in some locations to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles to the project site. All new driveway construction would be subject to approvals by the City Traffic Engineer. Through such plan check reviews, the project would comply with all regulations regarding roadway design, thus minimizing any potential impacts from traffic safety hazards.</p>
--	--	--

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>Additionally, pedestrian circulation would include internal pathways and sidewalks along the street frontages adjacent to the project site. City condition of approval PW-54 requires that all new access ramps comply with the ADA requirements and that existing nonconforming access ramps be constructed to comply with ADA requirements. Condition PW-55 requires that all new sidewalks be, at minimum, 4 feet wide and that the project provide sidewalks behind new and existing driveway approaches (Appendix CON).</p> <p>Compliance with the City conditions of approval as well as ADA regulations would ensure no adverse impacts to accessibility from project implementation.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. 2017. <i>Shorebreeze Apartments Development Project, Traffic Impact Analysis.</i></p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2017. Standard Conditions (by department). Effective January 30, 2017.</p>
--	--	---

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	The project site is an infill site developed with existing multi-family residential uses in Mountain View, an urbanized area. The project site has been disturbed, with about 68 percent of the site covered by impervious (developed or paved, non-vegetated) surfaces. The remaining 32 percent is landscaped with ornamental vegetation. There are no natural features or water resources on the project site or in the project vicinity.
Vegetation, Wildlife	3	<p><u>Vegetation</u></p> <p>In April 2017, HortScience prepared an arborist report for the project site. The report is included as Appendix BIO. The report inventories all trees on the project site, complete with physical attribute information for inventoried trees including circumference at breast height, approximate height, dripline radius, approximate age, health/condition,</p>

		<p>and benefit to the existing urban forest.</p> <p>The project site contains 102 trees. Seventy-five of the 102 trees on and in the immediate vicinity of the project site qualify as heritage trees. Thirty-eight trees would be removed to accommodate project construction. Of these, 22 trees qualify as heritage trees as defined by California Senate Bill (SB) 745. Trenching, grading, and construction would take place within the driplines of protected trees, resulting in potentially adverse impacts to a protected wildlife resource.</p> <p>Mountain View City Code Chapter 32.29 requires a permit for the removal of any heritage tree or construction of improvements within the dripline or any heritage or protected tree. The project applicant would comply with conditions of approval PL-89, PL 90, PL-92, PL-93, PL-96, and PL-98. (Refer to Appendix CON for complete definitions of these conditions.) These conditions would reduce the severity of impacts resulting from the removal, relocation, or altering of heritage trees. The 22 heritage trees would be replaced at a ratio of 2:1; therefore, the project would include at least 44 replacement trees. Because the project would comply with City regulations regarding removal of heritage trees, no adverse impacts would be expected to occur.</p> <p><u>Wildlife</u></p> <p>The project site does not accommodate sensitive habitat such as grasslands, woodlands, developed open space, wetlands, or open water. However, trees on the project site may provide suitable nesting habitat for migratory birds and raptors protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The removal of vegetation and/or trees during construction activities would result in direct and/or indirect impacts on nesting birds present on or in the vicinity of the project site.</p> <p>During construction, the project construction contractor would implement condition of approval PL-121 summarized below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PL-121: Requires vegetation removal and construction activities to be performed outside of the bird nesting season to the
--	--	---

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: SHOREBREEZE APARTMENTS

		<p>extent practicable. If construction occurs during the nesting bird season, a qualified biologist is required to conduct a survey to determine if nesting birds are present on the project site and in the surrounding area, and must establish no-disturbance buffer zones around the nests.</p> <p>Implementation of these conditions, along with federal regulations under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, would minimize adverse impacts to migrating and nesting birds in the project vicinity.</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p>California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2015. California Regional Conservation Plans [map]. Accessed June 12, 2017. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumntID=68626&inline.</p> <p>California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2017. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). https://map.dfg.ca.gov/bios/?tool=cnddbQuick.</p> <p>Mountain View, City of. 2012. <i>Mountain View 2030 General Plan</i>.</p> <p>HortScience, Inc. 2017. <i>Updated Arborist Report, Shorebreeze Apartments, Mountain View, CA</i>.</p> <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017. ECOS Environmental Conservation Online System. Accessed June 9, 2017. https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77.</p> <p>US Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017. National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper. Accessed June 9, 2017. http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html.</p>
Other Factors	2	None.

ADDITIONAL STUDIES PERFORMED

Updated Arborist Report: Shorebreeze Apartments (April 2017). Prepared for MidPen Housing Corporation. Prepared by HortScience, Inc.

Geotechnical Investigation: Proposed Apartment Buildings—Shorebreeze Apartment Complex. (September 19, 2016). Prepared for MidPen Housing Corp. Prepared by Rockridge Geotechnical.

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment: Shorebreeze Apartments (September 19, 2016). Prepared for MidPen Housing Corp. Prepared by AEI Consultants.

Traffic Impact Analysis: Shorebreeze Apartments Redevelopment Project (June 29, 2017). Prepared for Michael Baker International, Inc. Prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

LIST OF PERMITS OBTAINED

Public Outreach: [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]: The City hosted a public open house on July 27, 2017. The City mailed a notice of the open house in both English and Spanish to occupants and owners of properties within a quarter mile radius of the project site. MidPen representatives knocked on the doors of surrounding properties to hand out a flier for the open house and to introduce themselves to neighbors. A total of 20 community members attended the open house. Attendees raised concerns about the project including safety, lighting and glare, landscaping, parking, traffic, and noise. An informal follow up meeting was held on 8/14/17 to meet with the 2 neighbors to address the trash enclosure location. 3 neighbors attended along with MidPen staff.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]: The project site is in Mountain View. The city was analyzed for cumulative impacts through its General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The EIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan could result in significant cumulative impacts related to traffic and circulation, air quality, noise, ozone, and particulate emissions. The proposed project would incrementally contribute to these impacts, but it would not make a substantial contribution to any significant cumulative impact.

Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]:

Alternative A – The project site is currently occupied with affordable apartments. Alternative uses of the site are not within the purview of the project applicant as a nonprofit affordable housing developer. Further development of the site as a nonresidential land use would not afford the City the means to address its stated goal to supply affordable housing in the area.

Alternative B - No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

The No Project Alternative assumes the site would not be redeveloped with additional affordable housing units, and an opportunity to help meet the City of Mountain View's goal for affordable housing would be missed. Under this scenario, the existing 12 townhouse units would remain. The property would be underutilized and would not meet the city's need for increased affordable housing.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions: The project would be a benefit to the City of Mountain View by increasing rental housing opportunities for lower-income seniors and families. The project would not result in any significant environmental impacts.

Documentation

City of Mountain View. 2012. *Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Final Environmental Impact Report*.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]

None required.

Determination:

Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27]

The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

Finding of Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27]

The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

Preparer Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Name/Title/Organization: _____

Certifying Officer Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Name/Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environmental Review Record (ERR) for the activity/project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).