

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW
RESOLUTION NO.
SERIES 2015

A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW
2030 GENERAL PLAN AND GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION PROGRAM,
SAN ANTONIO CHANGE AREA SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT AND ADOPTING CEQA FINDINGS, A STATEMENT OF
OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

WHEREAS, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000, *et seq.*, the City has prepared a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the updated development projections for the City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program, San Antonio Change Area; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mountain View prepared and circulated for public comment a Draft SEIR, held a public hearing on the Draft SEIR before the Zoning Administrator on May 13, 2015, and gave all public notices in the manner and at the times required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Final SEIR, which includes the Draft SEIR and response to comments document for the City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program, San Antonio Change Area, was presented to the City Council on June 23, 2015, and the City Council has reviewed the Final SEIR on the proposed project and all associated staff reports, meeting minutes, testimony, and evidence constituting the record of proceedings (as defined in the CEQA Findings); and

WHEREAS, the Final SEIR identifies certain significant effects on the environment that would result from the implementation of the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Final SEIR identifies mitigation measures which, when implemented, will substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects on the environment caused by the proposed project, with the exception of the significant unavoidable impacts to one additional roadway segment during daily operations (project-level and cumulative conditions), one additional freeway segment during daily operations (project-level and cumulative conditions), and deficient roadway miles during the A.M. peak in Palo Alto; and

WHEREAS, the Final SEIR identifies and analyzes alternatives to the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to monitor the changes to the project, which the lead agency has adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Mountain View, having independently considered the Final SEIR and the potentially significant environmental effects of the project as shown in the Final SEIR for the City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program, San Antonio Change Area, that the Council:

1. Certifies that the Final SEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA and reflects the independent judgment of the City Council; and

2. Adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project, attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

3. Adopts all of the feasible mitigation measures identified and described in the Final SEIR and determines that the project, as mitigated, will avoid or reduce all of the significant adverse impacts to a less-than-significant level, with the exception of the significant unavoidable impacts to one additional roadway segment during daily operations (project-level and cumulative conditions), one additional freeway segment during daily operations (project-level and cumulative conditions), and deficient roadway miles during the A.M. peak in Palo Alto, for which the significant unavoidable impacts are considered acceptable because the unavoidable adverse environmental effects are outweighed by the benefits of the project as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations; and

4. Finds that the alternatives identified and analyzed in the Final SEIR cannot achieve the project objectives to the same degree as the proposed project and do not represent substantial environmental benefits over the proposed project and are, therefore, rejected as infeasible, within the meaning of CEQA, in favor of the proposed project; and

5. Adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, attached hereto as Exhibit B.

TIME FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The time within which judicial review of this document must be sought is governed by California Code of Procedure Section 1094.6 as established by Resolution No. 13850 adopted by the City Council on August 9, 1983.

RS/3/RESO
803-06-23-15r-E

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW 2030 GENERAL PLAN AND GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION PROGRAM – SAN ANTONIO CHANGE AREA PROJECT

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code

The City of Mountain View (City), through the City Council, is the lead agency for the City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program – San Antonio Change Area Project (Project), as defined in Section 15367 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

The City makes these CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (collectively “Findings”) in connection with the following City actions:

- Resolution to certify the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Final SEIR) and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project;

The City certified the Final EIR for the 2030 General Plan in July 2012. The Project represents a change in the development assumptions described in the Final EIR, but remains essentially the same project as the 2030 General Plan, with no changes proposed to the General Plan, its goals or policies (see Section II.A of the Final SEIR). As provided in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has prepared and certified a Final SEIR to disclose whether the changes in assumptions would result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts in relation to those identified in the 2030 General Plan Final EIR.

The Final SEIR prepared by the City for the Project consists of both the Draft SEIR (November 2014) and the Final SEIR (April 2015), including Responses to Comments on the Draft SEIR (together the “Final EIR”). The City’s Resolution certifying the Final SEIR certifies that the Final SEIR: (1) has been completed in compliance with CEQA; (2) was presented to the City Council, and the City Council reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final SEIR prior to approving the Project; and (3) reflects the City’s independent judgment and analysis (CEQA Guidelines § 15090(a)).

The Final SEIR is incorporated by reference in these Findings and identifies significant environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the Project. The following Project impacts would be new or substantially more severe than the impacts disclosed in the Final EIR certified for the 2030 General Plan:

- TRA-2 (increase in daily vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operations on San Antonio Road between Central Expressway and California Street at the Project and cumulative levels);
- TRA-3 (increase in daily vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operations on the freeway segment northbound State Route (SR) 85 from Evelyn Avenue to Moffett Boulevard; and worsening of level of service from LOS D to LOS E on southbound SR 85 from El Camino Real (ECR) to Fremont at the Project and cumulative levels); and
- TRA-4 (Increase in peak hour vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operation on adjacent Palo Alto roadway segment for the AM peak hour at the Project and cumulative levels).

The Project would result in a slight increase (0.8 dBA or less) in ambient noise levels along three roadway segments. However, this is not a substantial increase in the severity of a significant and unavoidable impact. Therefore, no new mitigation is necessary. All pertinent mitigation measures from the Final EIR for the 2030 General Plan continue to apply.

As noted herein, there would be a cumulative traffic impact that was not identified in the 2030 General Plan resulting from the traffic contribution from citywide land use changes (including an additional 1.5 million sf office space in the East Whisman Change Area).

The City finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures as part of the Project approval that will reduce the new or substantially more severe significant impacts to a less-than-significant level (Section 3 of these Findings). Implementation of the Project would result in new or more severe significant traffic impacts as noted above, as well as new contributions to the Cumulative plus Project condition.

The 2030 General Plan EIR described and evaluated the following four alternatives.

- **No Project Alternative** assumed that development would continue in accordance with the 1992 General Plan.
- **Lower Intensity Alternative** assumed that there would be less intensive development in the specified change areas, allowing for fewer jobs and less housing in the North Bayshore and East Whisman Change Areas and along transportation corridors by 2030.
- **Increased Housing Alternative** assumed that there would be more intensive residential development in proximity to jobs and is intended to substantially reduce the city's per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per service population to the level associated with existing conditions.
- **North Bayshore Alternative** assumed that the area will concentrate on and continue its role as a regional high-tech employment center and will not include a residential component.

Pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, no additional alternatives, beyond those studied in the 2030 General Plan EIR, were developed and analyzed for this SEIR. Although the City is amending land use assumptions in the 2030 General Plan EIR, no changes are proposed to be made to the 2030 General Plan, its goals, or policies. Since the City is not changing the 2030 General Plan, none of the alternatives found to be infeasible in 2012 with adoption of the General Plan are now found to be feasible.

Because of the unavoidable significant impacts noted above, Section 4 of this document makes findings regarding the Project Alternatives discussed in the Final SEIR. In addition, the City has, in determining whether to approve the Project, balanced the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits of the Project against this unavoidable environmental risk, and has found that the benefits of the Project outweigh the potentially unavoidable adverse environmental effect. The resultant Statement of Overriding Considerations is set forth in Section 6 of this document. Section 7 explains that recirculation of the SEIR is not required.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION 1

 1.1 Requirements for Findings 1

 1.2 Record of Proceedings..... 1

 1.3 Organization/Format of Findings 2

**SECTION 2: CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW 2030 GENERAL PLAN AND GREENHOUSE GAS
 REDUCTION PROGRAM – SAN ANTONIO CHANGE AREA PROJECT 2**

 2.1 Project Description 2

 2.2 Project Objectives..... 3

 2.3 Alternatives..... 3

**SECTION 3: FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE
 LESS-THAN-SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE AND A NEW IMPACT THAT WILL
 BE REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL..... 4**

 3.1 Transportation and Circulation..... 4

 3.2 Air Quality..... 5

 3.3 Noise..... 6

**SECTION 4: FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT MITIGATION
 MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES..... 7**

 4.1 Mitigation Measures..... 7

 4.2 Alternatives..... 11

SECTION 5: FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS..... 13

 5.1 Transportation and Circulation..... 13

SECTION 6: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS..... 15

 6.1 Regulatory Benefits 16

 6.2 Economic Benefits..... 16

 6.3 Social Benefits..... 16

 6.4 Region-wide or Statewide Environmental Benefits..... 17

SECTION 7: CONCLUSION; NO RECIRCULATION OF THE EIR IS REQUIRED 18

REFERENCES..... 19

TABLE 1: RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES..... 8

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
City	City of Mountain View
EV	electric vehicle
FAR	floor-to-area ratio
Final SEIR	final subsequent environmental impact report
GGRP	Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program
GHG	greenhouse gas
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MVFD	Mountain View Fire Department
PV	Photovoltaic
R&D	research and development
SR	State Route
TDM	Transportation Demand Management
VMT	vehicle miles traveled

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Requirements for Findings

Section 15091 of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
 - (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
 - (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

For those significant effects that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the public agency is required to find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh its significant effects on the environment.¹ The *CEQA Guidelines* state in section 15093(a) that:

“If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposal project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered ‘acceptable.’”

1.2 Record of Proceedings

For purposes of CEQA and the findings set forth herein, the record of proceedings for the City’s decision on the project consists of: a) matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to, federal, State and local laws and regulations; and b) the following documents which are in the custody of the City:

- Notice of Preparation and other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project (see Appendix A of the Draft SEIR for the Notice of Preparation);
- The Public Review Draft SEIR for the City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program – San Antonio Change Area Project, together with appendices, dated November 2014, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference, or referred to therein;
- All written and verbal comments submitted to the City by agencies, organizations, or members of the public (before, during, and after the close of the public comment period on the Draft SEIR up through the close of the public testimony portion of the City Council’s public hearing on the Project);
- The Final SEIR for the City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program – San Antonio Change Area Project, dated March 2015, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference, or referred to therein;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the City in connection with the Project, and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All documents submitted to the City by agencies or members of the public in connection with development of the Project;
- The City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program, adopted by the City

¹ Public Resources Code Section 21081(b).

Council on July 10, 2012;

- The City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2011012069), including all appendices thereto (General Plan EIR), and all documents cited, incorporated by reference, or referred to therein, certified by the Mountain View City Council on July 10, 2012, and all findings and resolutions adopted by the City in connection with the General Plan EIR;
- Any minutes or verbatim transcripts of all information and study sessions, workshops, public meetings, and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings; and
- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The location and custodian of the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings are:

City of Mountain View Community Development Department
500 Castro Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Contact: Rebecca Shapiro, phone: (650) 903-6306

1.3 Organization/Format of Findings

Section 2 of these findings contains a summary description of the Project, sets forth the objectives of the Project, and briefly describes why no additional alternatives to the Project, beyond those evaluated in the 2030 General Plan EIR, are evaluated in the SEIR. Section 3 identifies the Project's environmental effects. Section 4 discusses the feasibility of Project alternatives. Section 5 identifies the significant cumulative impacts to which the Project would contribute that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Section 6 includes the City's *Statement of Overriding Considerations*. Section 7 explains that recirculation of the SEIR is not required.

SECTION 2: CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW 2030 GENERAL PLAN AND GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION PROGRAM – SAN ANTONIO CHANGE AREA PROJECT

This section provides a brief description of the Project, lists the objectives of the Project, and lists the Project alternatives evaluated in the Final SEIR.

2.1 Project Description

Since adoption of the 2030 General Plan EIR, additional development applications have been submitted to the City of Mountain View that are consistent with 2030 General Plan land use designations, but that would result in development intensity in the San Antonio Change Area beyond the level that was analyzed in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Specifically, for purposes of environmental review, the 2030 General Plan EIR assumed a net increase of approximately 1,870 housing units, 560,000 square feet (sf) of retail space and 79,000 sf of office space under the 2030 General Plan over baseline conditions (2009). This level of development was less than the theoretical maximum buildout based on land use controls established in the 2030 General Plan and evaluated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. At the time the 2030 General Plan EIR was prepared, these were considered reasonable assumptions of actual buildout.

Due to unanticipated development opportunities, the City has sought to allow an additional 800,000 sf of office space and 170 lodging rooms in the San Antonio Change Area. The City has also reallocated approximately 330 housing units and 80,000 sf of retail space from the San Antonio Change Area to other areas within the city. In order for the 2030 General Plan EIR to continue to be used as the basis for CEQA analyses of future projects, the City is evaluating these changes to the 2030 General Plan EIR buildout assumptions to determine the extent to which they would change the significance determinations of the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the "Project" evaluated in this SEIR is not a change in land use policy, but is instead the evaluation of a net new total square footage of development in the San Antonio Change Area of approximately 879,000 sf of office and 170 lodging rooms, and a 120,000 sf decrease in retail. Directly related to the analysis of additional office space and lodging

rooms, this SEIR also analyzes increases in the assumptions for projected employment in the San Antonio Change Area.

The maximum amount of development being evaluated under the Project is consistent with the land use designations, goals, and policies of the approved 2030 General Plan, including the allowed floor-to-area ratio (FAR) for office development. Therefore, no amendment to the 2030 General Plan is necessary nor is any amendment proposed.

Based on the defined FARs in the 2030 General Plan, approximately 2.9 million sf of office space could be accommodated in the San Antonio Change Area, a net increase of approximately 1.68 million sf above the 2009 baseline. Therefore, the 879,000 sf of office space analyzed in this SEIR is consistent with the land use policy for buildout under the General Plan because it is within the total office square footage that could be accommodated in the San Antonio Change Area. Similarly, the FARs in the General Plan would allow for an increase of approximately 6,000 dwelling units or hotel rooms in the Change Area, so the increase of 170 lodging rooms and 1,540 housing units (1,870 units analyzed in the 2030 General Plan EIR minus the 330 units reallocated to other areas of the City) is consistent with land use policy as well. However, the analysis in the 2030 General Plan EIR relied on land use assumptions that were less than the maximum intensity permitted by the General Plan. The proposed net new total allowable development is also less than the maximum intensity permitted by the General Plan, but reflects additional, previously unperceived development opportunities.

2.2 Project Objectives

The primary objective of the Mountain View 2030 General Plan (adopted in July 2012) is to establish the policy direction for future development and preservation within Mountain View's planning areas. The primary objective of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program (GGRP) is to implement the General Plan and comply with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and statewide guidelines that establish an efficiency standard for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. None of the objectives of the 2030 General Plan or the GGRP have changed for the purposes of evaluation in this Draft SEIR.

The City has established the following objectives for the proposed changes to land use assumptions in the San Antonio Change Area (i.e., the Project).

- Identify Citywide impacts and mitigations related to new office development in the San Antonio Change Area.
- Use new information of likely impacts and feasible mitigations in assessing new office development.
- Streamline future development review by updating the buildout assumptions of the 2030 General Plan EIR through adoption of a SEIR, thereby allowing the use of the various "tiering" options provided under the CEQA Guidelines.

2.3 Alternatives

The following four alternatives were analyzed in the 2030 General Plan EIR. No additional alternatives, beyond those analyzed in the 2030 General Plan EIR, were developed and analyzed for this San Antonio Change Area SEIR. Although the City is amending certain assumptions in the 2030 General Plan EIR, there are no proposed changes to the 2030 General Plan and additional alternatives did not need to be developed.

- **No Project Alternative**, required by CEQA, assumes that the Draft General Plan and GGRP would not be adopted or implemented and that development would continue in accordance with the 1992 General Plan.
- **Lower Intensity Alternative** assumes that there would be less intensive development in the specified change areas, allowing for fewer jobs and less housing in the North Bayshore and East Whisman Change Areas and along transportation corridors by 2030.
- **Increased Housing Alternative** assumes that there would be more intensive residential development close to jobs and is intended to substantially reduce the city's per capita VMT per service population to the level associated with existing conditions.
- **North Bayshore Alternative** assumes that the area will concentrate on and continue its role as a regional

high-tech employment center and will not include a residential component.

Pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, no additional alternatives were developed and analyzed for this Subsequent EIR because, although the City is amending land use assumptions in the 2030 General Plan EIR, no changes are proposed to be made to the 2030 General Plan or its goals and policies. Because the City is not changing the 2030 General Plan, none of the alternatives found to be infeasible in 2012 with adoption of the General Plan are now feasible.

SECTION 3: FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS-THAN-SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE AND A NEW IMPACT THAT WILL BE REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, the SEIR identifies new and substantially more severe significant effects that could result from the Project. Although not required under Section 15091, the City finds that the following impacts resulting from the Project are different than, but not substantially more severe than the impacts identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. For a detailed description of impacts, see the appropriate text in the Final SEIR.

3.1 Transportation and Circulation

Impact TRA-1: Increase in daily vehicle miles traveled per service population over the existing condition.

The 2030 General Plan Final EIR found this to be a significant and unavoidable impact. Similar to the 2030 General Plan Final EIR, implementation of changed land use assumptions in the SEIR for the San Antonio Change Area would result in an increase in VMT per service population, resulting in a significant impact. Specifically, VMT per service population is projected to increase to 19.2 daily VMT per service population in 2030 from the existing value of 18.3 (2009 baseline). This is a slight decrease in the 19.3 VMT per service population projected for buildout of the 2030 General Plan under the land use projections in the Final EIR, but would still result in a significant impact. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 was recommended in the 2030 General Plan EIR to reduce VMT per service population through a multi-modal transportation monitoring policy that requires the City to monitor progress on effectiveness of VMT policies and to maintain LOS D or E for most intersections and roadway segments.

Implementation of the changed land use assumptions in the San Antonio Change Area would slightly decrease VMT projections from those in the 2030 General Plan EIR. So, the significance determination for the Project would be essentially the same as in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the impact has been adequately analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR.

Impact TRA-2: Increase in daily vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operation on roadway segments.

As analyzed in the 2030 General Plan EIR (refer to pages 160–166 in the 2030 General Plan EIR), implementation of the General Plan would increase motor vehicle traffic and congestion throughout the city, which would result in degraded roadway segment levels of service below acceptable thresholds on several roadway study segments, as summarized in Table IV.C-2 of the SEIR. This impact was identified as significant and unavoidable in the 2030 General Plan EIR.

Similar to the 2030 General Plan EIR, implementation of changed land use assumptions in the San Antonio Change Area would increase motor vehicle traffic and congestion, which would result in a significant impact on the same roadway segments identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. However, as shown in Table IV.C-2 of the SEIR, level of service impacts would be less severe under the Project than found in the 2030 General Plan EIR for the following segment: Rengstorff Avenue between southbound US 101 ramps and Middlefield Way would improve from LOS F to LOS E. Therefore, the impact has been adequately analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR.

Impact TRA-3: Increase in daily vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operation on freeway segments.

Under the VTA and Caltrans traffic impact analysis guidelines, a project would have a significant impact on freeway segments if the addition of project traffic would cause the freeway segments to exceed their level of service standards or cause the freeway segments that currently exceed their level of service standards to exceed 1

percent of the segments capacity. As analyzed in the 2030 General Plan EIR (refer to pages 166–176 in the 2030 General Plan EIR), implementation of the 2030 General Plan would increase motor vehicle traffic and congestion throughout the city. This would result in degraded freeway segment levels of service below acceptable thresholds on several freeway study segments, as summarized in Table IV.C-3 of the SEIR. This impact was identified as significant and unavoidable in the 2030 General Plan EIR.

Similar to the 2030 General Plan EIR, implementation of changed land use assumptions in the San Antonio Change Area would increase motor vehicle traffic and congestion, which would result in a significant impact on the same freeway segments identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. However, as shown in Table IV.C-3, level of service impacts would be less severe under the Project than found in the 2030 General Plan EIR for the following segment: Northbound US 101 from SR 237 to Ellis Street would improve from LOS F to LOS E. Therefore, the impact has been adequately analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR.

Impact TRA-4: Increase in peak hour vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operation on adjacent jurisdiction roadway segments.

As analyzed in the 2030 General Plan EIR (refer to pages 177–184 in the 2030 General Plan EIR), the implementation of the 2030 General Plan would increase motor vehicle traffic and congestion on roadways in communities outside the City of Mountain View. As summarized in Table IV.C-4 of the SEIR, the traffic resulting from buildout of the General Plan would have a significant impact on the deficient roadways in Los Altos, Palo Alto, and Sunnyvale. This is because on 25 percent or more of the deficient roadway lane miles in these communities, more than 10 percent of the traffic volumes would be contributed by the Project during the AM or PM peak hour.

Similar to the 2030 General Plan EIR, implementation of a higher land use projections in the SEIR for the San Antonio Change Area would increase motor vehicle traffic and congestion, which would result in a significant impact on the major roadways of the same communities (Los Altos, Palo Alto, and Sunnyvale) identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. However, as shown in Table IV.C-4 of the SEIR, for the AM peak hours for Los Altos and Sunnyvale and the PM peak hour for Los Altos and Palo Alto, the percentages of the deficient roadway lane miles with the Project were identified to be slightly lower than described in the 2030 General Plan EIR because the changes in land use assumptions both within the Change Area as well as citywide would alter the origins and destinations of anticipated vehicle trips and affect the travel routes to and from the Change Area. The impact is significant, but not more severe than the significant impact disclosed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the impact has been adequately analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR.

3.2 Air Quality

Impact AQ-2b: Violation of a BAAQMD air quality standard or substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation from Project operation.

The 2030 General Plan EIR (pages 226-228) states that the GGRP could contribute to or result in a violation of air quality standards in the existing and cumulative conditions by increasing VMT at a rate greater than the rate of population increase. The additional 800,000 sf of office space and 170 hotel rooms being analyzed under the Project would provide additional employment opportunities and thus increase employee vehicle trips within the General Plan area. Table IV.D-2 of the SEIR summarizes the change in VMT, population growth and employment growth, service population, and VMT per service population associated with the additional office and hotel land uses within the San Antonio Change Area. As shown in Table IV.D-2 of the SEIR, implementation of these changed land use assumptions in the San Antonio Change Area would result in an increase in VMT, population growth, employment, service population, and VMT per service population over existing conditions (2009 scenario) that is generally similar to what was disclosed in the 2030 General Plan EIR (see Columns D and F in Table IV.D-2 of the SEIR for a comparison of changes relative to existing [2009] conditions associated with this SEIR and the 2030 General Plan EIR). Relative to the previous General Plan buildout that was identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR, total VMT is expected to increase approximately 1.1 percent while employment is expected to increase approximately 3.8 percent, resulting in the service population increasing approximately 1.7 percent. Thus, the growth in VMT is lower than the growth in service population by approximately 6.8 percent. This difference between VMT and service population growth is less than the

difference identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR, which was approximately 7.4 percent. (See Footnote 2 in Table IV.D-2 of the SEIR for a discussion of how 6.8 percent and 7.4 percent are calculated.)

The Project would result in a 1.1 percent increase in daily VMT over the forecast in the 2030 General Plan EIR. This would marginally increase the severity of this significant impact identified in the 2030 General Plan. However, because the increase in severity is not substantial, the impact has been adequately analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR.

Impact AQ-3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant

The 2030 General Plan EIR (pages 228–229) states that the 2030 General Plan and GGRP would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any pollutant, as growth in VMT would exceed growth in service population within Mountain View. As discussed in the SEIR under Impacts AQ-1 and AQ-2b, numerous goals and policies within the Mobility, Land Use, and Infrastructure and Conservation Elements of the 2030 General Plan would help to reduce the cumulative contribution of pollutants within the City by promoting actions consistent with the Clean Air Plan. For example, General Plan Policy MOB 9.2 supports development and transportation improvements that help reduce per capita VMT. As discussed in Impact AQ-2b, the assumption of additional office and hotel land uses within the San Antonio Change Area would result in an increase in VMT that is less than the magnitude forecasted to the 2030 General Plan EIR. Accordingly, although the impact on air quality is significant and unavoidable, the Project’s impact is not more severe than the impact disclosed in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the impact has been adequately analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR.

3.3 Noise

Impact NOI-3: Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels

A significant impact would occur if the Project would result in a substantial (5 dBA or greater) permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above existing levels without the Project. The 2030 General Plan EIR projected that traffic volumes along some roadway and freeway segments in the city would increase due to growth envisioned in the General Plan. This increase in traffic volumes under the 2030 General Plan condition would result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels along roadway segments identified in the SEIR.

As described under Impact NOI-1, although implementing the Project would result in traffic pattern changes and increased traffic volume on some roadway segments, as listed in Table IV.F-2 of the SEIR, the change or increase in traffic noise levels would not be more than 1 dBA greater than that identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. This is not considered a substantial increase in traffic noise levels beyond what was previously identified. Therefore, the Project would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of significant traffic noise impacts on roadway segments analyzed. Therefore, the impact has been adequately analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR.

3.4 Public Services

Impact PS-1a: Reduced service ratios and response times for fire and police protection during construction.

The Project would result in a new impact on public services. Construction of future projects in the San Antonio Change Area could result in temporary closure of traffic lanes and subsequent disturbance of traffic patterns. This could result in significant delays in response times for both police and fire protection services. All construction activities associated with future development in the Change Area would be temporary and all building plans would be subject to review by the City and the Mountain View Fire Department (MVFD) prior to the issuance of any building permits. Regarding the need for increased police services during construction, site-specific construction activities would be secured and enclosed by a chain-link fence and it is not anticipated that significant new service calls to the police department would result. Additionally, future construction activities are unlikely to materially or permanently increase the need for emergency fire protection services.

Emergency access to the Change Area could be affected during construction of future projects. Temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles.

Mitigation Measure PS-MM-1 will reduce this impact to a less than significant level by ensuring emergency access to the San Antonio Change Area.

PS-MM-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan.

Prior to issuance of grading permits, the construction contractor will develop a traffic control plan in accordance with the City’s policies and submit for City approval. The plan will be implemented throughout the course of project construction and may include, but will not be limited to, the following elements.

1. Limit truck access to the project site during peak commute times (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.).
2. Require that written notification be provided to contractors regarding appropriate routes to and from the project site, and the weight and speed limits on local roads used to access the project site.
3. Provide access for emergency vehicles at all times.
4. Provide adequate onsite parking for construction employees, site visitors, and inspectors as feasible.
5. Maintain pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation during project construction where safe to do so. If construction encroaches on a sidewalk, a safe detour will be provided for pedestrians at the nearest crosswalk. If construction encroaches on a bike lane, warning signs will be posted that indicate bicycles and vehicles are sharing the roadway.
6. Require traffic controls in the project area and the project entrance driveway, including flag persons wearing bright orange or red vests and using a “Stop/Slow” paddle to control oncoming traffic.
7. Post standard construction warning signs in advance of the construction area and at any intersection that provides access to the construction area.
8. Repair or restore the road right-of-way to its original condition or better upon completion of the work.

SECTION 4: FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES

Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines provides that a SEIR must examine alternatives when “new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete” shows that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, or mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

4.1 Mitigation Measures

One new feasible mitigation measure, beyond those identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR and adopted with the findings on that EIR, is identified in the SEIR. Mitigation Measure PS-1 will be implemented to reduce the Project’s impact on public services to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure PS-MM-1 would require the construction contractor for any development project to develop a traffic control plan in accordance with the City’s policies. This mitigation would ensure emergency access to the Change Area.

Eight recommended mitigation measures were submitted by agencies commenting on the Draft SEIR. None of the recommended mitigation measures have been incorporated into the SEIR. These measures are listed below, with the reasons for their rejection.

Table 1: Recommended Mitigation Measures

Recommended Measure (comment number)	Commenting Agency	Reason for Rejection
Additional transit and active transportation strategies (2-5)	Caltrans	<p>The 2030 General Plan EIR mitigation measures identified in the SEIR are not the only methods by which the City is reducing traffic impacts. The City has already enacted transit and active transportation strategies for the San Antonio Change Area as part of its General Plan policies. Examples include:</p> <p><i>LUD 21.4: Improved pedestrian and bicycle circulation.</i> Support improved pedestrian and bicycle circulation and connectivity throughout the area.</p> <p><i>LUD 22.6: Improved mobility.</i> Support improved mobility within San Antonio Center for vehicles, transit, bicyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p><i>LUD 22.7: Improved bicycle and pedestrian connections.</i> Promote improved bicycle and pedestrian connections to the San Antonio Caltrain station, El Camino Real bus service, adjacent neighborhoods and the citywide bicycle and pedestrian network.</p> <p>The Mobility Element of the General Plan provides additional strategies, including the following policies:</p> <p><i>MOB 1.2: Accommodating all modes.</i> Plan, design and construct new transportation improvement projects to safely accommodate the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, motorists and persons of all abilities.</p> <p><i>MOB 5.1: Transit agencies.</i> Coordinate with local and regional transit agencies including Metropolitan Transportation Commission, VTA, JPB (Caltrain), SamTrans and the California High-Speed Rail Authority to improve transportation service, infrastructure and access in the city.</p> <p><i>MOB 5.5: Access to transit services.</i> Support right-of-way design and amenities consistent with local transit goals to make it easier to get to transit services and improve transit as a viable alternative to driving.</p> <p>These strategies provide an existing policy framework for transit and active transportation strategies similar to the mitigation requested by the commenter.</p>
Participation in the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) voluntary contribution program for the regional transportation program (2-9)	Caltrans	At this time, there is no county or regional transportation impact fee program that would apply to the Project Area. The VTA is the agency responsible for planning and implementing improvements on regional transportation facilities in Santa Clara County.

Recommended Measure (comment number)	Commenting Agency	Reason for Rejection
		<p>The City of Mountain View would support and participate in development of a regional fee program should it be proposed by VTA or other relevant agency. In the event that a regional transportation impact fee is established, projects developed consistent with the Project Area could be required to pay the fee as part of their impact mitigation strategy.</p>
<p>Prepare a Multimodal Improvement Plan to provide an alternative to auto capacity increasing mitigation measures for significant impacts to CMP facilities (3-2)</p>	<p>VTA</p>	<p>The 2030 General Plan EIR mitigation measures identified in the SEIR are not the only methods by which the City is reducing traffic impacts. The City has already adopted this suggestion as a General Plan goal and policies in the Mobility Element. Thus, a framework already exists to implement multimodal improvements.</p> <p><i>Goal MOB-8: Transportation performance measures that help implement larger City goals.</i></p> <p><i>MOB 8.1: Multi-modal performance measures.</i> Develop performance measures and indicators for all modes of transportation, including performance targets that vary by street type and location.</p> <p><i>MOB 8.2: Level of service.</i> Ensure performance measurement criteria optimize travel by each mode.</p> <p><i>MOB 8.3: Multi-modal transportation monitoring.</i> Monitor the effectiveness of policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per service population by establishing transportation mode share targets and periodically comparing travel survey data to established targets.</p>
<p>A voluntary contribution to regional transportation improvements may be a feasible and reasonable mitigation measure to reduce the level of transportation impacts for the project (3-4)</p>	<p>VTA</p>	<p>At this time, there is no county or regional transportation impact fee program that would apply to the Project Area. The VTA is the agency responsible for planning and implementing improvements on regional transportation facilities in Santa Clara County. The City of Mountain View would support and participate in development of a regional fee program should it be proposed by VTA or other relevant agency. In the event that a regional transportation impact fee is established, projects developed consistent with the Project Area could be required to pay the fee as part of their impact mitigation strategy.</p>
<p>Establish requirements for future developments in the San Antonio Change Area to adopt Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Trip Reduction measures (3-5)</p>	<p>VTA</p>	<p>The 2030 General Plan EIR mitigation measures identified in the SEIR are not the only methods by which the City is reducing traffic impacts. The City already has enacted TDM strategies as part of its General Plan policies.</p>

Recommended Measure (comment number)	Commenting Agency	Reason for Rejection
		<p><i>MOB 10.2: Reduced travel demand.</i> Promote effective TDM programs for existing and new development.</p> <p>The City also adopted specific TDM requirements in the San Antonio Precise Plan area (December 2014), which establishes trip reduction targets above and beyond the targets adopted in the GGRP.</p>
<p>The City of Mountain View should collect fees for the fair share cost of feasible mitigations in adjacent communities and place them in an escrow account for future improvements (4-4)</p>	<p>City of Palo Alto (Palo Alto)</p>	<p>Currently, no cross-jurisdictional program is in place to fund local improvements in adjacent communities. Because no program is in place and no specific improvements have been identified, the proposed mitigation measure is speculative.</p>
<p>Where Significant and Unavoidable mitigation is referenced due to "increase in daily vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operation" is assumed, local and regional program mitigation should be discussed and considered in the DEIR including local-sponsored transit programs to serve the Change Area. Consider partnering with the City of Palo Alto, the Valley Transportation Authority, or other local transit operators to expand a more robust transit system to help create better transit links for the Change Area. (4-5)</p>	<p>Palo Alto</p>	<p>The 2030 General Plan EIR mitigation measures identified in the SEIR are not the only methods by which the City is reducing traffic impacts. The following General Plan policies already include the suggested mitigation.</p> <p><i>LUD 2.3: Local collaboration.</i> Collaborate with neighboring jurisdictions on issues of mutual interest.</p> <p><i>MOB 5.1: Transit agencies.</i> (see above)</p> <p><i>MOB 5.3: Local transportation services.</i> Create or partner with transit providers, employers, educational institutions, major commercial entities and event organizers to improve local transportation services.</p> <p><i>MOB 5.4: Connecting key areas.</i> Identify and implement new or enhanced transit services to connect Downtown, El Camino Real, San Antonio, North Bayshore, East Whisman and NASA Ames Research Park.</p> <p>The City already has enacted local, collaborative transit programs, including separate community shuttle (citywide) and employment center shuttle services.</p>
<p>Feasible mitigation, although costly, can include the reconstruction of roadway facilities over Central Expressway to support bicycle/pedestrian connections (4-6)</p>	<p>Palo Alto</p>	<p>The City of Mountain View recently completed a Pedestrian Master Plan (2014) to improve access to transit, connect the pedestrian network throughout the city, and improve access to employment and retail centers. A major update to the City's Bicycle Transportation Plan (previously dated 2008) is planned for circulation in 2015. The City has also initiated a Multimodal Improvement Plan.</p>

4.2 Alternatives

Pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, no additional alternatives were developed and analyzed for this SEIR because, although the City is amending land use assumptions in the 2030 General Plan EIR, no changes are proposed to be made to the 2030 General Plan or its goals and policies. Because the City is not changing the 2030 General Plan, none of the alternatives found to be infeasible in 2012 with adoption of the General Plan are now feasible. Similarly, because the impacts identified in the SEIR relate to development that is already allowable under the General Plan, there are no other alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the 2030 General Plan EIR.

4.2.1 Project Alternatives

The 2030 General Plan EIR analyzed four alternatives to the 2030 General Plan: the No Project Alternative, the Lower Intensity Alternative, the Increased Housing Alternative, and the North Bayshore Alternative. The reasons for finding each of these alternatives infeasible are described below and paraphrase the findings for the 2030 General Plan EIR. These reasons have not changed with certification of the Final SEIR.

4.2.1.1 No Project Alternative

The CEQA Guidelines stipulate that an EIR specifically include a “No Project” alternative. The purpose in including a No Project alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project. The Guidelines specifically advise that the No Project alternative is “what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project is not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” The Guidelines emphasize that an EIR should take a practical approach, and not “...create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment [Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B)].”

Under the No Project Alternative, the 2030 General Plan and GGRP would not have been adopted or implemented and development would have continued in accordance with the 1992 General Plan. This alternative assumed the full implementation (by 2030) of development envisioned under the 1992 General Plan, which would result in a total of approximately 80,580 persons, 38,270 dwelling units, and 68,370 jobs. This alternative would result in approximately 7,990 fewer residents, 3,970 fewer dwelling units, and 13,860 fewer jobs than would result under the 2030 General Plan. Under this alternative the 1992 General Plan policy framework would continue to be in effect, which represents a business-as-usual approach to regulating land use in the City.

The City of Mountain View found that the No Project Alternative would retain land use configurations that would hinder the City’s ability to accommodate regional employment and housing demand and would not encourage the City’s business climate to the same extent as the 2030 General Plan. The No Project Alternative would not include adoption and implementation of the TDM programs and GGRP, and was found to be infeasible because it would not fully meet any of the Project objectives.

4.2.1.2 Lower Intensity Alternative

The Lower Intensity alternative assumed that there would be less intensive development in the specified change areas (at an FAR of approximately 0.75), specifically allowing for fewer jobs and less housing in the North Bayshore and East Whisman change areas and along transportation corridors by 2030. The level of development would be higher than under the No Project Alternative but less than under the 2030 General Plan. This alternative assumed TDM programs and GGRP measures that would be adopted in conjunction with the 2030 General Plan. At full implementation of the Lower Intensity alternative in 2030, the City would contain a population of 84,750 with 40,340 dwelling units and 76,380 jobs. Compared to the 2030 General Plan, the Lower Intensity alternative would result in 3,820 fewer residents, 1,900 fewer dwelling units, and 5,850 fewer jobs.

The City of Mountain View found that under this alternative, population and job growth and development intensity would be reduced in the North Bayshore and East Whisman areas. Along major transportation corridors, including El Camino Real, development intensity would also be reduced compared to the 2030 General Plan. This reduced development intensity would be visible in the built environment in the form of shorter structures, reduced building footprints, and additional open space and/or surface parking.

The Lower Intensity alternative would include adoption and implementation of the GGRP. Therefore, the various transportation, energy, and water conservation measures and actions that are incorporated in the GGRP would be implemented City-wide. However, development would still be less intensive under this alternative than the 2030 General Plan.

This alternative would likely have similar environmental impacts as the 2030 General Plan. Additionally, the Lower Intensity alternative would generally achieve all of the objectives of the 2030 General Plan and GGRP, but not to the extent of the project. For all of the foregoing reasons, and for any of them individually, the City rejected the Lower Intensity alternative.

4.2.1.3 Increased Housing Alternative

The Increased Housing alternative was intended to substantially reduce the City's per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and achieve other environmental benefits by providing additional housing in the City in close proximity to jobs. This alternative was intended to improve the City's jobs-to-housing ratio, which is characterized by a jobs-heavy imbalance and contributes to the City's existing commuter traffic levels. The amount of housing that would be developed under the Increased Housing alternative would exceed that of the 2030 General Plan (and the No Project Alternative, Lower Intensity Alternative, and North Bayshore Alternative). The Increased Housing Alternative assumed adoption of the TDM programs and GGRP measures that would be adopted in conjunction with the 2030 General Plan. At full implementation of the Increased Housing alternative in 2030, the City would contain a population of 106,320 with 50,870 dwelling units and 82,230 jobs. Compared to the 2030 General Plan, the Increased Housing alternative would result in 17,750 additional residents, 8,630 additional dwelling units, and the same number of jobs.

The additional housing that would be developed under the alternative would be located primarily in three change areas: the North Bayshore, El Camino Real and in the San Antonio change areas.

The Increased Housing alternative would include adoption and implementation of the GGRP. Therefore, the various transportation, energy, and water conservation measures and actions that are incorporated in the GGRP would be implemented City-wide. These measures would tend to encourage compact, transit-oriented development and reduced dependence on private motor vehicles.

The City of Mountain View found that the Increased Housing alternative would fully achieve all fourteen of the objectives of the Draft General Plan and GGRP. The alternative would achieve these objectives primarily by creating a development pattern that is characterized by intensive development in change areas, increased transit use, and an expanded housing supply located in close proximity to jobs. However, the more intensive development (when compared to the 2030 General Plan) would likely increase public services, utilities, and visual resources impacts. For all of the foregoing reasons, and for any of them individually, the City rejects the Increased Housing alternative.

4.2.1.4 North Bayshore Alternative

The North Bayshore alternative assumed that the North Bayshore area will concentrate on and continue its role as a regional high-tech employment center and will not include a residential component. In addition to a decrease of 1,110 housing units and 2,240 residents from the 2030 General Plan, this alternative also assumed that there would be a reduction of 500,000 square feet of commercial/office uses and 1,410 jobs in the North Bayshore area when compared to the 2030 General Plan.

The North Bayshore area would include a high density mix of commercial and research and development (R&D) land uses to promote employment growth and more diverse and accessible services and retail uses to serve workers and Mountain View residents. The distribution of new housing units and jobs under the North Bayshore alternative would be different than under the 2030 General Plan. In particular, housing would not be included in North Bayshore although the land use designations and an allowable FAR of up to 1.0 for the North Bayshore Mixed-Use land use designation would allow for the expansion and location of high-tech companies. Other areas of the City would develop and grow as described for the 2030 General Plan and would include increased development around major transportation corridors and transit hubs, the village center concept, and development of higher-intensity mixed uses in neighborhood centers.

In addition and similar to the proposed project, the North Bayshore alternative includes adoption and implementation of the TDM programs and GGRP. Specifically, the measures and actions in the GGRP encompassing a broad range of categories, including transportation, energy, and water, would be implemented. From a physical environmental perspective, the GGRP measures would result in more development of green buildings and infrastructure, effective development of transit-oriented projects, less greenhouse gas emissions, and more water and energy conservation similar to the 2030 General Plan.

The City of Mountain View selected the North Bayshore alternative as the preferred alternative in the certified 2030 General Plan EIR. The City amended the General Plan to remove residential from North Bayshore.

SECTION 5: FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS

The Final SEIR identifies significant environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the Project. The Project would result in transportation impacts, and no feasible mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore certain impacts to transportation would remain significant unavoidable impacts of the Project.

5.1 Transportation and Circulation

Impact TRA-2: Increase in daily vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operation on roadway segments. (Individual and Cumulative Impacts)

As discussed in Impact TRA-2, the Project would result in significant impacts on some roadway segments due to an increase in motor vehicle traffic on degraded roadways, and would cause one additional segment, San Antonio Road between Central Expressway and California Street, to exceed its level of service threshold, in addition to segments identified in the 2030 General Plan Final EIR.

This impact would occur at both the Project-level and the Cumulative-level. Cumulative development would add more motor vehicle trips on roadway segments throughout the city, with the greater traffic increase on segments closer to the Change Area. The cumulative scenario also considers potential future growth in the East Whisman Change Area, which is about 3.5 miles east of the Project on the other side of the city. Growth in the East Whisman Change Area is considered in the cumulative analysis because, similar to the Project, growth projections considered in the General Plan EIR in the East Whisman Change Area are proposed to be increased over what was originally analyzed. The San Antonio Change Area and East Whisman Change Area projects, together, make up the cumulative analysis presented in the SEIR because these two areas of the City were the only areas being projected to be modified from the General Plan EIR at the time SEIR analysis was prepared. Cumulative vehicle trips generating from each Change Area would be diverted and reduced with increased distance from the Change Area. Accordingly, cumulative development would result in a slight traffic increase on roadway segments near the San Antonio Change Area. As illustrated in Table VI-3 of the SEIR, cumulative development would affect the same segments identified in Impact TRA-2. Therefore, the significance determination for this cumulative impact is the same as the individual impact discussed in Impact TRA-2. Cumulative development would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact on roadway segments, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-2b, as identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final SEIR.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR.

Basis for Findings: The City has adopted reasonable mitigation for this impact, however that mitigation cannot fully avoid the impact. Mitigation Measure TRANS-2b states:

To improve the LOS, the roadway segments can be widened to meet the citywide level of service standard. Widening roadways will result in improved levels of service and decreased vehicle delays; however, the additional pavement width and crossing distance conflicts with the City's multi-modal goals and desire to better balance transportation investments. Alternatively, the City can consider potential operational improvements such

as signal timing and coordination, to ensure that the roadway system is optimized for safe and efficient traffic flow where these improvements are feasible and under the authority and jurisdiction of the City to implement. In the case of San Antonio Road between SB US 101 Ramps and Charleston Road, implementation of roadway widening cannot be guaranteed because this roadway segment is located outside of the City of Mountain View's jurisdiction. While signal timing and coordination may reduce levels of service impacts on some roadways, the City cannot be certain at this time that such improvements would fully mitigate these impacts and no other feasible mitigation measures have been identified as part of this General Plan planning-level analysis. Due to the conflicts with the City's multi-modal policies and physical constraints, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable under Draft General Plan Conditions 2030.

As explained in the measure itself, the mitigation measure would not fully mitigate impacts because the roadway widening improvements could potentially conflict with the City's multi-modal policies and are limited by physical constraints in the form of existing structures; and it cannot be ascertained at this time that the operational improvements would fully mitigate the impacts.

Impact TRA-3: Increase in daily vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operation on freeway segments. (Individual and Cumulative Impacts)

As discussed in Impact TRA-3, the Project would result in a significant impact on some freeway segments due to an increase in motor vehicle traffic on degraded freeway segments. The Project's impact is not substantially more severe than the impacts identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR, with two exceptions, as described in Table IV.C-3 of the SEIR. Northbound SR 85 from Evelyn Avenue to Moffett Boulevard would operate at LOS D under the Project, an increase in the LOS C identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Southbound SR 85 from El Camino Real to Fremont Avenue would operate at LOS E under the Project, an increase in the LOS D identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Similarly, as described in Table VI-4 of the SEIR, cumulative development in the San Antonio and East Whisman Change Areas would affect the same freeway segments as identified in Impact TRA-3. Accordingly, the significance determination for this cumulative impact is the same as that discussed in Impact TRA-3. Development at the level identified in the Project would result in significant and unavoidable individual and cumulative impacts on freeway segments, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-3a as identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Individual and cumulative impacts related to freeway segment operation would be significant and the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final SEIR.

Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final SEIR.

Basis for Findings: The City has adopted reasonable mitigation for this impact, however that mitigation cannot fully avoid the impact. Mitigation Measure TRANS-3a states:

To improve the LOS, these freeway segments could be widened by one or more freeway lanes to meet the VTA and/or Caltrans level of service standard. While widening these freeways would result in improved levels of service and decreased vehicle delays, most of the freeways serving Mountain View are constrained by the available right of way and funding. Additionally, all of the segments are under Caltrans jurisdiction and the City of Mountain View cannot ensure that improvements to freeway segments are made.

No feasible new mitigation measures have been identified. There is no county or regional transportation impact fee program that would apply to the Project. The SCVTA is the agency responsible for planning and implementing improvements on regional transportation facilities in Santa Clara County. The City of Mountain View would support and participate in development of a regional fee program should it be proposed by SCVTA or other relevant agency. In the event that a regional transportation impact fee is established, projects developed consistent with the Project could be required to pay the fee as part of their impact mitigation strategy.

As explained in the measure itself, the mitigation measure would not fully mitigate impacts because the freeway widening improvements are constrained by the available right of way, existing development adjoining the right of way limiting the potential for acquiring additional right of way, and funding. In the face of this uncertainty, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact TRA-4: Increase in peak hour vehicle traffic or degradation of traffic operation on adjacent jurisdiction roadway segments. (Individual and Cumulative Impacts)

As analyzed in the 2030 General Plan EIR (refer to pages 177–184 in the 2030 General Plan EIR), the implementation of the General Plan would increase motor vehicle traffic and congestion on roadways in communities outside the City of Mountain View. As summarized in Table IV.C-4 of the SEIR, the traffic resulting from buildout of the General Plan would have a significant impact on the deficient roadways in Los Altos, Palo Alto, and Sunnyvale. This is because on 25 percent or more of the deficient roadway lane miles in these communities, more than 10 percent of the traffic volumes would be contributed by the Project during the AM or PM peak hour. Therefore, the impact was identified as significant. Similarly, as described in Table VI-5 of the SEIR, cumulative traffic resulting from buildout in the San Antonio and East Whisman Change Areas would affect roadways in the same cities as identified in Impact TRA-4. Accordingly, the significance determination for this cumulative impact is the same as that discussed in Impact TRA-4.

The Project’s changes in development assumptions would increase forecasted levels of motor vehicle traffic and congestion, which would result in a significant impact on the major roadways of the same communities (Los Altos, Palo Alto, and Sunnyvale) identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. As shown in Tables IV.C-4 and VI-5 of the SEIR for the AM peak hours for Los Altos and Sunnyvale and the PM peak hour for Los Altos and Palo Alto, the percentages of the deficient roadway lane miles with the Project (Scenario 3) and cumulatively (with the Project and development in the East Whisman Change Area, i.e., Scenario 4) were identified to be slightly lower than the 2030 General Plan EIR and would therefore not be more severe than the significant effect identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR. However, the Project would increase the percentage of deficient land miles in Palo Alto in the AM. This is a substantially more severe impact in comparison to the findings of the 2030 General Plan EIR. As a result, the Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact on a roadway segment.

The 2030 General Plan EIR essentially found that there is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Both of the Mitigation Measures applicable to this impact, TRANS-4a and TRANS-4b of the 2030 General Plan EIR, state that “No feasible mitigation measures are available...”

Findings: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final SEIR.

Basis for Findings: The City has enacted numerous policies as part of the General Plan Mobility Element that encourage: complete streets (MOB 1.1 – 1.6), walkability (MOB 3.1 – 3.5), bikeability (MOB 4.1 – 4.5), transit use (MOB 5.1 – MOB 5.6), vehicle parking efficiency (MOB 7.1 – 7.3), transportation performance measures (MOB 8.1 – 8.3), reduced VMT (MOB 9.2), and vehicles and roadway system efficiency MOB 10.1 – MOB 10.4). Taken as a whole these policies, as applied to future development projects and updated development regulations, will minimize traffic generation by land uses within the City. This in turn minimizes, although it does not avoid, the impact of city-originated traffic on the roads of adjoining cities. No other mitigation is feasible.

SECTION 6: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project against its unavoidable risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered acceptable.² CEQA requires the agency to support, in

² CEQA Guidelines, Section 15093(a).

writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record.³

6.1 Regulatory Benefits

- The Project effectively updates the 2012 EIR that was certified for the 2030 General Plan by analyzing development under the General Plan using the redistributed and more intensive land use assumptions. Although no change is being made to the 2030 General Plan, updating the General Plan EIR enables it to be used as the foundation for analysis of future development projects that otherwise would have exceeded the 2012 EIR's level of analysis.
- Updating the 2030 General Plan EIR clarifies its use as a first tier environmental analysis for future development projects that are consistent with the General Plan. This can streamline the CEQA process for those development projects by allowing the CEQA document to avoid repetitious analyses of impacts that have already been adequately analyzed in the General Plan EIR and SEIR. That, in turn, facilitates the regulatory review process for such development projects.

6.2 Economic Benefits

- The Project will facilitate the revitalization of underutilized sites by simplifying the CEQA process. Future development of a higher land-use intensity, mixed-use development that supports business growth in the City, and higher employment and continued mixed-use growth in the San Antonio Change Area would provide an economic benefit to the City. Development based on the Project's higher land use assumptions will create approximately 2,300 new jobs, increasing the benefits of employment over existing conditions.
- The Project's higher development assumption will advance the vision of the San Antonio Change Area by streamlining the regulatory review of a mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented commercial-retail and employment center adjacent to and inclusive of transit and residential uses. The General Plan includes the following San Antonio Change Area goals and policies that are supported by the Project.

Goal LUD-21: A gateway neighborhood with diverse land uses, public amenities and strong connections to surrounding areas.

Policies

- LUD 21.1: A mix of land uses. Support a mix of commercial land uses serving the neighborhood and the region.
- LUD 21.3: Improved connectivity. Promote improved connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods, destinations and Downtown.
- LUD 21.4: Improved pedestrian and bicycle circulation. Support improved pedestrian and bicycle circulation and connectivity throughout the area.
- The Project will generate revenue for the City through increased property tax revenue and tax revenue from redevelopment within the San Antonio Change Area.

6.3 Social Benefits

- The Project will advance the vision of the San Antonio Change Area by streamlining the regulatory review process. The General Plan includes the following San Antonio Change Area goals and policies that are supported by the Project: Goal LUD-21, Policies LUD 21.1, LUD 21.3, and LUD 21.4.
- The Project will meet the City's land use planning goals for the San Antonio Change Area of the General Plan by streamlining the regulatory review process for a transit-oriented employment center that incorporates a

³ CEQA Guidelines, Section 15093(b).

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan. The General Plan includes the following San Antonio Change Area goals and policies that are supported by the Project: Goal LUD-21 and the following additional goals and policies.

Goal LUD-22: A revitalized San Antonio Center with a diverse mix of uses and connections to adjacent neighborhoods.

Policies

- LUD 21.2: Higher-density residential near transit. Encourage higher-density residential uses near bus and Caltrain stations.
- LUD 22.1: San Antonio Center transformation. Support the transformation of San Antonio Center into a regional mixed-use and commercial destination.
- LUD 22.6: Improved mobility. Support improved mobility within San Antonio Center for vehicles, transit, bicyclists and pedestrians.

6.4 Region-wide or Statewide Environmental Benefits

- The Project will promote compact growth by encouraging higher intensity development that will provide housing and job opportunities at a location near existing infrastructure, with the goal of reducing the region’s overall greenhouse gas emissions by focusing development near transit and utility infrastructure consistent with the Mountain View General Plan, which recognizes the San Antonio Change Area as an important retail-commercial and employment center with residential and commercial growth potential near the Caltrain corridor, and as encouraged by SB 375.
- The intensification of land uses under the Project, will facilitate future development that is consistent with greenhouse gas reduction measures in the Mountain View Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program (GGRP), including, Measure E-1.3 – Non-Residential Lighting Retrofit, Measure E-1.7 – Exceed State Energy Standards in New Non-Residential Development, Measure E-2.3 – Non-Residential Photovoltaic Systems, Measure T-1.1 – Transportation Demand Management. The Project is consistent with the General Plan and therefore is consistent with any of the measures in the GGRP. The more intense land use assumptions evaluated under the Project support the City's efforts to reduce dependency on fossil fuels and nonrenewable energy to decrease its share of GHG emissions and contributions to global climate change and to help make Mountain View a more attractive place to live through implementation of the GGRP and by adding density on underutilized sites served by existing transportation and utility infrastructure. Related General Plan goals and policies that are supported by the Project include:

Goal LUD-3: A diverse, balanced and flexible mix of land uses that supports a strong economy, complete neighborhoods, transit use and community health.

Goal MOB-10: The most effective use of the city’s transportation networks and services.

Policies

- LUD 3.1: Land use and transportation. Focus higher land use intensities and densities within a half-mile of public transit service and along major commute corridors.
- MOB 10.2: Reduce travel demand. Promote effective TDM programs for existing and new development.
- The TDM programs of future development, facilitated by the Project, will be enforceable through:
 - Conditions of approval adopted and enforced by the City.
 - Creation of a third-party monitoring and enforcement mechanism with monetary penalties for non-performance.
- The future development facilitated by the Project could include the following features LEED® features.

- Exceedance of California Energy Code requirements.
- Photovoltaic (PV) arrays.
- Low intensity/energy-efficient lighting.
- Low-flow lavatory faucets, water closets, and urinals.
- Low Water Use landscaping.
- Onsite stormwater runoff treatment.
- Future development facilitated by the Project will reduce solid waste from construction through recycle or salvage, meeting a goal of 50 percent reduction.
- Future development facilitated by the Project will comply with the City of Mountain View’s Zero Waste Plan, reducing the per capita rate for commercial waste. Tenants will be required to recycle waste.

The foregoing benefits provided to the public through approval and implementation of the Project outweigh the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the Project that cannot be mitigated; and each of the benefits of future development facilitated by the Project separately and individually outweighs the potentially unavoidable adverse environmental impact identified in the Final SEIR and therefore finds those impacts to be acceptable.

On balance, as discussed above, the City finds that there are specific considerations associated with the Project that serve to override and outweigh the Project’s significant and potentially unavoidable cumulative traffic impact. Therefore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a), these adverse effects are considered acceptable.

SECTION 7: CONCLUSION; NO RECIRCULATION OF THE EIR IS REQUIRED

The changes and new information provided in the Final SEIR consist of the following.

- Staff-initiated clarifications to the Draft EIR.
- Responses to public comments on the Draft EIR.

This new information does not include identification of new significant impacts associated with the Project or mitigation measures, or new Project alternatives or mitigation measures that warrant consideration.

The City of Mountain View finds that the new information added to the Final SEIR merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications to an adequate SEIR and is not “significant” within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The City of Mountain View further finds that incorporating the new information and corrections does not deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on the Project or its effects, and that no information has been added to the Final SEIR that would warrant recirculation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.1. This finding is based on all the information presented in the Final SEIR and the record of proceedings.

REFERENCES

- City of Mountain View. 2010. The Precise Plan Amendments and San Antonio Center Project Environmental Impact Report. SCH No 2010072044. Prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. December.
- City of Mountain View. 2012. City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan. Prepared by City of Mountain View Community Development Department, Mountain View, CA. Adopted July 10.
- LSA Associates. 2012. City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Environmental Impact Report. SCH No. 2011012069. Prepared for City of Mountain View, CA.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been formulated based upon the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Consideration pursuant to Section 15091 and 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code for the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Final SEIR) prepared for the City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and the City of Mountain View Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program – San Antonio Change Area (proposed project). The MMRP, which is found in Table 1, lists the mitigation measure recommended in the Final SEIR (which includes the Draft SEIR and Response to Comments documents) prepared for the proposed project, and identifies mitigation monitoring requirements. The Final MMRP must be adopted when the City Council makes a final decision on the project. The MMRP prepared for the 2030 General Plan EIR was adopted in June 2012. All mitigation measures in the 2030 General Plan EIR continue to apply.

This MMRP has been prepared to comply with the requirements of State law (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6). State law requires the adoption of an MMRP when mitigation measures are required to avoid significant impacts. The MMRP is intended to ensure compliance during implementation of the project.

The MMRP is organized in a matrix format. The first column identifies the environmental impacts. The second column, entitled "Mitigation Measures," refers to the recommended mitigation measures. The third column, entitled "Responsibility for Compliance," refers to the entity responsible for mitigation measure implementation. The fourth column, entitled "Method of Compliance and Oversight of Implementation," refers to the manner in which the mitigation measure is implemented, and who has oversight over ensuring implementation of the mitigation measure. The fifth column, entitled "Timing of Compliance," details when monitoring will occur to ensure that the mitigating action is completed.



MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM
City of Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas
Reduction Program San Antonio Change Area
State Clearinghouse # 2013092026

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation and Avoidance Measures	Responsibility for Compliance	Method of Compliance and Oversight of Implementation	Timing of Compliance
PUBLIC SERVICES				
<p>Impact PSR-1a: Reduced service ratios and response times for fire and police protection during construction.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PS-MM-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of grading permits, the construction contractor will develop the traffic control plan in accordance with City’s policies and submit for City approval. The plan will be implemented throughout the course of project construction and may include, but will not be limited to, the following elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit truck access to the project site during peak commute times (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.). • Require that written notification be provided to contractors regarding appropriate routes to and from the project site, and the weight and speed limits on local roads used to access the project site. • Provide access for emergency vehicles at all times. • Provide adequate onsite parking for construction employees, site visitors, and inspectors as feasible. • Maintain pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation during project construction where safe to do so. If construction encroaches on a sidewalk, a safe detour will be provided for pedestrians at the nearest crosswalk. If construction encroaches on a bike lane, warning signs will be posted that indicate bicycles and vehicles are sharing the roadway. • Require traffic controls in the project area and the project entrance driveway, including flag persons wearing bright orange or red vests and using a “Stop/Slow” paddle to control oncoming traffic. • Post standard construction warning signs in advance of the construction area and at any intersection that provides access to the construction area. • Repair or restore the road right-of-way to its original condition or better upon completion of the work. 	<p>City of Mountain View Public Works Department and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Implementation and continued monitoring of identified mitigation measure to maintain service ratios and response times for fire and police protection during construction</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>