

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW
RESOLUTION NO.
SERIES 2014

A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE SAN ANTONIO PRECISE PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ADOPTING CEQA FINDINGS,
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 an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the San Antonio Precise Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mountain View prepared and circulated for public comment a Draft EIR, held a public hearing on the Draft EIR before the Environmental Planning Commission on September 17, 2014, and gave all public notices in the manner and at the times required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR, which includes the Draft EIR and response to comments document for the San Antonio Precise Plan, was presented to the City Council on December 2, 2014, and the City Council has reviewed the Final EIR 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 EIR identifies certain significant effects on the environment that would result from the implementation of the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR identifies mitigation measures which, when implemented, will substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects on the environment caused by the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR 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 EIR and the potentially

significant environmental effects of the project as shown in the Final EIR for the San Antonio Precise Plan, that the Council:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA and reflects the independent judgment of the City Council; and
2. Adopts the CEQA findings for the project, attached hereto as Exhibit A; and
3. Adopts all of the feasible mitigation measures identified and described in the Final EIR and determines that the project, as mitigated, will avoid or reduce all of the significant adverse impacts to a less-than-significant level; and
4. Finds that the alternatives identified and analyzed in the Final EIR 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/7/RESO
803-12-02-14r-E

San Antonio Precise Plan

CEQA FINDINGS

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

November 7, 2014

The Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared by the City of Mountain View (City) for the San Antonio Precise Plan consists of the Draft EIR (including the Initial Study in Appendix A of the Draft EIR) and Response to Comments Document on the Draft EIR. The Final EIR identifies significant environmental impacts that will result from implementation of the project. The City finds that with implementation of applicable Conditions of Approval (COAs) and General Plan policies and goals, in addition to the identified mitigation measures as part of project approvals, all potential impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As required by CEQA, the City, in adopting these CEQA Findings also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project. The City finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated by reference, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the project. In accordance with CEQA and the *CEQA Guidelines*, the City adopts these findings as part of the certification of the Final EIR for the project. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3), the City also finds that the Final EIR reflects the City's independent judgment as the lead agency for the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION 2: CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW DRAFT SAN ANTONIO PRECISE PLAN	3
SECTION 3: EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE MITIGATED TO LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVELS	5
SECTION 4: EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT OR NOT SIGNIFICANT	9
SECTION 5: FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	13
SECTION 6: SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL	16
SECTION 7: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS	16

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statutory Requirements for Findings

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, §21080) and the *CEQA Guidelines* (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, §15063) state that if it has been determined that a project may or will have significant impacts on the environment then an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared. Accordingly, an EIR has been prepared by the City of Mountain View (hereafter referred to as “the City”) to evaluate potential environmental effects that may result from implementation of the proposed City of Mountain View San Antonio Precise Plan. The EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, §21000 et seq.), and implementing State *CEQA Guidelines* (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, §15000 et seq.).

In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15090, the City, as Lead Agency for the City of Mountain View San Antonio Precise Plan (hereafter referred to as “the SA Precise Plan or Precise Plan or project”), certifies that:

- a. The Final EIR for the proposed SA Precise Plan has been completed and processed in compliance with the requirements of CEQA;
- b. The Final EIR was presented to the City Council of the City of Mountain View (hereafter referred to as “the City Council”), as the decision-making body for the proposed SA Precise Plan, and the City Council reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to adopting the proposed SA Precise Plan; and
- c. The Final EIR reflects the City of Mountain View’s independent judgment and analysis. The City has exercised independent judgment in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c) in retaining its own environmental consultant directing the consultant in the preparation of the EIR as well as reviewing, analyzing, and revising material prepared by the consultant.

These CEQA Findings of Fact (hereafter referred to as “Findings”), and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) have been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the *CEQA Guidelines*. The purpose of these Findings is to satisfy the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081 and Sections 15090, 15091, 15092, 15093, and 15097 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, in connection with the adoption of the proposed SA Precise Plan. Before approving a project (in this case, adoption of the SA Precise Plan) an EIR must be certified pursuant to Section 15090 of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Prior to approving a project for which an EIR has been certified, and for which the EIR identifies one or more significant environmental impacts, the approving agency must make one or more of the following findings, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 Section 15091 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, for each identified significant impact:

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.

It is recommended that one or more of the specific written findings above be adopted regarding each significant impact associated with the proposed SA Precise Plan. Those findings are presented here, along with a presentation of facts in support of the findings. Concurrent with the adoption of these findings, the City Council will adopt the MMRP, presented as a separate document. Section 15092 of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that after consideration of an EIR, and in conjunction with the Section 15091 findings identified above, the lead agency may decide whether or how to approve or carry out the project.

It is recommended that the City Council expressly finds the Final EIR for the proposed SA Precise Plan reflects the City's independent review and judgment, as required by CEQA. In accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *CEQA Guidelines*, it is recommended that the City Council adopt these Findings as part of its certification of the Final EIR.

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:

- Draft San Antonio Precise Plan;
- Notice of Preparation and other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the project (see Appendix A of the Draft EIR for the Notice of Preparation);
- The Public Review Draft EIR, Initial Study, and supporting documentation prepared for the proposed project (Appendix A through C and the Draft EIR), dated August 2014;
- All written and verbal comments submitted by agencies, organizations and members of the public during the public comment period and at public hearings on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments (see Response to Comments Document, dated November 7, 2014);
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- The Staff Report for the November 17, 2014 Environmental Planning Commission meeting;
- The Staff Report for the December 2, 2014 City Council meeting;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the City in connection with the project, and all documents cited or referred therein;
- All final reports, studies, memoranda, maps, correspondence, and all planning documents prepared by the City, or the consultants, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to:
 - a) the City's compliance with CEQA;
 - b) development of the project; or
 - c) the City's action on the project; and

- All documents submitted to the City by agencies or members of the public in connection with development of the project.

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 alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. Section 3 identifies the potentially significant effects of the project which were determined to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. All numbered references identifying specific mitigation measures refer to numbered mitigation measures found in the Draft EIR, the Initial Study and Response to Comments Document. Section 4 identifies the project's potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant, and do not require mitigation. Section 5 discusses the feasibility of project alternatives. Section 6 identifies the significant impacts of the project, including cumulative impacts, that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level even though all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the project.

SECTION 2: CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW DRAFT SAN ANTONIO PRECISE PLAN

This section lists the objectives of the proposed project, provides a brief description of the project, and lists the project alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR.

2.1 Project Objectives

The SA Precise Plan implements change area policy identified in the 2030 General Plan. The primary objectives of the SA Precise Plan for EIR analysis were developed from goals and policies identified in the 2030 General Plan.

- Implement the 2030 General Plan's vision, goals, policies and other direction for the area, including:
 - More diverse commercial serving the neighborhood and region;
 - New higher-intensity development in the San Antonio Change Area, including higher-density residential development near transit and;
 - A revitalized San Antonio Center;
 - Improved mobility for all travel modes, especially pedestrian and bicycle circulation; and
 - Improved open space amenities.
- Create one comprehensive Precise Plan for an area currently regulated through several existing zoning designations and Precise Plans.
- Establish development policies and standards reflecting the 2030 General Plan vision.

The following are more detailed policy direction established during the SA Precise Plan development:

- Revitalize the Plan Area as a diverse and dynamic mixed-use environment.

- Promote achievement of fundamental land use, open space, urban design and circulation policies.
- Prioritize regional commercial and residential uses in the core of the Plan Area, with flexibility for diverse complementary commercial activities throughout the area over time.
- Support increased housing supply and diversity of unit types.
- Promote achievement broad community objectives such as mobility improvements and affordable housing.
- Organize the Plan Area around a range of new landscaped connections and open space amenities.
- Create pedestrian-oriented site and building design, active frontages, and increased tree canopy.
- Promote placemaking principles and create well-programmed and designed open space amenities.
- Locate buildings designed with active, pedestrian-oriented frontages on new and improved streets and open space areas.
- Promote well-integrated development including coordinated public access, shared parking, wayfinding signage and other amenities supporting the image and function of a cohesive area.
- Improve the pedestrian environment and promote walking to/within the Plan Area through more walkable blocks and comfortable, landscaped connections.
- Improve bicycle facilities to/through the Plan Area by closing gaps in the network, adding connections through large blocks and providing enhanced improvements in key locations.
- Integrate the revitalized Plan Area with surrounding neighborhoods through improved bicycle and pedestrian connections, sensitive transitions and limits on noise impacts.
- Promote transit services through higher-intensity, transit-oriented development and improved bicycle and pedestrian connections.
- Create a "park once" environment through consolidated, centralized underground garages and/or attractively designed parking structures.
- Encourage shared parking and access across multiple sites.

2.2 Project Description

The SA Precise Plan identifies planning principles and policies, development regulations, and an implementation strategy for approximately 123 acres of land including and surrounding the San Antonio Center shopping area, largely comprised of the San Antonio Change Area identified in the 2030 General Plan. A few adjacent parcels have been added to the Change Area to create cohesive block areas, primarily for circulation and urban design policy purposes, and the SA Precise Plan area is slightly larger than the San Antonio Change Area. The purpose of the SA Precise Plan is to implement the 2030 General Plan land use, mobility, and other policy direction. The SA Precise Plan includes specific policies and development standards for circulation, land use, urban design, open space, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility; intensity and heights; off-site improvements; and programmatic requirements, including parking and transportation demand management.

2.3 Alternatives

The following three alternatives to the SA Precise Plan were considered in this Draft EIR:

- **The No Project alternative** assumes the development identified in the 2030 General Plan would occur within the SA Precise Plan area, and not the level of development anticipated under the San Antonio Change Area Supplemental Environmental Impact Report SEIR.
- **The Medium Density Housing alternative** assumes a change in the type of housing allowed within the SA Precise Plan area from High Density to Medium Density, resulting in a reduction in housing units and a corresponding reduction in residents.
- **The Reduced Office Development alternative** assumes a cap on the amount of office development allowed within the SA Precise Plan area.

A more detailed description of these alternatives, and required findings, are set forth in Section 5: Feasibility of Project Alternatives.

SECTION 3: EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE MITIGATED TO LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVELS

The Draft EIR and Initial Study (Appendix A of the Draft EIR) identified certain potentially significant effects that could result from the project. However, the City finds for each of the significant or potentially significant impacts identified in this section, that based upon substantial evidence in the record, changes or alterations have been required or incorporated into the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects as identified in the Final EIR¹ and, thus, that adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce these significant or potentially significant effects to less-than-significant levels. Adoption of the recommended mitigation measures will effectively make the mitigation measures part of the project.

3.1 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

IMPACT TRANS-1: Implementation of the Precise Plan would result in a conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-1: Add a right turn overlap phase at Intersection #17, San Antonio Road/California Avenue for the westbound right turn movement, or comparable improvement to maintain acceptable intersection LOS.

Findings for Mitigation Measures TRANS-1: With installation of this improvement (a right turn overlap phase at Intersection #17, San Antonio Road/California Avenue for the westbound right turn movement) the Level of Service at this intersection would improve to LOS D and would not conflict for level of service standards for this intersection. Pursuant to *CEQA*

¹ *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15091.

Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), the City finds that Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 will be incorporated into the project via conditions of approval, and will reduce Impact TRANS-1 to a less-than-significant level.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

Impact AIR-1: Construction of new projects associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan could result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Mitigation Measures AIR-1: All new development projects, associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan, which include buildings within 1,000 feet of a residential dwelling unit shall conduct a construction health risk assessment to assess emissions from all construction equipment during each phase of construction prior to issuance of building permits. Equipment usage shall be modified as necessary to ensure that equipment use would not result in a carcinogenic health risk of more than 10 in 1 million, an increased non-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), or an annual average ambient PM_{2.5} increase greater than 0.3 µg/m³.

Findings for Impact AIR-1: Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would require that all new development within 1,000 feet of a residential dwelling unit conduct a construction health risk assessment. As site-specific development is not proposed as part of the project, this mitigation measure would ensure that construction equipment use associated with future projects would not result in a carcinogenic health risk of more than 10 in 1 million, an increased non-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), or an annual average ambient PM_{2.5} increase greater than 0.3 µg/m³. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 would ensure that any potential construction equipment emissions impact to would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(1), the City finds that Mitigation Measure AIR-1 will be incorporated into the project via conditions of approval, and will reduce Impact AIR-1 to a less-than-significant level.

Impact AIR-2: Implementation of the SA Precise Plan could result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Mitigation Measures AIR-2: For residential or other sensitive use projects proposed within 500 feet of El Camino Real and Central Expressway, and/or any of the stationary sources identified in Table IV.B-6 of the EIR, the City of Mountain View shall require an evaluation of potential health risk exposure. The applicant for a sensitive use project within the Precise Plan area shall prepare a report using the latest BAAQMD permit data and roadway risk estimates to determine impacts to future residents. The report shall outline any measures that would be incorporated into the project necessary to reduce carcinogenic health risk to less than 10 in 1 million, reduce the non-cancer risk to less than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), and ensure the annual average ambient PM_{2.5} increase is less than 0.3 µg/m³. Measures to reduce impacts could include upgrading air filtration systems of fresh air supply, tiered plantings of trees, and site design to increase distance from source to the receptor.

Findings for Impact AIR-2: Mitigation Measure AIR-2 would require residential or other sensitive use projects proposed within 500 feet El Camino Real and Central Expressway, and/or

any of the stationary sources identified in Table IV.B-6 of the EIR, to prepare an evaluation of potential health risk exposure. As site-specific development is not proposed as part of the project, this mitigation measure identifies and requires measures to reduce carcinogenic health risk to less than 10 in 1 million, reduce the non-cancer risk to less than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), and ensure the annual average ambient PM_{2.5} increase is less than 0.3 µg/m³.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-2 would ensure that impacts related to sensitive receptors exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations emissions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(1), the City finds that Mitigation Measure AIR-2 will be incorporated into the project via conditions of approval, and will reduce Impact AIR-2 to a less-than-significant level.

3.3 NOISE

Impact NOISE-1: Construction activities associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan could create significant short-term vibration impacts on nearby sensitive land uses.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: The following language shall be included as a Condition of Approval for new projects associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan:

- In the event that pile driving would be required for any proposed project within the SA Precise Plan area, all residents within 300 feet of the project site shall be notified of the schedule for its use a minimum of one week prior to its commencement. The contractor shall implement “quiet” pile driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration, or the use of portable acoustical barriers) where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions.
- To the extent feasible, the project contractor shall phase high-vibration generating construction activities, such as pile-driving/ground-impacting operations, so they do not occur in the same period with demolition and excavation activities in locations where the combined vibrations would potentially impact sensitive areas.
- The project contractor shall select demolition methods not involving impact, where possible (for example, milling generates lower vibration levels than excavation using clam shell or chisel drops).
- The project contractor shall avoid using vibratory rollers and packers near sensitive areas whenever possible.

Findings for Impact NOISE-1: Mitigation Measures NOISE-1, which requires future development to implement measures to control vibration, will substantially lessen the potential construction related vibration impact. These mitigations comprise vibration-control actions that have been successfully used by municipalities throughout the State to substantially reduce construction period vibration levels. Similar measures are incorporated into the conditions of approval for development projects throughout California, and are easily monitored during the actual construction period. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(1), the City finds that Mitigation Measures NOISE-1 will be incorporated into the project via conditions of approval, and will reduce Impact NOISE-1 to a less-than-significant level.

3.4 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Impact UTL-1: Future development associated with implementation of the San Antonio Precise Plan could result in impacts to the existing water infrastructure. Development may necessitate upsizing of nearby water distribution mains and other improvements.

Mitigation Measure UTL-1: As private properties within the Plan area are developed, project-specific capacity and condition analyses of applicable water infrastructure adjacent and downstream of the project sites shall be performed to identify any impacts to the water system. As a condition of approval and prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, the Public Works Department will determine and assign responsibility to project applicants for upgrades and improvements to the City's water infrastructure, as necessary.

Finding for Impact UTL-1: Mitigation Measure UTL-1 requires a project-specific capacity and condition analysis of water infrastructure to identify any system deficiencies. If necessary, upgrades to water systems would be required prior to the issuance of a grading and/or building permit. Implementation of this measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(1), the City finds that Mitigation Measure UTL-1 will be incorporated into the project via conditions of approval, and will reduce Impact UTL-1 to a less-than-significant level.

Impact UTL-2: Future development associated with implementation of the San Antonio Precise Plan could result in impacts to the existing wastewater infrastructure. Development may necessitate upsizing of nearby wastewater sewer mains and other improvements.

Mitigation Measures UTL-2: As private properties within the Plan area are developed, project-specific capacity and condition analyses of applicable wastewater infrastructure adjacent and downstream of the project sites shall be performed to identify any impacts to the wastewater system. As a condition of approval and prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, the Public Works Department will determine and assign responsibility to project applicants for upgrades and improvements to the City's wastewater infrastructure, as necessary.

Finding for Impact UTL-2: Mitigation Measure UTL-2 requires a project-specific capacity and condition analysis of wastewater infrastructure to identify any system deficiencies. If necessary, upgrades to wastewater systems would be required prior to the issuance of a grading and/or building permit. Implementation of this measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091(a)(1), the City finds that Mitigation Measure UTL-2 will be incorporated into the project via conditions of approval, and will reduce Impact UTL-2 to a less-than-significant level.

Impact UTL-3: Future development associated with implementation of the San Antonio Precise Plan could result in impacts on existing stormwater infrastructure.

Mitigation Measure UTL-3: As private properties within the Plan area are developed, project-specific analyses of stormwater infrastructure adjacent and downstream of the project sites shall be performed to identify any impacts to the system. As a condition of approval and prior

to issuance of grading and/or building permits, the Public Works Department will determine and assign responsibility to project applicants for upgrades and improvements to the City's stormwater infrastructure, as necessary.

Finding for Impact UTL-3: Mitigation Measure UTL-3 requires a project-specific capacity and condition analysis of stormwater infrastructure to identify any system deficiencies. If necessary, upgrades to stormwater systems would be required prior to the issuance of a grading and/or building permit. Implementation of this measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), the City finds that Mitigation Measure UTL-3 will be incorporated into the project via conditions of approval, and will reduce Impact UTL-3 to a less-than-significant level.

SECTION 4: EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT OR NOT SIGNIFICANT

The City finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, as discussed below, the following impacts associated with the project are not significant or are less than significant, and do not require mitigation. The Draft EIR (Chapters IV and VI) and the Initial Study (Appendix A of the Draft EIR) provide a detailed analysis of the less-than-significant impacts of the proposed project.

4.1 Aesthetics

The SA Precise Plan includes development standards and guidelines intended to enhance the pedestrian experience within the SA Precise Plan area, as well as to guide future development within the SA Precise Plan area. With adherence to and implementation of the SA Precise Plan development standards and guidelines and applicable 2030 General Plan policies and actions, implementation of the SA Precise Plan would result in less-than-significant aesthetic impacts.

4.2 Agricultural Resources

The SA Precise Plan area is an urban developed area and is not used for agriculture or forestry purposes. Implementation of the SA Precise Plan would not impact agricultural or forestry resources or result in the loss of designated agricultural land.

4.3 Biological Resources

The SA Precise Plan area is currently developed with a mix of commercial and residential uses, surface parking lots, and roadways. Development associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan would occur in these already developed areas of Mountain View, and would not occur within biologically sensitive areas. Most wildlife species that use developed areas (including the SA Precise Plan area) are generalists that have adapted to human-modified habitats. No special-status species are expected to occur within the SA Precise Plan area. With adherence to and implementation of the identified biological resources-related General Plan policies and actions, and the applicable COAs as described in Section 4.4 of the Initial Study (included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR), implementation of the SA Precise Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources.

4.4 Cultural Resources

The SA Precise Plan area includes numerous buildings, some of which may have historical value and may not be formally registered in the Mountain View Register, California Register, or National Register. Additionally, unidentified archaeological and paleontological resources may be located within the SA Precise Plan area.

Implementation of the SA Precise Plan will allow for more intense development and pedestrian improvements within the SA Precise Plan area which could directly (i.e., demolition) or indirectly (i.e., adverse effects to historical setting from adjacent construction) impact historical buildings and structures that may qualify as historical resources under CEQA. As described in Section 4.5 of the Initial Study (included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR), the General Plan and the General Plan EIR contain policies and actions that will mitigate potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the City would apply the applicable cultural resources related COAs to any development associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan. It should be noted that cultural resource impacts generally must be determined on a project specific basis; however, with adherence of the policies, actions and COAs described within the Initial Study, potential cultural resources impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level on a program-level basis.

4.5 Geology

Major regional faults located in the vicinity Mountain View are capable of producing very strong to violent ground shaking. Strong to violent seismic shaking could cause serious structural damage to buildings not engineered and constructed to comply with the current California Building Codes, and could cause extensive non-structural damage to buildings in the SA Precise Plan area. Existing federal and State programs are designed to provide current information detailing seismic hazards and impose regulatory requirements regarding geotechnical and soils investigations. As described in Section 4.6 of the Initial Study (included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR) the General Plan and the General Plan EIR contains policies and actions that will mitigate potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the City would apply the applicable geology and soils related COAs to any development associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan, which would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Mountain View Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program (GGRP) was adopted on July 10, 2012. The GGRP meets the requirements of the BAAQMD “qualified plans” as described in the BAAQMD *CEQA Guidelines*. The GGRP identifies a series of GHG emissions reduction measures to be implemented by development projects that would allow the City to achieve its GHG reduction goals. Based on the implementation of the required measures in the GGRP, the SA Precise Plan would be consistent with the GGRP, and would not result in a significant operational or construction-related greenhouse gas emission impact. Implementation of the SA Precise Plan would result in a less-than-significant greenhouse gas emissions impact.

4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

New development or redevelopment in the SA Precise Plan area would involve the routine management of hazardous materials that could pose a significant threat to human health or the environment if not properly managed or accidentally released. Construction and post-construction

activities could include the use of hazardous materials such as motor fuels, oils, solvents, and lubricants. An accidental release of hazardous materials during fueling, maintenance, or improper operation of construction equipment could potentially occur and pose a risk to construction workers, the public, and the environment.

The storage, use, handling, generation, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials during site construction and operation activities are addressed by federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and other programs. Additionally, as described in Section 4.8 of the Initial Study (included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR), the General Plan includes several policies and actions related to hazards and hazardous materials. Furthermore, the City has several hazardous materials COAs that would be applicable to development associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan. Although hazardous materials releases from accidents cannot feasibly be eliminated, implementation of the General Plan policies and actions, applicable COAs, as well as adherence to existing regulatory programs on the federal, State, and local levels, would reduce potential impacts related to the reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions to a less-than-significant level.

4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Development associated with the SA Precise Plan would be subject to existing water quality regulations and programs; these programs establish water quality standards and provide enforcement. New development projects would be required to comply with these programs. Implementation of several policies and actions in the General Plan, as well as applicable COAs, also would strengthen enforcement of surface water and groundwater quality standards and waste discharge requirements.

Development under the SA Precise Plan has the potential to increase and alter impervious surfaces, which could increase stormwater runoff volumes, potentially resulting in hydromodification impacts (degradation of water quality in creeks related to higher erosive flows). Construction activities, operation of new development, and associated changes in runoff patterns also have the potential to introduce contaminants to stormwater. Compliance with existing NPDES permits for construction and post-construction as well as compliance with 2030 General Plan policies and actions and applicable COAs (identified in Section 4.9 of the Initial Study included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Finally, new development under the SA Precise Plan could be placed in flood zones; however, compliance with existing programs and regulations would limit flooding impacts. Development associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan would have less-than-significant impacts with regard to hydrology and water quality.

4.9 Land Use and Planning

The SA Precise Plan includes no large-scale infrastructure projects such as new freeways or high-volume roadways that would divide an established community. Likewise, critical transportation infrastructure linking one neighborhood to another would not be removed as part of the SA Precise Plan. The SA Precise Plan seeks to enhance mobility between and within existing neighborhoods by expanding the existing multi-modal transportation system. The SA Precise Plan will implement the 2030 General Plan land use, mobility, and other policy direction for the San Antonio Center. This includes specific policies, development standards and guidelines for topics such as land use, intensity

and heights, off-site improvements, and programmatic requirements, including parking and transportation demand management.

The 2030 General Plan contains many policies, some of which may compete with each other or be implemented differently based on the characteristics of different areas of the City. It is possible that specific development proposed and in conformance with the SA Precise Plan may not meet every policy within the 2030 General Plan; however, the City will determine whether each specific development, on balance, is consistent with the General Plan. Potential land use impacts would be considered less than significant.

4.10 Population and Housing

Implementation of the SA Precise Plan is projected to increase the population of the area by 2,490 people, and the number of housing units by 1,235 units. General Plan policies and actions support the intensification of the SA Precise Plan area. Adverse impacts associated with any displacement of existing housing and people is not likely but would be minimized by an overall increase in the area's housing stock. Therefore, displacement would only occur under limited circumstances, and the SA Precise Plan would not result in significant impacts related to population and housing.

4.11 Public Services and Recreation

With the implementation of General Plan policies and actions, impacts to police and fire services are expected to be less than significant. Additionally, the City will consider the environmental effects of new facilities at a project level when they are proposed over time. Impacts associated with community facilities, such as library services, that would occur under the SA Precise Plan would be limited. Population growth associated with the SA Precise Plan would not increase demand for library services in the City such that new facilities would be required and this impact would be less than significant.

While development under the SA Precise Plan would increase enrollment within the school districts that are already near or over capacity, potentially significant impacts that may result from increased enrollment would be mitigated through the implementation of applicable General Plan policies, which supports coordination with school districts for new school development and expansion to accommodate future growth, and through the required payment of school impact fees as established by State law. The school districts are responsible for implementing the specific methods of mitigating school impacts under the Government Code. The school impact fees and the school districts' methods of implementing measures specified by Government Code 65996 would offset increased student enrollment. Payment of school facility mitigation fees has been deemed by the State legislature (per Government Code Section 65995(h)) to constitute full and complete mitigation of impacts of a development project on the provision of adequate school facilities, even though, as a practical matter, additional funding, usually from statewide or local bond measures, are needed to create new school capacity.

Development associated with the implementation of the SA Precise Plan would be required to pay applicable District fees to fund necessary school service and facility improvements to accommodate anticipated school enrollment growth within the school districts. Therefore, through the payment of associated development fees, compliance with applicable State and local regulations, implementation of the SA Precise Plan would have a less-than-significant impact on school facilities.

SECTION 5: FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

5.1 Project Alternatives

The Draft EIR included three alternatives: the No Project alternative; the Medium Density Housing alternative; and the Reduced Office Development alternative. The City hereby concludes that the Draft EIR sets forth a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project so as to foster informed public participation and informed decision making. The City finds that the alternatives identified and described in the Draft EIR were considered and further finds them to be infeasible as described below pursuant to CEQA section 21081.

5.1.1. No Project Alternative. The No Project alternative assumes the development identified in the 2030 General Plan EIR would occur within the SA Precise Plan area, and not the level of development anticipated under the SA Precise Plan (which is consistent with the separate San Antonio Change Area Supplemental Environmental Impact Report [SEIR]). The 2030 General Plan anticipated an increase in population and units and a decrease in jobs within the SA Precise Plan area as compared to the SA Precise Plan and SEIR projections.

The No Project alternative also assumes the coordinated development strategy identified in the SA Precise Plan (which identifies ways to reduce the super blocks within the San Antonio Center, improve pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and provides land use, development and design standards) would not be implemented. Growth would occur randomly as applications were processed within the SA Precise Plan area. Development and streetscape standards included in the SA Precise Plan, including measures to encourage pedestrian activity and multi-modal transportation within the area, would not be implemented. No bicycle improvements (beyond those identified in currently adopted City documents) would be implemented.

Findings for the No Project Alternative: The No Project alternative assumes development would occur in the SA Precise Plan area. However, design guidelines and standards identified within the SA Precise Plan would not be implemented. Measures to enhance pedestrian and bicycle circulation (such as separating bicycle facilities, improving pedestrian crossings, and other enhancements identified in the SA Precise Plan) would not occur as comprehensively. Any improvements associated with new projects in the SA Precise Plan area would not result in an integrated pattern of development or provide a cohesive more pedestrian- and bike-friendly environment within the Precise Plan area.

As this alternative could result in a reduction of the overall level of development within the Precise Plan compared to the proposed project, it is possible that the transportation impact associated with the proposed project (LOS impact at Intersection #17, San Antonio Road/California Avenue) would be reduced or eliminated. As with the proposed project, significant unavoidable traffic impacts are not anticipated under this alternative.

The air quality impacts associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan (potential exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction and operation periods) would still occur under this alternative; the identified mitigation measures would reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the No Project alternative would result in similar air quality impacts as the proposed project.

The noise impact associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan (construction vibration) would still occur under this alternative; the identified mitigation measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the No Project alternative would result in a similar noise impact as the proposed project.

The No Project alternative would result in an increase in housing and a decrease in jobs as compared to the proposed project. Implementation of this alternative would result in an increase in the number of students, and associated demand for school facilities. While this alternative would increase residents within the SA Precise Plan area, there would be a reduction in the number of employees within the Plan area, so the demand for police and fire services would likely be similar to the proposed project.

Because the No Project alternative would result in new development and redevelopment within the Plan area, potential impacts to existing water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure and the ability to serve new development would still occur. Studies would be required when new development is proposed. Implementation of the No Project alternative would result in similar impacts to utility systems as the proposed project.

As noted in the Draft EIR, there are 19 project objectives; this alternative would meet or partially meet six of those objectives. Given the reasons described above, the City rejects the No Project alternative.

5.1.2 Medium Density Housing Alternative. This alternative would change the type of housing allowed within the SA Precise Plan area from the high-intensity (and equivalent High Density residential uses) to Medium Density. Because of the change in density, it is possible the number of housing units in the SA Precise Plan area would decrease. However, given the mixed use environment of the SA Precise Plan area, it is difficult to quantify the specific reduction in housing units that would be associated with this change in housing type. For this analysis, it is assumed that the total number of units (and associated population) would be reduced by approximately one quarter (from 1,235 units to around 925 units). Office and other land uses would remain the same as the proposed project. The development and design vision and standards included in the SA Precise Plan would be implemented under this alternative.

Findings for the Medium Density Housing Alternative: As this alternative results in a reduction of the overall level of development within the SA Precise Plan area, it is possible that the transportation impact associated with the proposed project (LOS impact at Intersection #17, San Antonio Road/California Avenue) would be reduced or eliminated. As with the proposed project, significant unavoidable traffic impacts are not anticipated.

The air quality impacts associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan (potential exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction and operation periods) would still occur under this alternative; the identified mitigation measures would reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the Medium Density Housing alternative would result in similar air quality impacts as the proposed project.

The noise impact associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan (construction vibration) would still occur under this alternative; the identified mitigation measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the Medium Density Housing alternative would result in a similar noise impacts as the proposed project.

The Medium Density Housing alternative would result in a decrease in housing and the same number of jobs as compared to the proposed project. Implementation of this alternative would result in a decrease in the number of students and associated demand for school facilities. This alternative would also result in a slight decrease in the demand for police and fire services, as compared to the proposed project.

Because the Medium Density Housing alternative would result in new development and redevelopment within the Plan area, potential impacts to existing water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure and the ability to serve new development would still occur. Studies would be required when new development is proposed. Implementation of the Medium Density Housing alternative would result in similar impacts to utility systems as the proposed project.

As noted in the Draft EIR, there are 19 project objectives; this alternative would meet 15 objectives and partially meet four of those objectives. Given the reasons described above, the City rejects the Medium Density Housing alternative.

5.1.3 Reduced Office Development Alternative. This alternative would put a cap on the amount of office development allowed within the SA Precise Plan area. While it is hard to quantify the specific cap for office development, for this analysis it is assumed the total amount of net new office space allowed within the SA Precise Plan area would be approximately 75 percent of the amount anticipated under the SEIR. The level of housing anticipated under this alternative would be the same as the proposed project. The development and design vision and standards included in the SA Precise Plan would be implemented under this alternative.

Findings for the Reduced Office Development Alternative: As this alternative results in a reduction of the overall level of development within the SA Precise Plan area, it is possible that the transportation impact associated with the proposed project (LOS impact at Intersection #17, San Antonio Road/California Avenue) would be reduced or eliminated. As with the proposed project, significant unavoidable traffic impacts are not anticipated.

The air quality impacts associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan (potential exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction and operation periods) would still occur under this alternative; the identified mitigation measures would reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the Reduced Office Development alternative would result in similar air quality impacts to the proposed project.

The noise impact associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan (construction vibration) would still occur under this alternative; the identified mitigation measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the Reduced Office Development alternative would result in similar noise impacts to the proposed project.

The Reduced Office Development alternative would result the same amount of housing and a reduction in the number of jobs as compared to the proposed project. Implementation of this alternative would generate the same number of students and associated demand for school facilities as the proposed project. This alternative would result in a reduction of the amount of office space within the SA Precise Plan area, which could result in a slight decrease in the demand for police and fire services.

Because the Reduced Office Development alternative would result in new development and redevelopment within the Plan area, potential impacts to existing water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure and the ability to serve new development would still occur. Studies would be required when new development is proposed. Implementation of the Reduced Office Development alternative would result in similar impacts to utility systems as the proposed project.

As noted in the Draft EIR, there are 19 project objectives; this alternative would meet 17 objectives and partially meet two of those objectives. Given the reasons described above, the City rejects the Medium Density Housing alternative.

5.2 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The three alternatives included in this analysis have slightly different levels of development as the proposed project, but would likely result in similar environmental impacts. However, the Medium Density Housing alternative is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative because it would potentially reduce demand for school facilities, police and fire services, and may reduce the identified traffic impact. However, this alternative would not meet all of the project objectives.

Findings. The City finds the Medium Density alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative. However, because of the reduction in density it is likely that the number of housing units in the SA Precise Plan area would decrease. Additionally, this alternative would not fully meet all the project objectives. Given these reasons, the City rejects the Medium Density alternative.

SECTION 6: SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

All impacts identified within the Draft EIR and Initial Study can be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

SECTION 7: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Draft EIR and Initial Study did not identify any significant unavoidable impacts. All impacts identified within the Draft EIR and Initial Study can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is not required.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been formulated based upon the findings of the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for the City of Mountain View San Antonio Precise Plan (SA Precise Plan). The MMRP, which is found in Table 1, lists mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR (which includes the Draft EIR, Initial Study (Appendix A of the Draft EIR), and Response to Comments documents) prepared for the SA Precise Plan and identifies mitigation monitoring requirements. The Final MMRP must be adopted when the City Council makes a final decision on the project.

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.

Table 1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Compliance	Method of Compliance and Oversight of Implementation	Timing of Compliance
A. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
<p><u>TRANS-1:</u> Implementation of the Precise Plan would result in a conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.</p>	<p><u>TRANS-1:</u> Add a right turn overlap phase at Intersection #17, San Antonio Road/California Avenue for the westbound right turn movement, or comparable improvement to maintain acceptable intersection LOS.</p>	<p>Project Applicant and/or City of Mountain View Public Works Department</p>	<p>Method of Compliance: Study, design and install improvement Implementation Oversight: City of Mountain View Public Works Department</p>	<p>Prior to intersection reaching unacceptable LOS</p>
B. AIR QUALITY				
<p><u>AIR-1:</u> Construction of new projects associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan could result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p><u>AIR-1:</u> All new development projects, associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan, which include buildings within 1,000 feet of a residential dwelling unit shall conduct a construction health risk assessment to assess emissions from all construction equipment during each phase of construction prior to issuance of building permits. Equipment usage shall be modified as necessary to ensure that equipment use would not result in a carcinogenic health risk of more than 10 in 1 million, an increased non-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), or an annual average ambient PM_{2.5} increase greater than 0.3 µg/m³.</p>	<p>Project Applicant</p>	<p>Method of Compliance: Preparation of a Health Risk Assessment and implementation of any identified measures Implementation Oversight: City of Mountain View Public Works Department and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Prior to future demolition, site preparation, or construction activities</p>
<p><u>AIR-2:</u> Implementation of the SA Precise Plan could result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p><u>AIR-2:</u> For residential or other sensitive use projects proposed within 500 feet of El Camino Real and Central Expressway, and/or any of the stationary sources identified in Table IV.B-6 of the EIR, the City of Mountain View shall require an evaluation of potential health risk exposure. The applicant for a sensitive use project within the Precise Plan area shall prepare a report using the latest BAAQMD permit data and roadway risk estimates to determine impacts to future residents. The report shall outline any measures that would be incorporated into the project necessary to reduce carcinogenic health risk of to less than 10 in 1 million, reduce the non-cancer risk of to less than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), and ensure the annual average ambient PM_{2.5} increase is less than 0.3 µg/m³. Measures to reduce impacts could include upgrading air filtration systems of fresh air supply, tiered plantings of trees, and site design to increase distance from source to the receptor.</p>	<p>Project Applicant</p>	<p>Method of Compliance: Preparation of a Health Risk Assessment and implementation of any identified measures Implementation Oversight: City of Mountain View Public Works Department and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Prior to future project approval</p>

Table 1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Compliance	Method of Compliance and Oversight of Implementation	Timing of Compliance
C. NOISE				
<p><u>NOISE-1</u>: Construction activities associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan could create significant short-term vibration impacts on nearby sensitive land uses.</p>	<p><u>NOISE-1</u>: The following language shall be included as a Condition of Approval for new projects associated with implementation of the SA Precise Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event that pile driving would be required for any proposed project within the SA Precise Plan area, all residents within 300 feet of the project site shall be notified of the schedule for its use a minimum of one week prior to its commencement. The contractor shall implement “quiet” pile driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration, or the use of portable acoustical barriers) where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions. • To the extent feasible, the project contractor shall phase high-vibration generating construction activities, such as pile-driving/ground-impacting operations, so they do not occur in the same period with demolition and excavation activities in locations where the combined vibrations would potentially impact sensitive areas. • The project contractor shall select demolition methods not involving impact, where possible (for example, milling generates lower vibration levels than excavation using clam shell or chisel drops). • The project contractor shall avoid using vibratory rollers and packers near sensitive areas whenever possible. 	<p>Project Applicant/ Project Contractor</p>	<p>Method of Compliance: Implementation of identified measures</p> <p>Implementation Oversight: City of Mountain View Public Works Department and Community Development Department</p>	<p>During construction activities</p>
D. PUBLIC SERVICES				
<i>There are no significant Public Services impacts.</i>				