

# Addendum

## Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update

Prepared by



September 2022

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Section 1.0	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Purpose of the Addendum .....	1
1.2	Notice of Determination .....	2
Section 2.0	Project Information .....	3
2.1	Project Title .....	3
2.2	Project Location.....	3
2.3	Lead Agency Contact .....	3
2.4	General Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations.....	3
Section 3.0	Background Information .....	7
3.1	Previous Amendments and Environmental Documents .....	7
3.2	Relationship Between the Project and Potential Future Amendments .....	7
Section 4.0	Project Description.....	9
4.1	Overview .....	9
Section 5.0	Environmental Setting, Checklist, and Impact Discussion .....	21
5.1	Aesthetics.....	22
5.2	Biological Resources .....	26
5.3	Cultural Resources.....	30
5.4	Tribal Cultural Resources .....	35
Section 6.0	References.....	37
Section 7.0	Lead Agency and Consultants.....	38
7.1	Lead Agency .....	38
7.2	Consultants .....	38
Section 8.0	Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	39

## Figures

Figure 2.4-1: Regional Location Map.....	4
Figure 2.4-2: Vicinity Map .....	5
Figure 2.4-3: Aerial Photos of Project Site and Surrounding Area .....	6
Figure 4.1-1: Aerial Photos of Precise Plan Subareas affected by Proposed Project .....	10

## Tables

Table 4.1-1: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea A .....	11
Table 4.1-2: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea G .....	14
Table 4.1-3: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea H .....	18

## Appendices

Appendix A: Draft 2022 Precise Plan Amendments

## **SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION**

---

### **1.1 PURPOSE OF THE ADDENDUM**

The City of Mountain View, as the Lead Agency, has prepared this Addendum to the adopted 1999 City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan (Precise Plan) Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND), adopted 2004 City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan IS/ND, and certified 2012 Mountain View 2030 General Plan Environmental Impact Report (General Plan EIR) for proposed modifications to the Precise Plan design guidelines, development standards, and ground floor land uses allowed within certain subareas. The purpose of the Addendum is to evaluate whether the proposed modifications to the Precise Plan studied in the adopted 1999 IS/MND, adopted 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR will require major revisions to the previous environmental documents due to new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts identified in the previous environmental documents.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15164, provide that an addendum to a previously adopted ND can be prepared for a project if the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that one or more of the criteria and conditions summarized below are satisfied:

- (1) No Substantial Project Changes: There are no substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous environmental document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- (2) No Substantial Changes in Circumstances: Substantial changes have not occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous environmental document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- (3) No Substantial New Information: There is no new information of substantial importance which was not known or could not have been known at the time of the previous environmental document that shows any of the following:
  - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous environmental document;
  - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous environmental document;
  - (C) 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, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternatives; or
  - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous environmental document would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative

The proposed modifications to the Precise Plan, as described in this Addendum, do not create any of

the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines that call for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or IS/ND. No new significant impacts would occur, and no previously examined significant effects would be substantially more severe than disclosed in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, or 2012 General Plan EIR. Thus, an addendum to those documents has been prepared for the proposed modifications to the Precise Plan.

## **1.2 NOTICE OF DETERMINATION**

If the project is approved, the City will file a Notice of Determination (NOD), which will be available for public inspection and posted within 24 hours of receipt at the County Clerk's Office for 30 days. The filing of the NOD starts a 30-day statute of limitations on court challenges to the approval under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 15075(g)).

## **SECTION 2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION**

---

### **2.1 PROJECT TITLE**

Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan 2022 Amendments (2022 Amendments)

### **2.2 PROJECT LOCATION**

The Precise Plan area is approximately 130 acres in size and spans approximately two blocks on either side of Castro Street, and stretches between Central Expressway and El Camino Real in downtown Mountain View (refer to Figure 2.4-1, Figure 2.4-2, and Figure 2.4-3 for regional, vicinity, and aerial maps). Surrounding land uses to the Precise Plan area include residential uses to the east and west, residential and commercial uses to the south along and across El Camino Real and residential and commercial uses to the north across Central Expressway.

The Precise Plan area is broken into 10 subareas. The 2022 Amendments pertain to subareas A, G, and H only.

### **2.3 LEAD AGENCY CONTACT**

Edgar Maravilla, Senior Planner  
City of Mountain View  
Community Development Department, Planning Division  
500 Castro Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
(650) 903-6321  
edgar.maravilla@mountainview.gov


### **2.4 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS**

The Precise Plan area has a zoning designation of (P) Planned Community/Precise Plan, Downtown. The majority of the Precise Plan area, and 100% of subareas A, G and H, is designated Downtown Mixed-Use in the General Plan. Other portions of the Precise Plan are designated as Medium-High Density Residential (areas along View Street and Bryant Street), Medium Density Residential (an area along Hope Street), and Parks, Schools and City Facilities (a portion of the City Hall block).



REGIONAL MAP

FIGURE 2.4-1



VICINITY MAP

FIGURE 2.4-2





AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

FIGURE 2.4-3

## **SECTION 3.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

---

### **3.1 PREVIOUS AMENDMENTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS**

The City of Mountain View adopted an IS/ND and approved the Precise Plan on January 12, 1988. As described earlier in Section 2.2 Project Location, the Precise Plan covers an area that spans approximately two blocks on either side of Castro Street and stretches between Central Expressway and El Camino Real in downtown Mountain View. The purpose of the Precise Plan is to preserve and enhance the existing look and feel of the downtown core on Castro Street, promote cohesive quality development and improvements, and enhance the pedestrian character downtown. Since its original adoption in 1988, the Precise Plan has been amended six times. A summary of these amendments and the environmental documents prepared to evaluate them is included below:

- February 29, 2000: Reduced the allowed building heights in transitional areas, established a residential land use preference for certain transition areas, introduced Floor-Area-Ratio (FAR) limitations, and refined parking requirements. These amendments were analyzed in an Initial Study/Negative Declaration.
- April 24, 2001: Added signage standards. These amendments were analyzed in a Categorical Exemption, Class 5.
- May 25, 2004: Revised the allowable building heights along Castro Street and the allowable residential density and added parking exemptions for new retail uses in certain subareas of the Precise Plan. These amendments were evaluated in an Initial Study/Negative Declaration.
- November 10, 2015: Changed office uses from being a permitted ground-floor use to being a provisional use in Area J. These amendments were determined not to be a project under CEQA.
- October 2, 2018: Amendments added cannabis businesses as a provisionally allowed land use within the Precise Plan area. These amendments were determined not to be a project under CEQA.
- June 11, 2019: Prohibited storefront retail cannabis businesses within the Precise Plan area. These amendments were determined not to be a project under CEQA.

The most current environmental documents that evaluate the adopted Precise Plan are the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

### **3.2 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PROJECT AND POTENTIAL FUTURE AMENDMENTS**

On June 25, 2019, the City Council endorsed a two-phased approach to upcoming Precise Plan updates.

The intent of Phase I (2022 Amendments) (the proposed project) has been defined and is as follows:

- Limit the focus to only Subareas A, G, and H;
- Analyze historic preservation opportunities;
- Develop policies and standards to maintain the feel of downtown; and
- Promote and maintain ground-floor pedestrian activation.

The City has completed stakeholder meetings, economic analysis, and a series of public meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed 2022 Amendments from the Environmental Planning Commission, City Council, and the public. The City has sufficient information (i.e., specific details and proposed text amendments) about Phase I to complete environmental review for it.

The intent of Phase II has not yet been determined, but it may include the following:

- Precise Plan-wide focus; and
- New policies and standards related to design, parking, transportation demand management, land uses, and circulation.

The City plans to complete additional outreach, planning, and analyses prior to determining the scope and extent of the Phase II modifications. It is unknown when the Phase II modifications would be defined. Because the scope of the Phase II work is unknown at this time, it is speculative for the City to evaluate the environmental implications of this latter phase. For this reason, this document evaluates the Phase I modifications to the Precise Plan and subsequent environmental review for Phase II modifications will be required when those modifications are determined.


## **SECTION 4.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

### **4.1 OVERVIEW**

The following describes the proposed modifications (i.e., amendments) to the adopted Precise Plan. In accordance with City Council direction, the proposed update to the Downtown Precise Plan would only affect subareas A, G, and H of the Precise Plan area. These subareas are shown in Figure 4.1-1. The proposed project would not change the maximum development assumed for the Precise Plan in the original 1988 Precise Plan, subsequent Precise Plan amendments, or Mountain View 2030 General Plan. The proposed update would convert several existing design guidelines into standards and add new design standards in subareas A, G and H. The proposed update would institute a maximum FAR in Subarea H where no maximum currently exists. The maximum FAR would be consistent with the density currently allowed in area H. No increases to the allowed building heights, parking requirements, or overall allowed development intensities are proposed. As a result, the proposed updates would primarily change the design outcomes of new buildings in subareas A, G, and H, with the intent of maintaining the existing look and feel of those Precise Plan subareas.

The proposed updates to the Precise Plan are summarized in Table 4.1-1, Table 4.1-2, and Table 4.1-3 below. A draft of the proposed 2022 Amendments is included in Appendix A.



SUBAREAS TO BE UPDATED

FIGURE 4.1-1

**Table 4.1-1: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea A**

<b>Design Standards &amp; Guidelines</b>	<b>Description</b>
Building Height	Development standard revised to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A maximum building height of four stories is currently allowed, modifications made to clarify and set a maximum height of 50 feet.</li> </ul>
Development Massing	Design guideline elevated to standard: Previously a guideline paragraph, now two standards and two guidelines including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For developments adjacent to historic buildings, the building massing shall step down to be a maximum of 10 feet taller than the height of the adjacent historic building for a minimum of 10 feet from it.</li> <li>• A character change shall be provided at least every 75 feet: Character changes include at least two of the following: changes to primary colors, changes to primary materials, and changes to primary wall planes. Projects may elect to provide a massing break in lieu of or in addition to a character change. Massing breaks shall be minimum four feet deep and 10 feet wide.</li> <li>• Massing breaks, step backs and/or step-downs should be provided to create transition to existing surrounding development.</li> <li>• Special corner features should be incorporated at corner parcels. These may include but are not limited to display windows, corner roof features, taller massing and change in materials.</li> </ul>
Setback	Setbacks were placed in a chart, no changes to requirements.
Ground Level Treatment & Façade Articulation	Design guidelines elevated to standard: Previously two guideline paragraphs, now one standard and two guidelines included, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require street- and public open space facing façades to provide articulation in increments of up to 25 feet width, to activate the frontage and provide an engaging pedestrian experience.</li> <li>• Commercial development should meet ground-level treatment guidelines outlined in the Historic Retail District.</li> <li>• Pedestrian-level articulation should include storefront detailing, facade ornamentation, special materials, flower boxes, and other improvements to reinforce the pedestrian nature.</li> </ul>
Entrance	New design standard: Entrances is a new heading; three standards and two guidelines were added including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary pedestrian access to street-facing ground-level uses shall be along the public street.</li> <li>• Street-and public open space-facing entrances shall be recessed from the building facade by at least three feet creating a minimum six-foot wide entry alcove. Existing nonconforming alcoves shall be updated to meet this standard if the street-facing building facade is structurally modified.</li> <li>• Ramps and/or steps provided at entrances shall not encroach in the public right-of way.</li> </ul>

**Table 4.1-1: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea A**

Design Standards & Guidelines	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to individual ground floor residential units should include a transition from public to private areas using front porches, steps, stoops, landscaped setbacks, or similar features.</li> <li>• Residential and commercial entrances in mixed-use developments should be distinct and easily identifiable.</li> </ul>
Windows	<p>Design guideline elevated to standards: Previously a design paragraph, now four standards included, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At upper floor building facades, punched windows shall be provided.</li> <li>• A minimum of 90 percent of upper floor windows on street-or public open space facing building facades shall be designed such that: a. The total width of windows is not greater than nine feet. b. Windows are at least 12 inches apart. c. Windows with width-to-height ratio greater than 2:3 shall include vertical mullions such that each panel is not greater than 2:3 width-to-height ratio.</li> <li>• Windows shall be inset from the building facade or window trim by at least two inches to create shade and shadow detail.</li> <li>• Mirrored or reflective glass is not allowed on a street-or public open space-facing building facade at any level.</li> </ul>
Roof Treatment	<p>Design guideline elevated to standards: Previously a design guideline paragraph, now three standards and one guideline included, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous roof lines greater than 75 feet shall be broken up using stepbacks, changes in parapet or roof heights and/or by using a combination of roof forms.</li> <li>• Parapet caps shall be provided at the street-facing building facade. Where provided, cornices and parapet caps shall be at least six inches deep and six inches tall This standard does not apply to stepback floors.</li> <li>• Rooftop equipment shall be fully screened from public/street view using architectural elements including but not limited to parapets and screens.</li> <li>• When roof decks are added as a common open space or recreational facility, all mechanical and service equipment should be screened from the common open space.</li> </ul>
Open Space	<p>Existing guideline elevated to design standard/new standards: Two new standards and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ground-level common open spaces that have walkways or pathways shall be at least 10 feet wide with a minimum of 6 feet wide walkway</li> <li>• Raised planters provided at street-facing or public open space-facing setbacks shall not be taller than three feet: Interesting roof forms are encouraged throughout the downtown.</li> <li>• Building setback areas along streets and common open spaces within a development should be landscaped using California native trees and/or shrubs.</li> </ul>

**Table 4.1-1: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea A**

<b>Design Standards &amp; Guidelines</b>	<b>Description</b>
Building Material	<p>Existing guideline elevated to standard: Previously a design guideline paragraph, now one standard and three guidelines including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street-facing and public open space facing building facades shall have one primary material that has a traditional appearance, such as stone, brick, stucco, or wood.</li> <li>• Secondary materials for building facades may include modern and/or decorative elements such as glass, metal, tile etc.</li> <li>• Roofing materials and accenting features such as canopies, cornices, tile accents, etc. should offer color variation.</li> <li>• Residential building materials should include quality details such as wrought iron, wood-framed windows, wood brackets and tile roofs.</li> </ul>
Site Access	<p>Existing guideline elevated to standard: Previously a design guideline paragraph, now three standard and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For developments with less than 50 parking spaces, a maximum of one curb cut shall be provided.</li> <li>• Curb cuts shall be a maximum of 12 feet wide for one-way driveways and a maximum of 22 feet for two-way driveways unless otherwise required by City ordinance or policy</li> <li>• Curb cuts and parking shall not take up more than 42 feet of any street- or public open space-facing frontage</li> <li>• For developments with more than 50 parking spaces, no greater than two curb cuts should be provided.</li> </ul>
Parking	<p>Existing standard updated to be objective: Three standards and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When surface parking is provided on site, it shall be: a. Setback at least five feet from the street- or public open space-facing property line. b. Screened from the street using architectural and/or landscaping elements that are at least three feet but no greater than five feet tall.</li> <li>• Below grade parking shall not extend more than four feet above grade.</li> <li>• Ventilation exhaust or equipment for below grade parking shall not front public sidewalks or accessways (except the alley). If located along a street-facing facade, there shall be a minimum five-foot-wide landscape buffer between the building and the sidewalk.</li> <li>• Where feasible, primary vehicle access should be from an alleyway that extends from Bryant Street to Franklin Street along the southern property lines of the residential areas.</li> </ul>
Services/Trash Area	<p>Existing standard updated to be objective: Four standards and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New food service uses, and new buildings shall provide trash enclosures within the envelope of the building. Enclosures shall comply with any latest enclosure dimension standards.</li> <li>• Loading areas in new buildings shall be within the envelope of the building.</li> </ul>



<b>Table 4.1-1: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea A</b>	
<b>Design Standards &amp; Guidelines</b>	<b>Description</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All trash service and loading access shall be off an alley, if available. If not available, it shall be located in a well-screened location, away from residential uses.</li> <li>• All trash and loading areas outside the building envelope shall be screened from public view using landscape and architectural elements.</li> <li>• Screens, enclosures, and any other devices used to screen service facilities such as trash and loading areas should be consistent with the overall building architecture in form, material, and detail.</li> </ul>
Noise/Ground Vibration	<p>Existing standard updated to be easier to read: Previously a design standard paragraph, now one standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential projects within 300 feet of Evelyn Avenue right-of-way shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis by a certified acoustical engineer identifying impacts and measures to reduce impacts</li> </ul>

<b>Table 4.1-2: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea G</b>	
<b>Design Standards &amp; Guidelines</b>	<b>Description</b>
Building Height	<p>Design standard revised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A maximum building height of four stories is currently allowed, modification changes it to set a maximum height of 50 feet.</li> </ul>
Development Massing	<p>Design guideline elevated to standard: Previously a guideline paragraph, now two standards and two guidelines including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For developments adjacent to historic buildings, the building massing shall step down to be a maximum of 10 feet taller than the height of the adjacent historic building for a minimum of 10 feet from it</li> <li>• A character change shall be provided at least every 75 feet. Character changes include at least two of the following: changes to primary colors, changes to primary materials, and changes to primary wall planes. Projects may elect to provide a massing break in lieu of or in addition to a character change. Massing breaks shall be minimum four feet deep and 10 feet wide.</li> <li>• Massing breaks, setbacks and/or step-downs should be provided to create transition to existing surrounding developments.</li> <li>• Special corner features should be incorporated at corner parcels. These may include but are not limited to display windows, corner roof features, taller massing, and change in materials.</li> </ul>
Setback	Setbacks were placed in a chart no changes to requirements.
Ground Level Treatment & Façade Articulation	<p>Design guidelines elevated to standard: Previously two guideline paragraphs, now four standard and two guidelines including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street- and public open space-facing building facades shall be articulated in increments of up to 25 feet width using architectural</li> </ul>

**Table 4.1-2: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea G**

Design Standards & Guidelines	Description
	<p>and structural elements such as columns, fenestration patterns, entry alcoves, or changes in facade planes and materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of 50 percent of the ground floor commercial frontage area along streets and public open spaces shall be transparent facades. Doors providing 40 percent glazing on the ground floor in locations mentioned shall count toward the requirement.</li> <li>• When a base is provided along a street facing building facade, it shall be limited to 30 inches in height at grade and project a maximum of six inches from the building façade.</li> <li>• Street-facing canopies are allowed to extend up to six feet over the sidewalk and shall have a minimum vertical clearance of eight feet.</li> <li>• Commercial development should meet ground-level treatment guidelines outlined in the Historic Retail District</li> <li>• Pedestrian-level detailing should include storefront detailing, facade ornamentation, special materials, flower boxes and other improvements to reinforce the pedestrian nature.</li> </ul>
Entrance	<p>New design standard: Entrances is a new heading included, including three standards and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street-and public open space-facing entrances shall be recessed from the building facade by at least three feet creating a minimum six-foot wide entry alcove. Existing nonconforming alcoves shall be updated to meet this standard if the street-facing building facade is structurally modified.</li> <li>• Multiple entrances within a building shall be no more than 50’ apart on center</li> <li>• Ramps and/or steps provided at entrances shall not encroach in the public right-of-way.</li> <li>• Access to individual ground floor residential units should include a transition from public to private areas using front porches, steps, stoops, landscaped setbacks, or similar features.</li> </ul>
Windows	<p>Design guideline elevated to standards: Previously a design paragraph, now four standards including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At upper floor building facades, punched windows shall be provided.</li> <li>• A minimum of 90 percent of upper floor windows on street-or public open space facing building facades shall be designed such that: a. The total width of windows is not greater than nine feet. b. Windows are at least 12 inches apart. c. Windows with width-to-height ratio greater than 2:3 shall include vertical mullions such that each panel is not greater than 2:3 width-to-height ratio.</li> <li>• Windows shall be inset from the building facade or window trim by at least two inches to create shade and shadow detail.</li> </ul>

**Table 4.1-2: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea G**

<b>Design Standards &amp; Guidelines</b>	<b>Description</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mirrored or reflective glass is not allowed on a street-or public open space-facing building facade at any level.</li> </ul>
Roof Treatment	<p>Design guideline elevated to standards: Previously a design guideline paragraph, now three standards and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous roof lines greater than 75 feet shall be broken up using stepbacks, changes in parapet or roof heights and/or by using a combination of roof form</li> <li>• Parapet caps shall be provided at the street-facing building facade. Where provided, cornices and parapet caps shall be at least six inches deep and six inches tall. This standard does not apply to stepback floors.</li> <li>• Rooftop equipment shall be fully screened from public/street view using architectural elements including but not limited to parapets and screens.</li> <li>• When roof decks are added as a common open space or recreational facility, all mechanical equipment and service rooms should be screened from the common space</li> </ul>
Open Space	<p>Existing guideline elevated to design standard/new standards: Two new standards and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ground-level common open spaces that have walkways or pathways shall be at least 10 feet wide open space with a minimum of 6' wide walkway.</li> <li>• Raised planters provided in street-facing or public open space-facing setbacks shall not be taller than three feet.</li> <li>• Building setback areas along streets and common open spaces within a development should be landscaped using California native trees and/or shrubs.</li> </ul>
Building Material	<p>Existing guideline elevated to standard: Previously a design guideline paragraph, now one standard and four guidelines including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street-facing and public open space-facing, building facades shall have one primary material that has a traditional appearance, such as stone, brick, stucco, or wood.</li> <li>• Secondary materials for building facades may include modern and/or decorative elements such as glass, metal, tile etc.</li> <li>• Building facade materials should be light in color, i.e., earth tones, pastels or whites accented with dark or bright colors</li> <li>• Roofing materials and accenting features such as canopies, cornices, tile accents, etc. should offer color variation.</li> <li>• Residential building materials should include quality details such as wrought iron, wood-framed windows, wood brackets and tile roofs.</li> </ul>
Site Access	Existing guideline elevated to standard: Previously a design guideline

**Table 4.1-2: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea G**

<b>Design Standards &amp; Guidelines</b>	<b>Description</b>
	<p>paragraph, now four standards including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For developments with less than 50 parking spaces, a maximum of one curb cut shall be provided.</li> <li>• For developments with more than 50 parking spaces, no greater than two curb cuts shall be provided.</li> <li>• Curb cuts shall be a maximum of 12 feet wide for one-way driveways and a maximum of 22 feet for two-way driveways unless additional width is required for safety and operations.</li> <li>• Curb cuts and parking shall not take up more than 42 feet of any street- or public open space-facing site frontage</li> </ul>
Parking	<p>Existing standard updated to be objective: Previously a standard paragraph, now one standard included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ventilation exhaust or equipment for below grade parking shall not front public sidewalks or accessways (except the alley). If located along a street-facing facade, there shall be a minimum five-foot-wide landscape buffer between the building and the sidewalk.</li> </ul>
Services/ Trash Area	<p>Existing standard updated to be objective: Previously a standard paragraph, now four standards and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New food service uses and new buildings shall provide trash enclosures within the envelope of the building. Enclosures shall comply with any latest enclosure dimension standards.</li> <li>• Loading areas in new buildings shall be within the envelope of the building.</li> <li>• All trash service and loading access shall be off an alley, if available. If not available, it shall be located in a well-screened location, away from residential uses.</li> <li>• All trash and loading areas outside the building envelope shall be screened from public view using landscape and architectural elements.</li> <li>• Screens, enclosures, and any other devices used to screen service facilities such as trash and loading areas should be consistent with the overall building architecture in form, material, and detail.</li> </ul>

**Table 4.1-3: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea H**

<b>Design Standards &amp; Guidelines</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Building Height	<p>Development standard revised: Existing heights maintained for most of area H, with a height increase to the 100-200 block by 5 feet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area H 100-200 block increase height from 45 feet to 50 feet.</li> </ul>
Development Massing	<p>Design guideline elevated to standard: Previously a guideline paragraph, now two standards and two guidelines including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For developments adjacent to historic buildings, the building massing shall step down to be a maximum of 10 feet taller than the height of the adjacent historic building for a minimum of 10 feet</li> <li>• A character change shall be provided at least every 75 feet. Character changes include at least two of the following: changes to primary colors, changes to primary materials, and changes to primary wall planes. Projects may elect to provide a massing break in lieu of or in addition to a character change. Massing breaks shall be minimum four feet deep and 10 feet wide.</li> <li>• Massing breaks, stepbacks and/or step-downs should be provided to create transition to existing surrounding developments.</li> <li>• Special corner features should be incorporated at corner parcels. These may include but are not limited to display windows, corner roof features, taller massing, and change in materials features.</li> </ul>
Setback	<p>Setbacks were place in a chart no changes to requirements.</p>
Ground Level Treatment & Façade Articulation	<p>Design guidelines elevated to standard: Previously two guideline paragraphs, now four standards including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street- and public open space-facing building facades shall be articulated in increments of up to 25 feet width using architectural and structural elements such as columns, fenestration patterns, entry alcoves, or changes in facade planes</li> <li>• A minimum of 60 percent of the ground floor building facade area along Castro Street and 45 percent of the ground floor building facade area along Cross Streets shall have windows or doors. All doors with 40 percent of the area as glazing shall be counted towards this standard.</li> <li>• When a base is provided along a street-facing building facade, it shall be limited to 30 inches in height and project a maximum of six inches from the building façade.</li> <li>• Street-facing canopies are allowed to extend up to six feet over the sidewalk and shall have a minimum vertical clearance of eight feet.</li> </ul>
Entrance	<p>Design guideline elevated to standard: Entrances is a new heading, three new standards including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street-and public open space-facing entrances shall be recessed from the building facade by at least three feet creating a minimum six-foot wide entry alcove. Existing non-conforming alcoves shall be updated</li> </ul>

**Table 4.1-3: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea H**

	<p>to meet this standard if the street facing building facade is structurally modified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Along Castro Street, any building greater than 75’ wide shall be structurally designed to allow for multiple entrances, no more than 50’ apart on center. Entry alcove at street-facing building facade.</li> <li>• Ramps and/or steps provided at entrances shall not encroach in the public right-of-way.</li> </ul>
Windows	<p>Design guideline elevated to standards: Previously a design paragraph, now four standards including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At upper floor building facades, punched windows shall be provided.</li> <li>• A minimum of 90 percent of upper floor windows on street-or public open space-facing building facades shall be designed such that a. The total width of windows is not greater than nine feet. b. Windows are at least 12 inches apart. c. Windows with width-to-height ratio greater than 2:3 shall include vertical mullions such that each panel is not greater than 2:3 width-to-height ratio.</li> <li>• Windows shall be inset from the building facade or window trim by at least two inches to create shade and shadow detail.</li> <li>• Mirrored or reflective glass is not allowed on a street-or public open space-facing building facade at any level. Only transparent glass shall be used for windows or glazing at the ground floor.</li> </ul>
Roof Treatment	<p>Design guideline elevated to standards: Previously a design guideline paragraph, now three standards and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous roof lines for street-or public open space-facing building facades longer than 75 feet shall be broken up using changes in parapet or roof heights and/or by using a combination of roof forms. This does not apply to building facades at stepback floors.</li> <li>• Rooftop equipment shall be screened from public/street view using architectural elements including but not limited to parapets and screens.</li> <li>• Where provided, cornices and parapet caps shall be at least six inches deep and six inches tall.</li> <li>• When roof decks are added as a common open space or recreational facility, all mechanical equipment and service rooms should be screened from the common space.</li> </ul>
Open Space	<p>Existing guideline elevated to design standard/new standards: Two new standards and one guideline including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ground-level common open spaces that have walkways or pathways shall be at least 10 feet wide with a minimum of 6’ wide walkway</li> <li>• Raised planters provided in street-facing or public open space-facing setbacks shall not be taller than three feet.</li> <li>• Building setback areas along streets and public open spaces within a development should be landscaped using California native trees, shrubs and/or plants.</li> </ul>

<b>Table 4.1-3: Summary of 2022 Amendments for Subarea H</b>	
Building Material	Existing guideline elevated to standard: Previously a design guideline paragraph, now one standard and four guidelines including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street-facing and public open space-facing building facades shall have one primary material that has a traditional appearance, such as stone, brick, stucco, or wood.</li> </ul>
Parking	Parking development standard maintained, no change.
Services/ Trash Area	Existing standard updated to be objective: Previously a standard paragraph, now four standards and one guideline including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New food service uses and new buildings shall provide trash enclosures within the envelope of the building. Enclosures shall comply with any latest enclosure dimension standards.</li> <li>• Loading areas in new buildings shall be within the envelope of the building.</li> <li>• All trash service and loading access shall be off an alley, if available. If not available, it shall be located in a well screened location, away from residential uses.</li> <li>• All trash and loading areas outside the building envelope shall be screened from public view using landscape and architectural elements.</li> </ul>

## **SECTION 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, CHECKLIST, AND IMPACT DISCUSSION**

---

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 21093(b) and 15152(a), this Addendum tiers off the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR. This section discusses the impacts from the proposed 2022 Amendments. The analysis in this section has been prepared to determine whether any of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (described in Section 1.1 Purpose of the Addendum) would occur as a result of the proposed 2022 Amendments.

The proposed 2022 Amendments are limited to the design standards of the adopted Precise Plan and would be applicable to future development in the Precise Plan (specifically subareas A, G, and H). The amendments primarily pertain to building articulation, design details, setbacks, stepbacks, and screening. The amendments do not change the location, type, intensity, amount, or operation of development allowed by the adopted Precise Plan. Nor do the amendments affect the existing, physical conditions in and around the Precise Plan area. Therefore, the project amendments would not affect the following environmental factors:

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

The proposed 2022 Amendments effects on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, and tribal cultural resources are discussed below.



## 5.1 AESTHETICS

	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	New Less than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Approved Project	Less Impact than Approved Project
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? <sup>1</sup> If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 5.1.1 Existing Setting

The existing aesthetics setting has not substantially changed since adoption of the 2004 IS/ND or 1999 IS/MND or the certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR. Since the certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR, Senate Bill (SB) 743 was passed in September 2013. SB 743 states that a project’s aesthetic impacts would be considered less than significant if the project is a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project and located on an infill site within a transit priority area<sup>2</sup>. Subareas A, G, and H are urbanized areas developed with one- to three-story commercial, residential, and mixed-use buildings consisting of a variety of architectural styles.

### 5.1.2 Impact Discussion

If future development under the proposed 2022 Amendments meets the criteria stipulated in SB 743, these developments would result in less than significant aesthetic impacts.

<sup>1</sup> Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21099, “Employment center project” is defined as a project located on property zoned for commercial uses with a floor area ratio of no less than 0.75 and that is located within a transit proximity area. “Infill site” is defined as a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed, or on a vacant site where at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins, or is separated only by an improved public-right-of-way from, parcels that are developed with qualified uses. “Transit proximity area” is defined as an area within one-half mile of a major transit stop that is existing or planned, if the planned stop is scheduled to be completed within the planning horizon included in a Transportation Improvement Program adopted pursuant to Section 450.216 or 450.322 of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

a. Scenic vistas in the City include views of the Santa Cruz Mountains, Diablo Mountain Range, Mission Peak, and Stevens Creek. Shoreline Park in the North Bayshore area provides views of San Francisco Bay.

The 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND for the Downtown Precise Plan area concluded that future development allowed under the Precise Plan would have no impact on scenic vistas due to the heavily developed nature of the Downtown area and the lack of scenic vistas in the area.<sup>3,4</sup>

The 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan (which includes the Precise Plan) would result in less than significant impacts to scenic vistas because policy changes would primarily impact areas where scenic vistas are largely obscured by existing development.<sup>5</sup>

The proposed 2022 Amendments would convert some existing design guidelines into standards, create new standards, and would not alter the type or intensity of development allowed by the adopted Precise Plan. No physical changes to the environment are proposed. Since the proposed 2022 Amendments would not change the height with the exception of buildings within block 100-200 block of Subarea H where the maximum building height would increase by five feet from 45 to 50 feet. This five foot increase in allowed building height would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista when compared what is currently allowed and the proposed 2022 Amendments would not change the density of development allowed by the Precise Plan. For these reasons, the proposed 2022 Amendments would result in the same less than significant impact to scenic vistas as previously disclosed in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR. Furthermore, pursuant to the 2012 General Plan EIR, future development would be subject to the City's existing codes and policies pertaining to protection of scenic resources including the following General Plan Policies:

- LUD 6.1 ensure new development in or near residential neighborhoods is compatible with existing neighborhood character
- LUD 6.3 encourage building facades and frontages that create a presence at the street and along interior pedestrian pathways
- LUD 7.3 support new and renovated Downtown buildings to include human-scaled details such as street-facing windows, awnings, and architectural features to create a comfortable and interesting pedestrian environment
- LUD 9.1 ensure that new development includes sensitive height and setback transitions to existing development through adherence to precise plans, design guidelines, and zoning standards

b. The 1999 IS/MND concluded the Precise Plan would have no impact to scenic resources.<sup>6</sup> The 2004 IS/ND concluded that the Precise Plan would have a less than significant impact on scenic resources since the Precise Plan area is a heavily developed commercial corridor with no scenic

---

<sup>3</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*. May 2004. Page 33.

<sup>4</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*. December 1999. Page 3-11.

<sup>5</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR, SCH# 2011012069*. November 2011. Page 576.

<sup>6</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*. December 1999.

resources.

As discussed in the 2012 General Plan EIR, there are no state designated scenic highway within City limits and no portions of the City are visible from a state scenic highway, therefore, buildout of the General Plan (which includes the Precise Plan) would result in less than significant impacts to scenic resources.<sup>7</sup>

The Precise Plan area is not located along or adjacent to a state scenic highway.<sup>8</sup> The lack of visibility of Precise Plan area from a designated scenic highway has not changed since the adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND or certification of the 2012 General Plan. For this reason, the proposed 2022 Amendments would result in the same impact to scenic resources along a state scenic highway as disclosed in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

c. The 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that future development under the Precise Plan would be subject to the Development Review Committee (DRC) review process, which would ensure compliance with existing General Plan urban design policies. Future development would also be subject to the Precise Plan design guidelines, which govern the scenic quality of downtown. As a result, future development under the Precise Plan would not conflict with regulations governing scenic quality.

The purpose of the proposed 2022 Amendments is to maintain the current look and feel of downtown by converting some existing design guidelines into standards and creating new standards pertaining to building articulation, design details, height,<sup>9</sup> setbacks, stepbacks, and screening. The proposed 2022 Amendments would create additional regulations to ensure the scenic quality of downtown. For this reason, the project would complement and strengthen existing regulations governing scenic quality. The project would not result in new or substantially more severe conflicts with regulations governing scenic quality than previously disclosed in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

d. The 1999 IS/MND concluded that the Precise Plan would not result in light and glare impacts.<sup>10</sup> The 2004 IS/ND concluded that the design guidelines in the Precise Plan would limit the impact of new exterior lighting by requiring the strategic placement and orientation of all new lights to minimize glare. This would reduce any impacts of new developments to a less than significant level.<sup>11</sup> The 2012 General Plan EIR found that new development would create new sources of light and glare that could compromise daytime and nighttime views, however, implementation of mitigation measure VIS-1, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level through requiring projects to meet light

---

<sup>7</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR, SCH# 2011012069*. November 2011. Page 579.

<sup>8</sup> Caltrans. "California State Scenic Highway System Map." 2018. Accessed January 14, 2022. Available at: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116flaacia>.

<sup>9</sup> The maximum building height allowed in the 100-200 block of Subarea H would increase by five feet from 45 to 50 feet.

<sup>10</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*. December 1999. Page 3-11.

<sup>11</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*. May 2004. Pages 33 and 34.

standards and minimize light and glare from new development.<sup>12</sup>

General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure:

VIS-1: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following policy in the Land Use and Design chapter of the Draft General Plan:

Policy LUD-9.6: Light and glare. Minimize light and glare from new development.

**ACTION:** Light Standards. Adopt and periodically update a set of City Code regulations, standard mitigation measures, and/or development conditions to minimize off-site light and glare from new development.

The proposed 2022 Amendments would not change any of the existing standards regarding light and glare, nor would they result in increased light or glare because they primarily pertain to building articulation, design details, setbacks, stepbacks, and screening. In fact, the amendments include new design standards for Subareas A, G, and H that prohibit mirrored and reflective glass. This new standard would prevent glare. Furthermore, consistent with General Plan Policy LUD-9.6 and Action above, the City requires the following standard condition of approval for all development projects (including those in the Precise Plan area).

- **Lighting Plan:** The applicant shall submit a lighting plan in building permit drawings. This plan should include photometric contours, manufacturer’s specifications on the fixtures, and mounting heights. The design and location of outdoor lighting fixtures shall ensure there will be no glare and light spillover to surrounding properties, which is demonstrated with photometric contours extending beyond the project property lines. The lighting plan submitted with building permit drawings must be approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to building permit issuance.

For these reasons, the proposed 2022 Amendments would not result in new or substantially more severe light and glare impacts than disclosed in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

---

<sup>12</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR, SCH# 2011012069*. November 2011. Page 581.

5.2

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	New Less than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Approved Project	Less Impact than Approved Project
Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5.2.1 Existing Setting**

There have been no substantive changes to the regulatory framework for biological resources since the adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND, or the certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR.

Development projects have been approved and constructed since adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND, and since the certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR which have resulted in the loss of trees. All development projects are subject to the City's tree replacement requirements.

### **5.2.2 Impact Discussion**

**a.** The 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that due to the lack of sensitive habitat and location of the Precise Plan area in an urbanized area, implementation of the Precise Plan would not result in a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.<sup>13,14,15</sup>

The lack of suitable habitat for sensitive species in the Precise Plan area and urbanized location of the Precise Plan area has not changed since the adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND or certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR. The proposed 2022 Amendments would not change the area identified for development in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR. For these reasons, the proposed 2022 Amendments would result in the same impact as previously identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

**b.** The 1999 IS/MND did not identify any impacts to riparian habitats.<sup>16</sup> The 2004 IS/ND for the Downtown Precise Plan and 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that implementation of the Precise Plan would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities because no such habitats or communities are present within the fully urbanized Precise Plan area.<sup>17 18</sup>

The lack of riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities in the Precise Plan area and urbanized location of the Precise Plan area has not changed since the adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND or certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR. The proposed 2022 Amendments would not change the area identified for development within the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, or 2012 General Plan EIR. For these reasons, the proposed 2022 Amendments would result in the same impact to riparian habitats as previously identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

**c.** The 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that the Precise Plan would not result in a substantial adverse effect on any federally protected wetlands since there are no

---

<sup>13</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*. May 2004. Page 27.

<sup>14</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*. December 1999. Pages 3-7.

<sup>15</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR, SCH# 2011012069*. September 2012. Page 447-449. Note that the 2012 General Plan EIR identified mitigation reduce impacts to the burrowing owl and Congdon's tarplant located in the North Bayshore area (outside the Precise Plan area) to a less than significant level.

<sup>16</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*. December 1999. Page 3-7.

<sup>17</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR, SCH# 2011012069*. September 2012, Page 447-449. Note that the 2012 General Plan EIR identified mitigation reduce impacts to the riparian habitats and sensitive natural communities along Stevens Creek and in the northern portion of Shoreline Regional Park (outside the Precise Plan area) to a less than significant level.

<sup>18</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*. May 2004. Page 27.

wetlands or riparian habitats in the vicinity of the Precise Plan area.<sup>19,20, 21, 22</sup>

The lack of wetlands and riparian habitat in the Precise Plan area has not changed since the adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND or certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR. The proposed 2022 Amendments would not change the area identified for development in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR. For this reason, the proposed 2022 Amendments would result in the same impact as identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

**d.** The primary wildlife corridors within the City are Permanente Creek and Stevens Creek, which provide a link between undeveloped open space adjacent to San Francisco Bay and undeveloped areas in the hills south of City limits and are also suitable habitat for wildlife nursery sites.<sup>23</sup> Permanente Creek and Stevens Creek are located approximately 0.29 mile west and 0.47 mile east of the Precise Plan area, respectively. The 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that implementation of the Precise Plan would not occur within or adjacent to the Permanente Creek or Stevens Creek riparian corridors and, therefore, implementation of the Precise Plan would have no impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.<sup>24,25,26</sup>

The lack of wildlife corridors and nursery sites in the Precise Plan area has not changed since the adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND or the certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR. The proposed 2022 Amendments would not change the area identified for development in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR. However, future development allowed under the proposed 2022 Amendments could include landscaped rooftop open space with transparent rooftop railing which could obstruct the movement of native and migratory birds and pose collision risk if not properly designed. Future development would be subject to project-level, site specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA and would be required to document impacts on biological resources and incorporate measures to avoid or minimize such impacts, if necessary. For these reasons, there would be a less than significant impact on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. This is the same impact as identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

**e.** The 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that future development

---

<sup>19</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*. May 2004. Page 27.

<sup>20</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*. December 1999. Page 3-7.

<sup>21</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR, SCH# 2011012069*. September 2012. Page 451.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* Page 451. Note, the only wetlands in Mountain View are located along creeks and in the area immediately adjacent to the San Francisco Bay.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* Page 451.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* Page 451. Note that the 2012 General Plan EIR identified mitigation reduce impacts to wildlife movement corridors along Stevens Creek and Permanente Creek (outside the Precise Plan area) to a less than significant level.

<sup>25</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*. May 2004. Page 27.

<sup>26</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*, December 1999. Page 3-7.

under the Precise Plan would comply with the City’s Heritage Tree Ordinance.<sup>27, 28,29</sup>

The proposed 2022 Amendments would not change the area or type of development identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR. For these reasons, there would be a less than significant impact on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as the City’s tree protection ordinance. This is the same impact as identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

**f.** The 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that the implementation of the Precise Plan would have no impact on a habitat conservation plan because no habitat conservation plans are in effect in the Precise Plan area.<sup>30, 31,32</sup>

The lack of conservation plans governing the Precise Plan area has not changed since the adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND or the certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR. The proposed 2022 Amendments would not change the area identified for development in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR. For these reasons, implementation of the proposed 2022 Amendments would result in the same impact as previously identified in the 2004 IS/ND and 2012 General Plan EIR.

---

<sup>27</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR, SCH# 2011012069*. September 2012. Page 453.

<sup>28</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study, SCH# 2011012069*. May 2004. Page 28.

<sup>29</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*, December 1999. Page 3-7.

<sup>30</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR, SCH# 2011012069*. September 2012. Page 453.

<sup>31</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*. May 2004. Page 27.

<sup>32</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*, December 1999.



**5.3**

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	New Less than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Approved Project	Less Impact than Approved Project
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5.3.1 Existing Setting**

Since adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND and certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR, historic resources have been demolished in the Precise Plan area and the City has updated its Historic Resources Inventory (2017). Currently, the following six buildings in subareas A, G, and H are listed on the Mountain View Register of Historic Resources:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Weilheimer Store (124 Castro Street)      | 4. Rogers Building (142-156 Castro Street)                                 |
| 2. Ames Building (169-175 Castro Street)     | 5. Farmers & Merchants Bank Building (201 Castro Street /761 Villa Street) |
| 3. Mountain View Theater (228 Castro Street) | 6. Scarpa’s Meat Market (298 Castro Street)                                |

The following two buildings were deemed eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and are thereby eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historic Resources.

- |  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1. 938 Villa Street (Weilheimer House) | 2. 954 Villa Street (Airbase Laundry) |
|--|---------------------------------------|

**5.3.2 Impact Discussion**

a. In addition to the resources listed and eligible for listing identified in Section 5.3.1 Existing Setting, there may be additional historic resources identified downtown pending the City’s update of its Historic Ordinance and Register of Historic Resources that is currently underway.

Both the 1999 IS/MND and the 2004 IS/ND found that the implementation of the Precise Plan would result in a less than significant impact to historic resources with the implementation of Mitigation Measure MM II.N-1 and compliance with the City’s Historic preservation permit requirements such

as requiring a site-specific assessment by a qualified architectural historian for projects that propose modifications to any structures included on the City's Register of Historic Resources.<sup>33,34</sup> Mitigation Measure MM II.N-1 is superseded by and substantially the same as General Plan Policies LUD 11.1 through LUD 11.3 described below.

The 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that impacts to historic resources within the City from buildout of the General Plan would be less than significant with adherence to the following General Plan Policies and City Code requirements:<sup>35</sup>

#### General Plan Policies

- LUD 11.1: Historical preservation. Support the preservation and restoration of structures and cultural resources listed in the Mountain View Register of Historic Resources, the California Register of Historic Places or National Register of Historic Places.
- LUD 11.2: Adaptive re-use. Encourage the adaptive re-use of historic buildings in ways that retain their historical materials and character-defining features.
- LUD 11.3: Incentives. Encourage historical preservation through incentives and opportunities.

#### City Code Requirements

- Section 36.54.85: Applicability. No person shall make a significant alteration, redevelop, or relocate any structure or improvement, or any portion thereof, upon a property designated as a historic resource on the Mountain View Register of Historic Resources without first obtaining a "historic preservation permit" or HP permit.

The proposed 2022 Amendments would convert some existing design guidelines into standards and would not alter the type or level of development intensity currently allowed by the adopted Precise Plan. No physical changes to the environment are proposed. Furthermore, future development in the Precise Plan area (including in subareas A, G, and H) is required to adhere to the same mitigation measures, General Plan policies, and regulations identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR to reduce impacts to historic resources to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed ordinance update would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource. This is the same impact as previously identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

**b.** The 1999 IS/MND disclosed there were no known archaeological resources within the Precise Plan area and concluded that adherence to existing City policies regarding the discovery of archaeological resources would be sufficient to reduce any potential impacts to unrecorded archaeological resources to a less than significant level.<sup>36</sup> The 2004 IS/ND concluded that implementation of the Precise Plan would result in less than significant impacts to archaeological resources with incorporation of Mitigation Measure II.N-2, which would require a site-specific records search and historical research

---

<sup>33</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*, Page 34-35. May 2004.

<sup>34</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*, Page 3-12. December 1999.

<sup>35</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR*, Page 471. September 2012.

<sup>36</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*, Page 3-12. December 1999.

prior to development.<sup>37</sup> Mitigation Measure MM II.N-2 is superseded by and substantially the same as General Plan Policies LUD 11.5 and Actions LUD 11.5.1 through Action LUD 11.5.3 described below.

The 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that ground-disturbing activities associated with development allowed for under the General Plan could result in significant impacts to subsurface archaeological resources; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure MM CULT-1 would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.<sup>38</sup>

General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure:

CULT-1: The following new policy and actions shall be included in the Land Use and Design element of the General Plan:

POLICY LUD 11.5: Protect important archaeological and paleontological sites. Utilize the development review process to identify and protect archaeological and paleontological deposits.

ACTION LUD 11.5.1: Review Historic Property Directory List. Prior to approval of development permits for projects that include ground-disturbing activities, City staff shall review the most recent and updated Northwest Information Center list: Historic Property Directory for the County of Santa Clara, to determine if known archaeological and paleontological sites underlie the proposed project. If it is determined that known cultural resources are within ¼ mile of the project site, the City shall require the project applicant to conduct a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University to confirm whether there are any recorded cultural resources within or adjacent to the project site. Based on that research, the City shall determine whether field study by a qualified cultural resources consultant is recommended.

ACTION LUD 11.5.2: Pre-construction cultural resource surveys. Should City staff determine that field study for cultural resources is required, the project applicant shall have a cultural resource professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards in history and/or archaeology conduct a pre-construction survey to identify significant cultural resources – including archaeological sites, paleontological resources, and human remains – in the project site and provide project-specific recommendations, as needed. Coordination with local Native American communities should be done when significant cultural resources and remains are identified as part of pre-approval site analysis.

ACTION LUD 11.5.3: Archaeological and paleontological standard conditions. Adopt and periodically update a set of standard mitigation measures and development conditions to address the discovery and identification of archaeological and paleontological deposits.

---

<sup>37</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*, Page 35-36. May 2004.

<sup>38</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR*, Page 472-473. September 2012.

The proposed 2022 Amendments would convert some of the existing design guidelines into standards and would not alter the type or intensity of development currently allowed by the adopted Precise Plan. No physical changes to the environment are proposed. Consistent with General Plan Policy LUD 11.5, the City requires the following standard condition of approval for all development projects (including those in the Precise Plan area):

- **Discovery of Archaeological Resources.** If prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all activity within 100 feet of the find shall cease and the find shall be flagged for avoidance. The City and a qualified archaeologist, defined as one meeting the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology, shall be immediately informed of the discovery. The qualified archaeologist shall inspect the find within 24 hours of discovery and notify the City of their initial assessment. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks and artifacts; stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered-stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and wall, filled wells or privies, and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, in consultation with a Tamien Nation Tribal representative, shall develop a treatment plan that could include site avoidance, capping, or data recovery.

Furthermore, future development in the Precise Plan area (including subareas A, G, and H) is required to adhere to the same mitigation measure and General Plan policies and actions identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR to reduce impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level. This is the same impact as previously identified in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and the 2012 General Plan EIR.

c. The 1999 IS/MND concluded that there were no known human remains within the Precise Plan Area; therefore, the Precise Plan would have no impact.<sup>39</sup> The 2004 IS/ND concluded that ground-disturbing activities associated with development allowed under the Precise Plan could result in a significant impact to human remains and this impact could be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure II.N-4, which requires the same procedures as identified under General Plan Policy LUD 11.6 and that are discussed below.<sup>40</sup>

The 2012 General Plan EIR concluded that ground-disturbing activities associated with development allowed under the General Plan could result in significant impacts to human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries; however, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the following General Plan Policy:<sup>41</sup>

#### General Plan Policy

---

<sup>39</sup> City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*, Page 3-12. December 1999.

<sup>40</sup> City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*, Page 36-37. May 2004.

<sup>41</sup> City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR*, Page 473-474. September 2012.

- LUD 11.6: Human remains. Require all new development to meet state codes regarding the identification and protection of human remains.

The proposed 2022 Amendments would convert some existing design guidelines into standards and would not alter the type or intensity of development currently allowed by the adopted Precise Plan. No physical changes to the environment are proposed. Furthermore, future development in the Precise Plan area (including in subareas A, G, and H) is required to adhere to same mitigation measure and General Plan Policy LUD 11.6 identified in the 2004 IS/ND and 2012 General Plan EIR to reduce impacts to unknown human remains to a less than significant level. Consistent with General Plan Policy LUD 11.6, the City requires the following standard condition of approval for all development projects (including those in the Precise Plan area):

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

For these reasons, the proposed 2022 Amendments would result in a less than significant impact to human remains. This is the same impact as identified in the 2012 General Plan EIR and 2004 IS/ND.

## 5.4 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	New Less than Significant Impact	Same Impact as Approved Project	Less Impact than Approved Project
<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p>					
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 5.4.1 Existing Setting

There have been no substantial changes to the existing setting for tribal cultural resources since adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND or 2012 General Plan EIR. Subsequent to the adoption of the 1999 IS/MND and 2004 IS/ND and certification of the 2012 General Plan EIR, California Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) was adopted. AB 52 established a new category of resources for consideration by public agencies called Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs). AB 52 requires lead agencies to provide notice of projects to tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area if they have requested to be notified. Where a non-exempt project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, consultation is required until the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect on a tribal cultural resource or until it is concluded that mutual agreement cannot be reached.

Under AB 52, TCRs are defined as follows:

- Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are also either:

- Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources, or
- Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).
- A resource determined by the lead agency to be a TCR.

The City completed a Sacred Lands File Search for the site on July 19, 2022. One known tribal cultural resource was identified within the Precise Plan area through the file search.<sup>42</sup>

#### **5.4.2 Impact Discussion**

**a-b.** While the 2012 General Plan EIR, 2004 IS/ND, and 1999 IS/MND did not specifically discuss TCRs, the potential impacts to cultural resources of Native American importance were discussed in the cultural resources sections of these previous environmental documents. The proposed 2022 Amendments pertain to the design of future development allowed by the adopted Precise Plan. No physical changes to the environment are proposed and the project would not alter the type or level of development intensity currently allowed by the adopted Precise Plan. As discussed above, there is one known TCRs within the Precise Plan area. Therefore, future development in the Precise Plan area (including in subareas A, G, and H) shall notify all tribes listed with the NAHC and traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area that a project is proposed and complete tribal consultation pursuant to AB 52 as applicable. Additionally, as discussed in Section 5.3 Cultural Resources, future development in the Precise Plan area would be required to adhere to General Plan Policy LUD 11.5 and existing regulations (e.g., CEQA, AB 52) to reduce impacts to TCRs to a less than significant level. Existing regulations and City standard permit conditions would protect TCRs. The adoption of AB 52 (which requires tribal consultation) does not result in a new significant impact. For these reasons, the project would result in the same impact as disclosed in the 1999 IS/MND, 2004 IS/ND, and 2012 General Plan EIR.

---

<sup>42</sup> Cody Campagne, NAHC. Personal Communication. July 19, 2022.

## SECTION 6.0 REFERENCES

---

The analysis in this Initial Study is based on the professional judgement and expertise of the environmental specialists preparing this document, based upon review of the site, surrounding conditions, site plans, and the following references:

City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update Phase II Initial Study*. May 2004.

City of Mountain View. *Mountain View Register of Historic Resources*. September 20, 2017.

City of Mountain View. *Supplemental Initial Study for the City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan Update*. December 1999.

City of Mountain View. *City of Mountain View Draft 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program FEIR, SCH# 2011012069*. November 2011.

Caltrans. "California State Scenic Highway System Map." 2018. Accessed January 14, 2022. Available at: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116flaaca>.

Persons Contacted:

Cody Campagne, NAHC.



## **SECTION 7.0 LEAD AGENCY AND CONSULTANTS**

---

### **7.1 LEAD AGENCY**

#### **City of Mountain View**

Department of Community Development

Eric Anderson, Advanced Planning Manager

Edgar Maravilla, Senior Planner

### **7.2 CONSULTANTS**

#### **David J. Powers & Associates, Inc.**

Environmental Consultants and Planners

Kristy Weis, Principal Project Manager

Carolyn Neer, Project Manager

Nick Towstopiat, Assistant Project Manager

Ryan Osako, Graphic Artist

## **SECTION 8.0      ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

---

AB	Assembly Bill
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
DRC	Development Review Committee
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
FAR	Floor-Area Ratio
General Plan EIR	Mountain View 2030 General Plan Environmental Impact Report
IS	Initial Study
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
ND	Negative Declaration
NOD	Notice of Determination
Precise Plan	City of Mountain View Downtown Precise Plan
SB	Senate Bill
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resource
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service