

**Addendum to the
Mitigated Negative Declaration
for the**

885 WOODSIDE ROAD PRECISE PLAN

Prepared for:

The City of Redwood City
Planning Department
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, California 94064

August 30, 2007

Prepared by:

Impact Sciences, Inc.
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1825
Oakland, California 94612

In consultation with:

Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

Addendum to Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 885 Woodside Road Precise Plan August 30, 2007

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This report has been prepared by the City of Redwood City (City, the Lead Agency) as an Addendum to the October 2006 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (2006 IS/MND) for the 885 Woodside Road Precise Plan pursuant to Section 15164 (Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This Addendum describes the changes and/or additions to the 2006 IS/MND necessary to achieve CEQA compliance for proposed changes to the 885 Woodside Road Precise Plan.

On November 28, 2006, the Redwood City Planning Commission adopted the IS/MND for the 885 Woodside Road Precise Plan, and recommended approval of the Precise Plan to the City Council. On April 9, 2007, the City Council considered the Precise Plan at a public hearing and voted to refer the Precise Plan back to the Planning Commission to require that the project's vehicular access be relocated from Horgan Avenue to Woodside Road, to explore options to the project height of either four or five stories, and to consider a smoother transition to the neighborhood. The project applicant has revised the Precise Plan in response to City Council direction. This Addendum evaluates those proposed revisions, described below.

REVISIONS TO THE 885 WOODSIDE ROAD PRECISE PLAN

The project site is located at 885 Woodside Road. The existing site conditions are unchanged from those described in the 2006 IS/MND. The proposed changes to the Precise Plan include relocation of the site access from Horgan Avenue to Woodside Road and modification of building height and setbacks to provide a smoother transition to neighboring properties. Attachment 1 shows the revised project plans. The revisions are described below.

Site Access: The site plan has been revised to relocate access to the site from Horgan Avenue to Woodside Road. The applicant received approval from Caltrans on July 16, 2007 for access from Woodside Road (see encroachment permit in Attachment 2).

Height and Setback: The proposed height and setback revisions are summarized in the table on the following page and discussed in the following paragraphs.

Height: The project's overall height has been reduced by approximately three feet, from 61 to 58 feet. The primary height reduction is proposed along the east/rear property line adjacent to the existing single-family residences. The project's east elevation has been reduced to four stories/39 feet to the eave. This 39-foot height is 11 feet higher than the height limit for a two-story single-family residence (i.e., 28 feet). The five-story portion of the project has been shifted approximately 43 feet away from the single-family home towards Woodside Road and the gas station site, and is approximately 58 feet in height (not including the approximately 60 and 63 foot decorative tower features).

Setbacks: The project's western front yard setback (along Woodside Road) has not changed. This setback ranges from approximately eight feet (at the lobby entrance) to 23 feet; the current zoning allows a 0-foot setback. The Woodside Road sidewalk will also be increased from 7½ feet to 16 feet. The project's northern side yard setback (near the Montecito Apartments) has also not changed and is 8½ feet (where 0 feet is allowed). A portion of the southern side yard setback (near Horgan Avenue) has increased and now

ranges from 12 to 64 feet. A nine-foot wide sidewalk including planter strip will also be installed along Horgan Avenue where a sidewalk currently does not exist.

The project’s eastern rear yard setback (near the single-family residences) has also been revised. Previously, the project had a 15-foot first floor setback and a 20-foot setback for the second to fifth floors. The revised project is now tiered as follows: 36-foot setback along the at-grade patio area; 15-foot setback at the first-floor garage level; 20-foot setback at floors two through four (which contain 38 of the project’s 43 units); and a 43-foot setback for the five units located at the fifth floor (where 15 feet is normally required). The rear yards of the adjacent single-family homes further separate the structures by an additional 12 to 20+ feet.

Standard	Existing Zoning	Previous Project (+/-) (Planning Commission Hearing of 11/28/06)	Revised Project (+/-)
Height	75 feet/ 7 stories	61 feet/5 stories	39 feet to eave - 4 th floor 58 feet to ridge - 5 th floor 60 and 63 feet - decorative towers
Setbacks:			
Front (W) Woodside	0 feet	8 to 23 feet	8 to 23 feet
Side (N) Montecito	0 feet	8 feet	8 feet
Side (S) Horgan Ave.	0 feet	12 to 21 feet	12 to 21 feet, and 64 feet to at-grade patio
Rear (E) Danbury St.	15 feet	15 feet - 1 st floor parking 20 feet - 2 nd - 5 th floor units	15 feet - 1 st floor parking 20 feet - 2 nd -4 th floor (38 units) 43 feet - 5 th floor (5 units) 36 feet - at-grade patio

Neighborhood Transition and Privacy: The project has also been redesigned such that no windows or balconies on the fifth floor face the rear yard single-family residential neighbors. Only nine rear yard balconies now face east and these balconies are now partially enclosed (vs. fully open) to further increase privacy. The developer has also agreed to provide alternate tree species, including deciduous trees (rather than the previously proposed redwood trees) along the rear (east) property line to enhance privacy in spring and summer seasons and to maximize sunlight in autumn and winter seasons. These improvements, combined with the project’s reduced height and tiered rear yard setback approach (which increases from 15 to 20 to 43 feet from the first floor to the top floor), are similar to the standards used for the west side of El Camino Real within the adopted Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan and provide a more sensitive transition between neighboring properties.

CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR USE OF AN ADDENDUM

The City has determined that preparation of an Addendum to the adopted IS/MND pursuant to Sections 15164 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines is the most appropriate method for addressing the proposed revisions to the 885 Woodside Road Precise Plan. Section 15164(b) of the CEQA Guidelines allows the preparation of an Addendum to a Negative Declaration as follows:

- (b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in

Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines states:

(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(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 alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based on the information contained in this report, the City has determined that the proposed revisions to the 885 Woodside Road Precise Plan, and the associated necessary changes to the adopted IS/MND included in this report, meet the above CEQA criteria requiring preparation of, and treating this report as, an Addendum to the adopted 2006 IS/MND.

CIRCULATION AND PUBLIC REVIEW OF ADDENDUM

Under Section 15164(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, an addendum does not need to be circulated for public review. The decision making body is required to “consider” the Addendum with the adopted IS/MND prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164[d]). In the interest of full disclosure and public information, the City has decided to make the Addendum available for public review and comment for a period of 15 days, from August 30 to September 13, 2007. Written comments on the Addendum must be submitted to the Redwood City Planning Division (1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, CA 94063) prior to 5:00 p.m. on September 13, 2007.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO PRECISE PLAN

The following presents an evaluation of the proposed revisions to the Precise Plan in relation to the environmental impact conclusions of the 2006 IS/MND for the original Precise Plan. The evaluation follows the organization of the Environmental Checklist Form in the 2006 IS/MND.

1. Aesthetics

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project could result in aesthetic impacts related to the introduction of new exterior light sources. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. The 2006 IS/MND identified one mitigation measure designed to ensure that exterior and interior lighting would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views and thereby reduce aesthetic impacts to less than significant levels. That mitigation measure is still applicable to the revised Precise Plan:

Mitigation Measure 1-1: Prior to building permit issuance, the project sponsor shall submit an exterior lighting plan that includes only exterior lighting fixtures that do not allow direct light rays to leave the project site and which also do not allow direct light sources (incandescent, fluorescent, or other forms of electric illumination) to be directly visible from off-site locations. The plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not have a significant shade and shadow effect on adjacent properties, based on a shade and shadow study prepared by Solargy, Inc. The shade and shadow study was updated based on the proposed revisions to the project design and is on file with the Redwood City Planning Division. The updated study also concludes that the proposed revisions to project design would not have a significant shade and shadow effect on adjacent properties. Shadows would be longest at the Winter Solstice, and the proposed project would not significantly shade the residences to the east until later in the afternoon in all seasons. Those buildings would have enough solar access to install a solar hot water or photo voltaic energy collection system and, therefore, the owners' reasonable rights to sunlight would be preserved. In addition, late afternoon sunlight is already significantly attenuated by the existing extensive foliage along the rear property lines of the existing residences. No mitigation is required.

2. Agricultural Resources

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not result in any agricultural resources impacts. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. No mitigation is required.

3. Air Quality

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project could result in potential air quality impacts related to project construction activities. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. The 2006 IS/MND identified one mitigation measure designed to reduce construction-related air quality impacts to less than significant levels. That mitigation measure is still applicable to the revised Precise Plan:

Mitigation Measure 3-1: The following notes shall be incorporated on the grading and building plans prior to issuance of grading or building permits, and the measures shall be implemented during construction activities:

- a. Water all active construction and disturbed areas at least twice daily during dry periods.
- b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

- c. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (nontoxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
- d. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. Dust, sediment, and debris shall not be washed into the storm drain system.
- e. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets. Dust, sediment, and debris shall not be washed into the storm drain system.
- f. Excavation and grading activities shall be suspended and dust control measures shall be implemented when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

4. Biological Resources

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not result in biological resource impacts. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. No mitigation is required.

5. Cultural Resources

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project could result in the potential to unearth undiscovered cultural resources, which could represent a potentially significant effect. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. The 2006 IS/MND identified one mitigation measure designed to address the potential discovery of unexpected cultural resources and to reduce that potential impact to a less than significant level. That mitigation measure is still applicable to the revised Precise Plan:

Mitigation Measure 5-1: Prior to building permit issuance, the project sponsor shall incorporate via a note on the first page of the construction plans, that should cultural resources be encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit a Cultural Resources Management Plan, per City Requirements, to the Community Development Director for review and approval that outlines the findings and mitigation methods of curation and/or protection of the resources. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e). The note on the plans shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

6. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project could result in geology, soils, and seismicity impacts related primarily to differential settlement. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. The 2006 IS/MND identified one mitigation measure requiring that all recommendations included in the project's geotechnical report be incorporated into the project and approved by the City Engineer, thereby reducing geologic, soil, and seismic impacts to less than significant levels. That mitigation measure is still applicable to the revised Precise Plan.

Mitigation Measure 6-1: The proposed project will be constructed following the site preparation, design, and construction recommendations of the project's geotechnical report, including shoring for all excavations near property boundaries and installation of a two-way reinforced basement level mat to mitigate the projected differential settlements.

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not result in hazards or hazardous materials impacts. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. No mitigation is required.

Subsequent to Planning Commission adoption of the 2006 IS/MND, the City received a comment letter on the IS/MND from the California Department of Toxics Control (DTSC). The letter requested additional information about historic uses of the project site and site characterization with regard to the potential for contamination. The letter from DTSC was replied to on behalf of the City by Remediation Testing and Design (RTD) on February 13, 2007. DTSC had no further comment. These two letters are included in this Addendum as Attachment 3.

Also subsequent to adoption of the 2006 IS/MND, the San Mateo County Health Department requested a Human Health Risk Assessment be conducted for the proposed development of the project site. The project site is located adjacent to the Gas & Shop property at 895 Woodside Road, which is a leaking underground fuel tank (LUFT) site associated with operations of the former Laurel Glen Convalescent Hospital (San Mateo County Case #330128). The tank was removed in January 1996. A groundwater plume stemming from several gasoline releases at the Gas & Shop site has migrated over time underneath and beyond the project site. The risk assessment was prepared by Geomega Inc. and submitted to the County by the applicant on March 2, 2007. The County submitted questions/comments about the risk assessment in a letter dated April 2, 2007, and indicated that the assumptions and conclusions made by Geomega in preparing the risk assessment appeared reasonable; the County concluded that the hydrocarbon-affected groundwater beneath the project site would not pose an unacceptable risk to either construction workers or future occupants of the building based on the proposed construction details and the findings of the risk assessment. RTD replied to the County in a letter dated April 4, 2007, and no further comment from the County has been submitted. The project will be required to comply with the County-approved Waste Management Plan. The main text of the risk assessment, the County letter, and the RTD reply are included in this Addendum as Attachment 4. The full risk assessment is on file with the Redwood City Planning Division.

The documentation contained in these two sets of correspondence does not change the conclusions in the 2006 IS/MND, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project could result in hydrology and water quality impacts related to increased impervious area (contributing to increased stormwater flows) and potential impacts from an existing contaminated groundwater plume under the site. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. The 2006 IS/MND identified three mitigation measures designed to require the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs), installation of a prohibitive barrier, and submittal of a revised drainage plan, all designed to reduce hydrology and water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Those mitigation measures are still applicable to the revised Precise Plan:

Mitigation Measure 8-1: The applicants shall be required to follow the City of Redwood City's Water Conservation Program, which includes all of the Best Management Practices identified in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Regarding Urban Water Conservation as overseen by the California Urban Water Council.

Mitigation Measure 8-2: A revised plan shall be submitted for review in which there is a prohibitive barrier for vertical infiltration of contaminated vapors to residential floors of the proposed building.

Mitigation Measure 8-3: A revised drainage plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading or building permits. The drainage revisions shall include the following:

- a. Storm drains with a filtration system to clean water before displacing it
- b. Grade and sub-grade level parking with a labeled method for water drainage.
- c. A calculation of the existing quantity of storm water run off and plans for maintaining the existing rate of runoff project's construction
- d. The building's foundation shall be constructed to include underground barriers or mechanical systems to prevent lateral and vertical infiltration of contaminated groundwater from the adjacent property to permeate the storm drains

9. Land Use and Planning

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not result in land use or planning impacts. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. No mitigation is required. The 2006 IS/MND incorrectly stated (Section 9, Land Use and Planning, page 21) that the proposed project included a General Plan Amendment; no General Plan Amendment is required for the proposed project.

10. Mineral Resources

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not result in mineral resource impacts. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. No mitigation is required.

11. Noise

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project could result in construction-related noise impacts and the need to control interior noise levels of the project's residential units. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. The 2006 IS/MND identified two mitigation measures designed to limit construction noise levels and to ensure that interior noise levels after construction satisfy City standards, all designed to reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level. Those mitigation measures are still applicable to the revised Precise Plan:

Mitigation Measure 11-1: The following construction noise control measures are recommended to limit the amount of noise generated during the construction period. These measures would mitigate the impact to a less than significant level:

- a. Limit construction to daytime hours (7:00 am to 8:00 pm) Monday through Friday, with no construction activities on Weekends or holidays per Sec. 24.32 of the City of Redwood City Municipal Code.
- b. Construction activities or equipment shall not generate noise levels exceeding 110 dBA per Sec. 24.31 of the City of Redwood City Municipal Code.
- c. Utilize "quiet" models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engine.
- e. Equip all internal combustion engine driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- f. Locate stationary noise generating equipment as far as possible from noise sensitive receptors.
- g. Designate a noise disturbance coordinator who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler,

etc.) and institute reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site.

Mitigation Measure 11-2: The California Building Code requires project-specific acoustical analyses to achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA CNEL or lower in residential units exposed to exterior noise levels greater than 60 dBA CNEL. Building sound insulation requirements would need to include the provision of forced-air mechanical ventilation in noise environments exceeding 60 dBA CNEL, so that windows could be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control noise. Special building construction techniques (e.g., sound-rated windows and building facade treatments) may be required where exterior noise levels exceed 65 dBA CNEL. These treatments include, but are not limited to sound rated windows and doors, sound rated exterior wall assemblies, acoustical caulking, etc. The specific determination of what treatments are necessary will be conducted on a unit-by-unit basis during project design. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, will be submitted along with the building plans and approved prior to issuance of a building permit.

12. Population and Housing

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not result in population or housing impacts. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. No mitigation is required.

13. Public Services

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not result in public service impacts. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. No mitigation is required.

14. Recreation

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not result in recreation impacts. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. No mitigation is required.

15. Traffic and Transportation

The 2006 IS/MND found that the proposed project would not result in traffic or transportation impacts with the proposed access from Horgan Avenue. As indicated previously, the project access has been relocated from Horgan Avenue to Woodside Road, and Caltrans has issued an encroachment permit to the applicant for this revised access location.

Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. has prepared a revised transportation impact analysis (TIA) for the project with the access from Woodside Road (see Attachment 5). The original TIA only evaluated impacts to the Horgan Avenue/Woodside Road intersection. The revised TIA evaluates potential impacts to three intersections: Kentfield Avenue/Woodside Road, Horgan Avenue/Woodside Road, and Union Avenue/Woodside Road. The trip generation for the proposed project remains unchanged because the number of residential units is unchanged, but the trip distribution to the local roadway network was revised to reflect the relocated access from Horgan Avenue to Woodside Road. Similar to the original TIA, the results of the revised TIA show that, measured against the City of Redwood City level of service standards, all study intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service under project conditions, and there would be no measurable impact on bicycle, transit, parking, and pedestrian facilities. The proposed project includes completion of a missing sidewalk segment on Horgan Avenue between the Gas & Shop and the residential neighborhood.

The proposed site access and circulation also show no measurable impact under project conditions. The TIA does recommend that the project driveway onto Woodside Road be posted with a "right-turn only" sign because of the proximity of the driveway to Union Avenue. The applicant has agreed to include the installation of this signage on the building permit plan set.

As part of the revised TIA, turn-pocket storage capacity was analyzed for turn pockets where the proposed project would add traffic (i.e., the Kentfield/Woodside westbound left-turn and the Gordon Street-Orchard Avenue/Woodside eastbound left-turn). The analysis indicates that both left-turn pockets analyzed would have adequate storage capacity for anticipated left-turns at these intersections.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

The 2006 IS/MND found that although impacts to utility and service systems would be less than significant, two mitigation measures were recommended to ensure that potential impacts would remain at less than significant. The proposed revisions to the Precise Plan would not change that conclusion. The two mitigation measures in the 2006 IS/MND were designed to require the use of water conserving BMPs and to address stormwater runoff. Those mitigation measures are still applicable to the revised Precise Plan:

Mitigation Measure 16-1: The applicants shall be required to follow the City of Redwood City's Water Conservation Program, which includes all of the Best Management Practices identified in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Regarding Urban Water Conservation as overseen by the California Urban Water Council.

Mitigation Measure 16-2: A storm drainage plan and site drainage plan shall be submitted to the Engineering and Construction Services Department to mitigate potential impacts of storm water run-off and to ensure adequate accommodation of on-site and off-site drainage.

17. Mandatory Findings of Significance

The proposed revisions to the 885 Woodside Road Precise Plan would not alter the potential impacts in terms of the number or severity of potential effect. The same mitigation measures identified in the 2006 IS/MND would continue to adequately reduce all potential impacts associated with the revised project to less than significant levels. The project as revised would not result in a change to any of the mandatory findings of significance outlined in the 2006 IS/MND. A listing of all mitigation measures included in the 2006 IS/MND and which remain applicable and necessary to the revised project follow:

Mitigation Measure 1-1: Prior to building permit issuance, the project sponsor shall submit an exterior lighting plan that includes only exterior lighting fixtures that do not allow direct light rays to leave the project site and which also do not allow direct light sources (incandescent, fluorescent, or other forms of electric illumination) to be directly visible from off-site locations. The plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.

Mitigation Measure 3-1: The following notes shall be incorporated on the grading and building plans prior to issuance of grading or building permits, and the measures shall be implemented during construction activities:

- a. Water all active construction and disturbed areas at least twice daily during dry periods.
- b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- c. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (nontoxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.

- d. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. Dust, sediment, and debris shall not be washed into the storm drain system.
- e. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets. Dust, sediment, and debris shall not be washed into the storm drain system.
- f. Excavation and grading activities shall be suspended and dust control measures shall be implemented when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

Mitigation Measure 5-1: Prior to building permit issuance, the project sponsor shall incorporate via a note on the first page of the construction plans, that should cultural resources be encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit a Cultural Resources Management Plan, per City Requirements, to the Community Development Director for review and approval that outlines the findings and mitigation methods of curation and/or protection of the resources. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e). The note on the plans shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

Mitigation Measure 6-1: The proposed project will be constructed following the site preparation, design, and construction recommendations of BAGG, including shoring for all excavations near property boundaries and installation of a two-way reinforced basement level mat to mitigate the projected differential settlements.

Mitigation Measure 8-1: The applicants shall be required to follow the City of Redwood City's Water Conservation Program, which includes all of the Best Management Practices identified in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Regarding Urban Water Conservation as overseen by the California Urban Water Council.

Mitigation Measure 8-2: A revised plan shall be submitted for review in which there is a prohibitive barrier for vertical infiltration of contaminated vapors to residential floors of the proposed building.

Mitigation Measure 8-3: A revised drainage plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading or building permits. The drainage revisions shall include the following:

- a. Storm drains with a filtration system to clean water before displacing it
- b. Grade and sub-grade level parking with a labeled method for water drainage.
- c. A calculation of the existing quantity of storm water run off and plans for maintaining the existing rate of runoff project's construction
- d. The building's foundation shall be constructed to include underground barriers or mechanical systems to prevent lateral and vertical infiltration of contaminated groundwater from the adjacent property to permeate the storm drains

Mitigation Measure 11-1: The following construction noise control measures are recommended to limit the amount of noise generated during the construction period. These measures would mitigate the impact to a less than significant level:

- a. Limit construction to daytime hours (7:00 am to 8:00 pm) Monday through Friday, with no construction activities on Weekends or holidays per Sec. 24.32 of the City of Redwood City Municipal Code.
- b. Construction activities or equipment shall not generate noise levels exceeding 110 dBA per Sec. 24.31 of the City of Redwood City Municipal Code.

- c. Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engine.
- e. Equip all internal combustion engine driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- f. Locate stationary noise generating equipment as far as possible from noise sensitive receptors.
- g. Designate a noise disturbance coordinator who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site.

Mitigation Measure 11-2: The California Building Code requires project-specific acoustical analyses to achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA CNEL or lower in residential units exposed to exterior noise levels greater than 60 dBA CNEL. Building sound insulation requirements would need to include the provision of forced-air mechanical ventilation in noise environments exceeding 60 dBA CNEL, so that windows could be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control noise. Special building construction techniques (e.g., sound-rated windows and building facade treatments) may be required where exterior noise levels exceed 65 dBA CNEL. These treatments include, but are not limited to sound rated windows and doors, sound rated exterior wall assemblies, acoustical caulking, etc. The specific determination of what treatments are necessary will be conducted on a unit-by-unit basis during project design. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, will be submitted along with the building plans and approved prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mitigation Measure 16-1: The applicants shall be required to follow the City of Redwood City’s Water Conservation Program, which includes all of the Best Management Practices identified in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Regarding Urban Water Conservation as overseen by the California Urban Water Council.

Mitigation Measure 16-2: A storm drainage plan and site drainage plan shall be submitted to the Engineering and Construction Services Department to mitigate potential impacts of storm water run-off and to ensure adequate accommodation of on-site and off-site drainage.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The following information sources were used in the preparation of this document, in addition to those identified in the 2006 IS/MND:

1. 885 Woodside Road, Conceptual Plans, Gerald Yates, Architect, July 4, 2007.
2. Shadow Study, Solargy, Inc., March 30, 2007.
3. 885 Woodside Road Transportation Impact Analysis, Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., August, 2007.
4. Caltrans Encroachment Permit, issued July 16, 2007 (see Attachment 2).
5. Correspondence between DTSC and Remediation Testing and Design (see Attachment 3).
6. Human Health Risk Assessment (March 2007) and correspondence between San Mateo County Health Department and Remediation Testing and Design (see Attachment 4).

ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised Project Plans for 885 Woodside Road Precise Plan
2. Caltrans Encroachment Permit for 885 Woodside Road
3. Correspondence between DTSC and Remediation Testing and Design
4. Geomega Health Risk Assessment (text only) and Correspondence between San Mateo County Health Department and Remediation Testing and Design
5. 885 Woodside Road Transportation Impact Analysis, Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., August, 2007

LIST OF PREPARERS

Redwood City Staff

Maureen Riordan, Senior Planner
Valerie J. Young, AICP, Contract Planner
Rich Haygood, City Traffic Engineer

Consultants

Dain Anderson, Associate Principal
Michelle Knudson, Staff Planner
Impact Sciences, Inc.
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1825
Oakland, California 94612

Gary Black, President
Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
40 South Market Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95113