
2. SUMMARY

This EIR chapter includes: (1) a summary description of the various components and actions included in the *Public Review Draft Downtown Precise Plan*, summer 2006 (the "project"); (2) a summary description of the two Maximum Allowable Development (M.A.D.) choices being considered for the Precise Plan by the City--a "Maximum Intensity" buildout alternative and a "Moderate Intensity" buildout alternative; (3) a summary list of related environmental issues to be resolved; (4) a summary of the associated significant environmental impact and mitigation findings of this EIR for each of the two M.A.D. alternatives; and (5) a summary of three additional EIR-identified alternatives to the proposed actions and their comparative environmental effects.

This summary should not be relied upon for a thorough understanding of the proposed project or its associated impacts and mitigation needs. Please refer to chapters 3 through 18 of this EIR for a more complete description of the proposed project, associated project impacts and mitigation measures, and alternatives.

2.1 PROPOSED PRECISE PLAN (THE "PROJECT")

The Downtown Precise Plan project, as articulated in the *Public Review Draft Downtown Precise Plan*, summer 2006 (Draft Precise Plan), is comprised of objectives, goals, strategies, actions, and development regulations formulated to achieve a City-desired contemporary "vision" for a "unique and robust" Downtown area. The draft Plan sets forth specific land use parameters, development standards, and urban design criteria formulated to facilitate and guide growth and revitalization within the Downtown area over the next approximately 15 years in a manner that achieves the City-desired "vision."

The proposed overall Precise Plan objective is to assist the City and the City's Redevelopment Agency in providing for, and encouraging buildout of, a unique and robust Downtown. The stated intent is to provide for restructuring land use, density, architectural character, streetscapes, and parking provisions as necessary to create a well-designed, contemporary, and financially viable Downtown. The Draft Precise Plan includes standards (mandatory) and guidelines (preferred, not mandatory) for site development (e.g., land use, building heights, setbacks, frontages); streets, landscaping, and public space; parking; architecture; and signage in the Precise Plan area.

A stated specific objective of the Precise Plan is to provide for and facilitate more housing development concentrated in the Downtown. The Precise Plan, in concert with the City's Draft General Plan *Housing Element*, is intended to provide for the expansion of city housing choices by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing and mixed use (commercial/housing) development in the Downtown at densities and heights greater than currently permitted. The Draft Precise Plan stipulates that this housing and mixed use development be conveniently located near public transportation, shopping, employment, recreation, and other community facilities.

2.2 REQUIRED APPROVALS

The City of Redwood City (the City) is the Lead Agency¹ for administering all environmental documentation and other procedural requirements for the Downtown Precise Plan project. Implementation of the project would require the following specific actions by the City:

- (1) adoption of the Draft Precise Plan;
- (2) adoption of associated amendments to the 1990 Redwood City Strategic General Plan (text and map) as necessary to ensure consistency between the General Plan and Precise Plan policies for land use mix, density, and other Downtown characteristics; and
- (3) similarly, approval of a rezoning to the City's "P" (Planned Community District) zone to reflect and implement the land uses and development standards specified by the Precise Plan, and to allow housing and mixed use development at Precise Plan-identified locations.

As the Lead Agency, the City also intends this EIR to serve as the CEQA-required environmental documentation for consideration of this project by other Responsible Agencies² and Trustee Agencies³ (e.g., San Mateo County Office of Environmental Health, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board) which may have limited discretionary authority over future site-specific development proposals facilitated by this project.

2.3 PRECISE PLAN BUILDOUT ALTERNATIVES

The Draft Precise Plan refers to City Council determination of a Maximum Allowable Development (M.A.D.) limitation or "cap," specifying the maximum combined amount of additional residential development (units), office and retail development (floor area) and commercial lodging development (hotel rooms) to be permitted within the Precise Plan area, expressed either in housing units or square footage. The ultimate M.A.D. limitation figures will be determined and adopted by the City Council based on consideration of the results of this EIR and other pertinent documentation, and on the related recommendations of the Redwood City Planning Commission.

The Draft Precise Plan stipulates that when the referenced M.A.D. limitation ("cap") is reached in any land use category, no further development in that category will be permitted without a City Council-approved amendment to its M.A.D. limitations for the Precise Plan area. The

¹CEQA Guidelines define the "Lead Agency" as the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.

²Under CEQA Guidelines, the term "Responsible Agency" includes all public agencies, other than the Lead Agency, which have discretionary approval power over aspects of the project for which the Lead Agency has prepared an EIR.

³Under CEQA Guidelines, the term "Trustee Agency" means a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project which are held in trust by the people of California.

Precise Plan also stipulates that, within the referenced overall M.A.D. development increment limitations, all future development in the Precise Plan area boundary shall conform to the development standards established in the Precise Plan.¹

In consultation with the Planning Commission, the City staff has identified a "Maximum Intensity" alternative and a less-intensive "Moderate Intensity" alternative that are considered to represent the range of M.A.D. limitations that may ultimately be adopted. In general, the "Moderate Intensity" development increments total approximately two-thirds (66.6 percent) of the "Maximum Intensity" development increments, with adjustments to reflect specific mixed use/ground floor retail and commercial lodging development objectives identified in the Draft Precise Plan. These adjustments are described in more detail in section 3.6 (Precise Plan Buildout Alternatives) of this EIR.

Table 2.1 summarizes the ***increments of change over existing conditions*** (per CEQA Guidelines section 15125)² anticipated with buildout in the Precise Plan area under the two M.A.D. alternatives over the next approximately 15 years. Precise Plan development capacities ultimately adopted by the City are expected to fall within the range of the two alternatives. For comparison purposes, Table 2.1 also summarizes the maximum increments of change over existing conditions permissible under existing land use policy (i.e., assuming no increase in current General Plan and zoning allowances).

The environmental issue chapters in this EIR (e.g., Population and Housing; Public Services, Utilities, and Infrastructure) evaluate in detail both the Maximum Intensity and Moderate Intensity project alternatives. The results of these evaluations are summarized in Table 2.2.

In addition, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 (Consideration and Discussion of Alternatives to the Proposed Project), EIR chapter 18 (Alternatives Evaluation Overview) compares in less detail the Maximum Intensity and Moderate Intensity project alternatives with three other alternatives: "Modified Precise Plan--Reduced Height (9-Story Height Limit)," "No Project--Buildout Under Existing Land Use Policy" (i.e., the "Existing Land Use Policy" scenario summarized in Table 2.1), and "No Project--No Change in Existing Development."

¹Public Review Draft Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan, September 2006; section 2.1.4, subsection 4) 6), "Maximum Allowable Development (M.A.D.)."

²When a new plan is being proposed, in this case the subject *Public Review Draft Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan*, CEQA Guidelines section 15125(a) requires that the EIR analysis of the plan's environmental impacts be based on comparison of the future with-project buildout scenario (in this case, the Maximum Intensity and Moderate Intensity alternative project buildout scenarios described in Table 2.1) to *existing conditions* rather than to the future without-project buildout scenario (the Existing Land Use Policy buildout scenario in Table 2.1). Therefore the impact analyses in chapters 5 through 15 of this EIR identify the potential environmental impacts associated with the *increments of change over existing conditions*, rather than over the Existing Land Use Policy buildout scenario listed in Table 2.1. A qualitative comparison of the Maximum and Moderate Intensity Precise Plan alternatives buildout scenarios with the Existing Land Use Policy alternative buildout scenario (and two other alternatives) is provided in chapter 18 (Alternatives Evaluation Overview) of this EIR.

Table 2.1
REDWOOD CITY DOWNTOWN PRECISE PLAN: SUMMARY OF PERMITTED INCREMENT OF CHANGE UNDER THE PROPOSED PRECISE PLAN VS. EXISTING LAND USE POLICY

	Residential (units)	Office (s.f.)	Retail (s.f.)	Lodging (rooms)	Industrial (s.f.)	Civic/Inst. (s.f.)
Maximum Intensity Alternative	3,700	600,000	295,000	200	-95,000	0
Moderate Intensity Alternative	2,500	275,000	221,000	200	-95,000	0
Existing Land Use Policy (Zoning)	3,300	921,000	275,000	189	-95,000	0

SOURCE: City of Redwood City, Wagstaff and Associates; June 2006.

2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

As required by the state CEQA Guidelines, the scope of this EIR includes all environmental issues to be resolved and any areas of environmental controversy known to the Lead Agency (the City), including those issues and concerns identified as possibly significant by the City in its preliminary environmental review (Initial Study¹) of the project, and by other agencies, organizations, and individuals in response to the City's Notice of Preparation² (dated April 28, 2006). These environmental concerns include (listed in the order that these topics are addressed in this EIR):

1. Land use and planning,
2. Population and housing,
3. Aesthetics and visual resources,
4. Cultural and historic resources,
5. Transportation and circulation,
6. Public services, utilities, and infrastructure,
7. Noise,
8. Air quality,
9. Hazards and hazardous materials,

¹The City's Initial Study for the project is included in appendix 21.2 of this EIR.

²The Notice of Preparation (NOP) is a CEQA-required brief notice sent by the Lead Agency to notify the Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, and potentially involved federal agencies that the Lead Agency plans to prepare an EIR for the project, and solicits guidance regarding EIR scope and content. The City's NOP for the Downtown Precise Plan project is included in appendix 21.2 of this EIR.

10. Biological resources, and
11. Geology and soils.

2.5 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

For each of the 11 environmental topics listed above, any **"significant"** project or cumulative impact and associated mitigation measure or measures identified in this EIR are summarized in Table 2.2, the SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES, which follows. The summary chart has been organized to correspond with the more detailed impact and mitigation discussions in chapters 5 through 15 of this EIR. The chart is arranged in five columns: (1) identified impacts, (2) potential significance without mitigation, (3) recommended mitigation measures, (4) the entity responsible for implementing each mitigation measure, and (5) the level of impact significance after implementation of the mitigation measure(s).

**Table 2.2
SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<i>AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES</i>				
<p>Impact 7-1: Light and Glare Impacts. The proposed Precise Plan would facilitate increased downtown development, and in particular, would permit construction of new 5-to-12-story (136-foot) maximum height structures in the Downtown area. Such buildings would include nighttime exterior illumination features. These exterior lighting features would be introduced in a Downtown area that is already highly urbanized with an abundance of existing lights. Nevertheless, exterior lighting features above the predominant 3-story elevation of the area, including exterior building illumination and illuminated signage, could be prominently visible at night and represent a noticeable visual distraction in views from surrounding nearby and distant vantage points. Additionally, daytime light reflection from the windows of the taller new structures could create glare impacts on surrounding areas and distant views. These effects would represent a potentially significant visual impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 7-1. Include in the conditions of approval for any individual future Downtown construction project involving building heights of greater than three stories (35 feet), a prohibition on exterior illumination of any building element above 35 feet after 10:00 PM, every day; or incorporate this requirement in the Precise Plan. For proposed new buildings taller than 35 feet, suggest in the Precise Plan guidelines some degree of tinting for glazing to reduce such potential glare effects. Implementation of these measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>	Individual Project Applicants	LS

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<i>CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES</i>				
<p>Impact 8-1: Disturbance of Archaeological Resources. Given that the Precise Plan area is located on alluvial soils, on the margin of San Francisco Bay near former wetlands, and bisected by Redwood Creek and its tributaries, there is a high likelihood that unrecorded archaeological resources exist in the area. New development facilitated by the Draft Precise Plan could disturb such existing unrecorded sensitive archaeological resources in the Downtown area. This possibility represents a <i>potentially significant impact</i>.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 8-1. During the City's normal project-specific environmental review (Initial Study) process for all future, discretionary, public improvement and private development projects in the Precise Plan area, the City shall determine the possible presence of, and the potential impacts of the action on, archaeological resources. For projects involving substantial ground disturbance, the individual project sponsor shall be required to contact the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) to determine whether the particular project is located in a sensitive area. Future development projects that the CHRIS determines may be located in a sensitive area (i.e., on or adjoining an identified archaeological site) shall proceed only after the project sponsor contracts with a qualified archaeologist to conduct a determination in regard to cultural values remaining on the site and warranted mitigation measures. This includes, in particular, projects that are located near the one recorded historic-era archaeological site in the Precise Plan area (CA-SMA-809H).</p> <p>In general, to make an adequate determination, the archaeologist should conduct a preliminary field inspection to: (1) assess the amount of</p>	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>visible ground surface, (2) identify locations of visible ground surface, (3) determine the nature and extent of previous impacts, and (4) assess the nature and extent of potential impacts. Such field inspection may demonstrate the need for some form of additional subsurface testing. Alternatively, on-site monitoring of subsurface activities (i.e., during grading or trenching) may be needed.</p> <p>If a significant archaeological resource is identified through this field inspection process, the City and project proponent shall seek to avoid damaging effects to the resources. Preserving the relationship between the artifact(s) and the archaeological context is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to an archaeological site. Preservation may be accomplished by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planning construction to avoid the archaeological site; ▪ Incorporating the site within a park, green space, or other open space element; ▪ Covering the site with a layer of chemically stable soil; or 		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. <p>When in-place mitigation is determined by the City to be infeasible, a <i>data recovery plan</i>, which makes provisions for adequate recovery of the scientifically consequential information about the site, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any additional excavation being undertaken. Such studies must be submitted to the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center (i.e., the NWIC at Sonoma State University). If Native American artifacts are involved, the studies must also be submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission. Identified cultural resources should be recorded on form DPR 422 (archaeological sites). Mitigation measures recommended by these two groups and required by the City shall be undertaken, if necessary, prior to resumption of construction activities.</p> <p>A <i>data recovery plan</i> and data recovery shall not be required if the City determines that testing or studies already completed have adequately recovered the necessary data, provided that the data have already been documented in another EIR and are available for review at the California Historical Resource</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>Regional Information Center (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4[b]).</p> <p>In the event that subsurface cultural resources are otherwise encountered during approved ground-disturbing activities for a Precise Plan area construction activity, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described above. Project personnel should not collect cultural resources. Prehistoric resources include chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, and pestles; and dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human burials. Historic-period resources include stone or adobe foundations or walls; structures and remains with square nails; and refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often located in old wells or privies. If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) shall apply.</p> <p>Implementation of this measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>		
<p>Impact 8-2: Potential Destruction or Degradation of Historic Resources. Future development projects that are otherwise consistent with the Draft Precise Plan may</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 8-2. Generally, for any future discretionary action within the Precise Plan area that the City determines, through the CEQA-required Initial Study review process,</p>	<p>City; Individual Project Applicants</p>	LS/SU

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>cause a substantial adverse change in either (a) the significance of one or more of the historic resources or potential historic resources identified in EIR Table 8.1 (Historic Resource List), or (b) the significance of the existing Redwood City Main Street District. Under the current (2006) CEQA Guidelines (section 15064.5(b)(1)), a substantial adverse change includes demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of one or more resources, such that the resource and/or the historic district in which it is located is "materially impaired." The significance of a historic resource is considered to be "materially impaired" when a project demolishes or materially alters the physical characteristics that justify the determination of a historic resource's significance (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5[b]). Such an adverse change to a CEQA-defined historic resource would constitute a significant impact.</p>		<p>may cause a "substantial adverse change" in one or more of the resources specified in the Historic or Potential Historic Resources List (Table 8.1), the City shall require project compliance with CEQA requirements applicable at that time.</p> <p>For discretionary actions that may cause a "substantial adverse change" to a resource identified in Table 8.1 as a "Historic Resource Under CEQA" (listed or eligible for listing in the National Register or California Register, or listed as a Local Landmark), the City shall prepare either an EIR or Mitigated Negative Declaration that includes mitigation for the potential change.</p> <p>For discretionary actions that may cause a "substantial adverse change" to a resource identified in Table 8.1 as a "Potential Historic Resource Under CEQA" ("not previously listed, but of historic interest), the City shall treat the property as a historic resource and prepare either an EIR or Mitigated Negative Declaration that includes mitigation for the potential change, or the applicant may conduct a historic resource survey meeting the requirements of Public Resources Code section 5024.1(g) to determine to City satisfaction whether the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that</p>		

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>the property is not historically or culturally significant.</p> <p>Under the CEQA Guidelines (section 15064.5(b)(3)), generally, an individual project's adverse impacts on a historic resource can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through applicant compliance with either of the following standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings</i>; or ▪ <i>Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings</i>. <p>Successful incorporation of either of these standards would therefore reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>For any future discretionary action that would result in the demolition of a historic resource identified as described above, or otherwise cause the significance of the resource to be "materially impaired," and for which the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards</i> identified above cannot be incorporated the City shall</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>require applicant implementation of one or more of the following four mitigation measures. If the City determines in the Initial Study that the impact is fully mitigated, then the impact would be deemed less than significant and the action may proceed based upon a Mitigated Negative Declaration; if the City determines that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable, a focused EIR would be required.</p> <p>(1) <i>Documentation.</i> Documentation of the affected historic resource and its setting shall be prepared. This documentation shall include three components:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) Photographs: An architectural photographer with HABS/HAER (Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record) experience shall photograph the affected historic resource. If large-format photography is not possible, 35mm photography is acceptable, if the negatives are processed according to HABS standards.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) Drawings: Full-measured drawings are preferable. Less elaborate drawings of minor aspects of the affected historic resources may be deemed acceptable.</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>(c) Historical Overview: Documentation shall include a historical overview of the affected resource.</p> <p>This documentation shall be filed with local libraries and historical societies, as appropriate.</p> <p>(2) <i>Relocation.</i> If preservation of the affected historic resource at the current site is determined to be impossible, the building shall, if feasible, be stabilized and relocated to other nearby sites appropriate to their historic setting and general environment. A moved building or structure that is otherwise eligible may be listed in the California Register if it was moved to prevent its demolition at its former location and if the new location is compatible with the original character and use of the historical resource. After relocation, the building's preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration, as appropriate, shall follow the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards</i> to ensure that the building retains its integrity and historical significance.</p> <p>(3) <i>Salvage.</i> If the affected historic resource can neither be preserved at its current site nor moved to an alternative site and is demolished, the project applicant shall consult with the Redwood City Historic Resources Advisory Committee and other local historical societies regarding salvage of materials from the</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>affected historic resource for public information or reuse in other locations. Demolition may proceed only after any significant historic features or materials have been identified and their removal completed.</p> <p>(4) <i>Commemoration.</i> If the affected historic resource can neither be preserved at its current site nor moved to an alternative site and is demolished, the project applicant shall, with the assistance of the Redwood City Historic Resources Advisory Committee or other professionals experienced in creating historical exhibits, incorporate a wall display featuring historic photos of the affected resource and a description of its historical significance into the publicly accessible portion of any subsequent development on the site.</p>		

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Impact 9-1: Impact on Broadway/Woodside Road (SR 84) Intersection--Maximum Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. During the AM peak hour, the Maximum Intensity project traffic increment would reduce the level of service (LOS) and increase average delay by more than five (5) seconds at the Broadway/Woodside Road intersection. During the PM peak hour, the Maximum Intensity project would increase the average delay at this intersection, which would already be

S

Mitigation 9-1. The intersection of Broadway and Woodside Road (SR 84) currently has five approach legs. The fifth leg of this intersection (the southbound US 101 off-ramp) is a major contributing factor to poor intersection operations. Currently the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) is studying improvement options for the US 101/Woodside Road interchange. One of the options would include modifications of this intersection to a standard 4-leg configuration. At this time,

City and future project applicants

SU

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
operating at LOS F, by more than five (5) seconds. These changes would represent a significant impact .		however, no feasible modifications have been identified with implementation assured to allow this intersection to operate at an acceptable level of service; therefore, the addition of Maximum Intensity project traffic is expected to result in a significant unavoidable impact .		
Impact 9-2: Impact Middlefield Road/ Woodside Road (SR 84) Intersection-- Maximum Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. During the PM peak hour, the Maximum Intensity project traffic increment would increase by more than five (5) seconds the average delay at the Middlefield/Woodside intersection, which is already operating at LOS E. This change would represent a significant impact .	S	Mitigation 9-2. The addition of a second eastbound left-turn lane on Woodside Road (SR 84) would achieve LOS D conditions under Maximum Intensity conditions. This improvement, however, would require intersection widening to provide adequate length for the additional left-turn lane. The improvement would also require Caltrans approval, which is uncertain at this time. Therefore, because implementation of this improvement is not assured, this intersection impact would be a significant unavoidable impact .	City and future project applicants	SU
Impact 9-3: Impact on Middlefield Road/ Jefferson Avenue Intersection--Maximum Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. During the PM peak hour, the Maximum Intensity project traffic increment would reduce the level of service to LOS E and increase average delay by more than five (5) seconds at the intersection of Middlefield Road/Jefferson Avenue. This change would represent a significant impact .	S	Mitigation 9-3(a). Restripe the southbound approach of Middlefield Road to one through lane and one right-turn lane, and prohibit southbound left turns. These changes would result in an acceptable LOS D under the Maximum Intensity alternative, thereby reducing the project impact to a less-than-significant level . or Mitigation 9-3(b). Implement <i>Mitigation 9-3(a)</i> plus restripe northbound Middlefield Road to	City and future project applicants	LS/SU

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>two (2) left-turn lanes and one shared through/right-turn lane. These changes would result in an acceptable LOS D under the Maximum Intensity buildout alternative, thereby reducing the project impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Mitigation 9-3(c). Restripe the southbound Middlefield Road approach to a shared left-through lane and one right-turn lane; restripe northbound Middlefield Road to one left-turn lane, one shared left-through lane, and one right-turn lane; and implement a split phase signal operation for northbound and southbound Middlefield Road. These changes would result in an acceptable LOS D under the Maximum Intensity alternative, thereby reducing the project impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Because either the diversion of traffic to pedestrian corridors on Broadway and Middlefield resulting from prohibiting southbound left turns (<i>Mitigations 9-3[a] or 9-3[b]</i>), or the impact on pedestrian signal sequencing with split phase signal operation (<i>Mitigation 9-3[c]</i>), may potentially degrade the Downtown pedestrian environment and decrease pedestrian safety, comfort, and convenience; and be inconsistent with existing and proposed City policies giving priority to the</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 9-4: Impact on Broadway/Jefferson Avenue Intersection--Maximum Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. During the PM peak hour, the Maximum Intensity project traffic increment would reduce operation to LOS F and increase average delay by more than five (5) seconds at the Broadway/Jefferson Avenue intersection. This change would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Downtown pedestrian environment; the City may choose to avoid the three mitigation options identified above in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a significant unavoidable impact under the current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."</p> <p>Mitigation 9-4. Add an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Broadway, and convert the existing northbound shared left-through right lane into a shared through/right-turn lane. These changes would result in an acceptable LOS D under the Maximum Intensity alternative, thereby reducing this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Because this mitigation would result in the loss of sidewalk at corner bulb-outs, degrading the existing and future pedestrian environment and sidewalk dining opportunities, and would therefore be inconsistent with City policies giving priority to the Downtown pedestrian environment, the City may choose to avoid these intersection modifications in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a significant unavoidable impact under current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."</p>	City and future project applicants	LS/SU

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 9-5: Impact Broadway/Middlefield Road Intersection--Maximum Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. During the PM peak hour, the Maximum Intensity project traffic increment would reduce operation to LOS E and increase average delay by more than five (5) seconds at the intersection of Broadway/Middlefield Road. This change would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-5. The intersection of Broadway/Middlefield Road is currently a 4-way stop controlled facility. Signalizing the intersection (2-phase control) would result in LOS B operations under Maximum Intensity conditions. Implementation of this measure would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Because this mitigation action would: (a) be less supportive of pedestrian convenience and orientation than the existing 4-way stop due to delays to pedestrians waiting to cross during “walk” phases and higher vehicle speeds through the intersection; (b) be inconsistent with City intentions for this intersection to be pedestrian-oriented given its location in the Downtown core; and (c) be inconsistent with the existing and proposed City policies giving priority to the Downtown pedestrian environment, the City may choose to avoid this intersection modification in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a significant unavoidable impact under current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."</p>	City and future project applicants	LS/SU
<p>Impact 9-6: Impacts on US 101 Freeway Segments--Maximum Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. Traffic generated by the proposed Maximum Intensity alternative is expected to</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-6. Mitigation of these effects to a less-than-significant level would require construction of an additional mixed flow lane on US 101. This widening is not deemed feasible</p>	City and future project applicants	SU

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>result in the following freeway segment operational effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ southbound US 101 (mixed flow) lanes between Woodside Road and Marsh Road (AM)--a V/C ratio change from 0.95 to 1.21 (an increase in volume exceeding segment capacity); and ▪ southbound US 101 (mixed flow) lanes between Whipple Avenue and Woodside Road (PM)--a V/C ratio change from 1.14 to 1.19 (an increase of more than one percent in a freeway segment already exceeding its capacity). <p>These freeway segment effects would represent a significant impact.</p> <p>Impact 9-7: Impact on Middlefield Road/Jefferson Avenue Intersection--Moderate Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. During the PM peak hour, the addition of Moderate Intensity project traffic would reduce the level of service to LOS E and increase average delay by more than five (5) seconds at the intersection of Middlefield Road/Jefferson Avenue. This change would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>by the City due to right-of-way constraints and cost. Therefore, the impact is expected to remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Mitigation 9-7(a). Restripe the southbound approach of Middlefield Road to one through lane and one right-turn lane, and prohibit southbound left turns. These changes would result in an acceptable LOS D under the Moderate Intensity alternative, thereby reducing the project's impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Mitigation 9-7(b). Implement <i>Mitigation 9-7(a)</i>, above, plus restripe northbound Middlefield Road to two (2) left-turn lanes and one shared</p>	City and future project applicants	LS/SU

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>through/right-turn lane. These changes would result in an acceptable LOS D under the Moderate Intensity alternative, thereby reducing the project impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Mitigation 9-7(c). Restripe the southbound Middlefield Road approach to a shared left-through lane and one right-turn lane; restripe northbound Middlefield Road to one left-turn lane, one shared left-through lane, and one right-turn lane; and implement a split phase signal operation for northbound and southbound Middlefield Road. These changes would result in an acceptable LOS D under the Moderate Intensity alternative, thereby reducing the project impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Because either the diversion of traffic to pedestrian corridors on Broadway and Middlefield resulting from prohibiting southbound left turns (<i>Mitigations 9-7 [a] or [b]</i>), or the impact on pedestrian signal sequencing with split phase signal operation (<i>Mitigation 9-7[c]</i>), may potentially degrade the Downtown pedestrian environment and decrease pedestrian safety, comfort, and convenience; and be inconsistent with existing and proposed City policies giving priority to the Downtown pedestrian environment; the City may choose</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 9-8: Impact on Broadway/Jefferson Avenue Intersection--Moderate Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. During the PM peak hour, Moderate Intensity project traffic would reduce the level of service to LOS F and increase average delay by more than five (5) seconds at the Broadway/Jefferson Avenue intersection. This change would represent a significant impact.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>to avoid the three intersection modification options identified above in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a significant unavoidable impact under current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."</p> <p>Mitigation 9-8. Add an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Broadway, and convert the existing northbound shared left-through right lane into a shared through/right-turn lane. These changes would result in an acceptable LOS D under the Moderate Intensity alternative. Implementation of this measure would therefore reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Because this mitigation would result in the loss of sidewalk at corner bulb-outs, degrading the existing and future pedestrian environment and sidewalk dining opportunities, and would be inconsistent with the existing and proposed City policies giving priority to the Downtown pedestrian environment, the City may choose to avoid this intersection modification in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a significant unavoidable impact under current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."</p>	<p>City and future project applicants</p>	<p>LS/SU</p>

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 9-9: Impact on Broadway/Middlefield Road Intersection--Moderate Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. During the PM peak hour, the Moderate Intensity project traffic increment would reduce operation to LOS E and increase average delay by more than five (5) seconds at the Broadway/Middlefield Road intersection. This change would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-9. The intersection of Broadway/Middlefield Road is currently a 4-way stop controlled intersection. Signalizing the intersection (2-phase control) would result in LOS B operations under Moderate Intensity conditions, thereby reducing this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Because this signalization mitigation would: (a) be less supportive of pedestrian convenience and orientation than the existing 4-way stop due to delays to pedestrians waiting to cross during "walk" phases and higher vehicle speeds through the intersection; (b) be inconsistent with City intentions for this intersection to be pedestrian-oriented given its location in the Downtown core; and (c) be inconsistent with City policies giving priority to the Downtown pedestrian environment, the City may choose to avoid this intersection modification in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a significant unavoidable impact based on current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."</p>	City and future project applicants	LS/SU
<p>Impact 9-10: Impacts on US 101 Freeway Segments--Moderate Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. Traffic generated by the proposed Moderate Intensity alternative is expected to</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-10. Mitigation of these effects to a less-than-significant level would require construction of an additional mixed flow lane on US 101. This widening is not deemed feasible</p>	City and future project applicants	SU

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>result in the following freeway segment operational effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ southbound US 101 (mixed flow) lanes between Woodside Road and Marsh Road (AM)--a V/C ratio change from 1.14 to of 1.20; and ▪ southbound US 101 (mixed flow) lanes between Whipple Avenue and Woodside Road (PM)--a V/C ratio change from 1.15 to 1.18. <p>These changes in freeway segment operations would represent a significant impact.</p>		<p>by the City due to right-of-way constraints and cost. Therefore, the impact is expected to remain significant and unavoidable.</p>		
<p>Impact 9-11: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the Alameda de las Pulgas/Woodside Road Intersection. During the AM and PM peak hours, the addition of project traffic would reduce the level of service (AM peak hour) and increase overall delay by more than five (5) seconds (AM and PM peak hours) at this intersection, which would already be operating at LOS E/F. This effect would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-11. Add a second left-turn lane to the southbound approach of Alameda de las Pulgas. This change would improve operation to LOS D in both peak periods. The project would require median removal and lane restriping. Although this project may be added to Redwood City's Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program in a future update, there is currently no funding for this project. Therefore, the mitigation is not assured and this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.</p>	City and future project applicants	SU
<p>Impact 9-12: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the El Camino and Whipple Avenue Intersection. During the AM</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-12. Due to right-of-way constraints, mitigation options at this intersection are limited. Mitigation would</p>	City and future project applicants	SU

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
and PM peak hours the addition of project traffic would increase average delay by more than five (5) seconds at this intersection, which would already be operating at LOS F. This effect would represent a significant impact .		require the addition of an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane and converting the eastbound-shared left-through lane into an exclusive through movement. This would allow changing from a current split-phase operation (eastbound/westbound) to a protected left-turn phasing, and would improve operation to LOS D in the AM peak hour and to LOS E in the PM peak hour. However, implementation of this improvement is not deemed feasible by the City due to the need to acquire right-of-way from adjacent commercial frontage. Therefore, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable .		
Impact 9-13: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the El Camino Real/ Jefferson Avenue Intersection. During the PM peak hour, the addition of project traffic would increase average delay by five (5) seconds or more at this intersection, which would already be operating at LOS E. This effect would represent a significant impact .	S	Mitigation 9-13. Mitigating this impact would require adding a second northbound left-turn lane on El Camino Real, and converting the right-turn lane into a shared through/right-turn lane. This improvement would necessitate lane restriping and possible median modifications. Level of service with this improvement would remain LOS E during the PM peak hour, but the increase in delay resulting from project traffic would be less than 5 seconds. Any improvement to El Camino Real would require Caltrans approval. At this time, lacking Caltrans approval, implementation of this mitigation is not assured. Therefore, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable .	City and future project applicants	SU

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 9-14: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the Middlefield Road/Woodside Road intersection. During the AM and PM peak hour, the project traffic would increase average delay by five (5) seconds or more at the intersection of Middlefield Road/Woodside Road, which would already be operating at LOS E/F. This effect would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-14. The addition of a second eastbound left-turn lane on Woodside Road (SR 84) would reduce the overall intersection delay <i>without the project</i> during the PM peak hour, but the delay <i>without the project</i> would remain significant in the AM peak hour. With the addition of the second eastbound left-turn lane, the intersection would still operate at LOS F in both the AM and PM peak hours <i>with the project</i>. In addition, any improvement to Woodside Road (SR 84) would require Caltrans approval. Caltrans approval for this mitigation is not assured. For these reasons, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.</p>	City and future project applicants	SU
<p>Impact 9-15: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the Middlefield Road/Jefferson Avenue intersection. During the PM peak hour, project traffic would reduce level of service and increase average delay by five (5) seconds or more at the intersection of Middlefield Road/Jefferson Avenue, which would already be operating at LOS F. This effect would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-15(a). Restripe the southbound approach of Middlefield Road to one through lane and one right-turn lane, and prohibit southbound left turns. These changes would result in LOS E operations during the PM peak hour, thereby reducing the project's impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Mitigation 9-15(b). Implement <i>Mitigation 9-15(a)</i> plus restripe northbound Middlefield Road to two (2) left-turn lanes and one shared through/right-turn lane. These changes would result in LOS E during the PM peak hour, thereby reducing the project's impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p>	City and future project applicants	LS/SU

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation 9-15(c). Restripe the southbound Middlefield Road approach to a shared left-through lane and one right-turn lane; restripe northbound Middlefield Road to one left-turn lane, one shared left-through lane, and one right-turn lane; and implement a split phase signal operation for northbound and southbound Middlefield Road. These changes would result in LOS E operations during the PM peak hour, thereby reducing the project impacts to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Because either the diversion of traffic to pedestrian corridors on Broadway and Middlefield resulting from prohibiting southbound left turns (<i>Mitigations 9-15[a] and [b]</i>), or the impact on pedestrian signal sequencing with split phase signal operation (<i>Mitigation 9-15[c]</i>), may potentially degrade the Downtown pedestrian environment and decrease pedestrian safety, comfort, and convenience; and be inconsistent with existing and proposed City policies giving priority to the Downtown pedestrian environment; the City may choose to avoid the three intersection modification options identified above in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a <i>significant unavoidable impact</i> under current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 9-16: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the Broadway/Jefferson Avenue Intersection. During the PM peak hour, the addition of project traffic would increase average delay by more than five (5) seconds at this intersection, which would already be operating at LOS F. This effect would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-16. Adding an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Broadway and converting the existing northbound-shared left-through right lane into a shared through/right-turn lane would result in improved LOS F operation with less average delay than that experienced under Cumulative (Without Project) Conditions. Implementation of this mitigation would therefore reduce the project impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Because this mitigation would result in the loss of sidewalk at corner bulb-outs, degrading the existing and future pedestrian environment and sidewalk dining opportunities, and would be inconsistent with City policies giving priority to the Downtown pedestrian environment, the City may choose to avoid this intersection modification in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a significant unavoidable impact based on current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."</p>	City and future project applicants	SU
<p>Impact 9-17: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the Broadway/Middlefield Intersection. During the PM peak hour, average delay would increase by five (5) seconds or more at this intersection, which already would be operating at LOS F. This effect would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-17. The intersection of Broadway/Middlefield Road is currently a 4-way stop controlled intersection. Signalizing the intersection (2-phase control) would result in LOS C operations under Cumulative (With Project) Conditions during the PM peak hour. Implementation of this measure would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p>	City and future project applicants	LS/SU

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		or		
		Because this signalization mitigation would: (a) be less supportive of pedestrian convenience and orientation than the existing 4-way stop due to delays to pedestrians waiting to cross during "walk" phases and higher vehicle speeds through the intersection; (b) be inconsistent with City intentions for this intersection to be pedestrian-oriented given its location in the Downtown core; and (c) be inconsistent with City policies giving priority to the Downtown pedestrian environment, the City may choose to avoid this intersection modification in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a significant unavoidable impact based on current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."		
Impact 9-18: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the Bay Road/Woodside Road Intersection. During the PM peak hour, project-generated traffic would increase average delay by five (5) seconds or more at this intersection, which already would be operating at LOS F. This effect would represent a significant impact .	S		City and future project applicants	SU
		Mitigation 9-18. This impact would be mitigated by implementing the Woodside Road Widening project, which requires Caltrans approval. That project is not fully funded, nor has a design been approved by Caltrans. Therefore, implementation of this mitigation is not assured, and this impact is considered significant and unavoidable .		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 9-19: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the Veterans Boulevard/Whipple Avenue Intersection. In the AM peak hour, project traffic would reduce operation from LOS D to LOS F at this intersection. In the PM peak hour, project traffic would increase average delay by five (5) seconds or more at this intersection, which would already be operating at LOS F. These effects would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-19(a). Add an eastbound left-turn lane on Whipple Avenue. This modification would mitigate impacts in the PM peak hour, but not in the AM peak hour. In addition, this mitigation would require acquisition of right-of-way from commercial frontage (including a gas station) and is therefore not considered feasible by the City. This impact therefore would be significant and unavoidable.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Mitigation 9-19(b). As a feasible option, add a second westbound left-turn lane on Whipple Avenue. This modification would reduce the level of impact, but not to a less-than-significant level (i.e., would not mitigate either the AM or the PM peak hour impact). Therefore, although reduced, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	City and future project applicants	SU
<p>Impact 9-20: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the Veterans Boulevard/Brewster Avenue Intersection. During the PM peak hour, project-generated traffic would reduce operation to LOS F and increase delay by five (5) seconds or more at this intersection. This effect would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-20(a). Restripe eastbound Brewster Avenue to one left-turn lane and one shared left-through-right turn lane. Signal operations would need to be changed to allow for split phasing for the eastbound/westbound Brewster approaches. These improvements would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level (i.e., would not fully mitigate either the AM or PM peak hour impacts). Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	City and future project applicants	SU/LS

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
---------	--	---------------------	------------------------------	---

or

Mitigation 9-20(b). Add a second eastbound left-turn lane on Brewster Avenue. Implementation of this measure would improve PM peak hour operations to LOS D, resulting in a ***less-than-significant impact***.

or

Because: (a) *Mitigation 9-20(a)* would result in pedestrians on each side of Brewster receiving a walk signal to cross Veterans Boulevard at separate times during the signal cycle, instead of the overlapping walk signal phases that now occur, thereby increasing delay for pedestrians and negatively impacting pedestrian convenience and safety; (b) *Mitigation 9-20(b)* would require the elimination of curbside-parking spaces and would preclude future pedestrian enhancements such as corner bulb-outs that would reduce pedestrian exposure to traffic; and (c) these effects would be inconsistent with City policies giving priority to the Downtown pedestrian environment; the City may choose to avoid the two mitigation options identified above in the interest of protecting the pedestrian environment. This choice would result in a ***significant unavoidable impact*** under current CEQA and City criteria for "Intersection Impacts."

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 9-21: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at the Veterans Boulevard/Woodside Road Intersection. In the PM peak hour, project traffic would increase average delay by five (5) seconds or more at this intersection, which already would be operating at LOS F. This effect would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-21. Right-of-way constraints due to the adjacent US 101 on- and off-ramps preclude any feasible mitigation. Therefore, the project contribution to this cumulative impact represents a significant unavoidable impact.</p>	City and future project applicants	SU
<p>Impact 9-22: Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts on US 101. Under Cumulative (With Project) Conditions, US 101 southbound segments from SR 92 to Whipple Avenue and from Woodside Road to Marsh Road are expected to have V/C ratios greater than 1.0 in the AM peak hour, and project traffic would increase the volumes on these segments by more than one percent of their capacity. In the PM peak hour, US 101 southbound segments from Whipple Avenue to Marsh Road would experience V/C ratios greater than 1.0, and project traffic would increase the volume on these segments by more than one percent of their capacity. These effects would represent a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 9-22. Mitigation of this impact to a less-than-significant level would require construction of an additional mixed flow lane. This widening is not deemed feasible due to right-of-way constraints and cost. This impact is therefore considered to be significant and unavoidable.</p>	City and future project applicants	SU
<p><i>PUBLIC SERVICES, UTILITIES, AND INFRASTRUCTURE</i></p>				
<p>Impact 10-1: Precise Plan-Related and Cumulative Impacts on Wastewater Treatment and Transmission Capacity--</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 10-1. Prior to City approval of any future individual development proposal in the Precise Plan area, if determined necessary by</p>	City; Individual Project	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Maximum Intensity Alternative. Precise Plan-facilitated development would increase wastewater generation in the project area.</p> <p>Preliminary estimates indicate that the Maximum Intensity Precise Plan alternative could generate a total of approximately 771,026 gallons of average daily <u>dry weather flow</u> (ADDWF) per day, for a net increase over existing conditions of 630,885 gpd. Redwood City already uses all of its allocated capacity from the SBSA treatment plant, but possesses an option to purchase an additional 1.915 million gallons per day (mgd) of dry weather capacity. The estimated Maximum Intensity alternative-related ADDWF increment of 630,885 gpd (0.631 mgd) is less than the City's purchase option of 1.915 mgd.</p> <p>In recent years, wastewater flow into the SBSA collection system from Redwood City has occasionally exceeded the current peak <u>wet weather flow</u> capacity right (exclusive of Redwood Shores) of 25.9 mgd. Since 1994-95, the City has exceeded its allocated capacity nine times during the winter. Since the SBSA treatment capacity allocation to Redwood City is already being exceeded during wet weather, the current allocation from the SBSA is inadequate to serve the projected</p>		<p>the City Engineer, the City shall purchase from the SBSA the added treatment capacity necessary to accommodate the projected net increase in wastewater generated by the proposed development. Each future individual development's ultimate treatment capacity requirement shall be calculated in the final permitting stage. The project applicant shall reimburse the City for the costs associated with the individual development's fair share of the purchase of this treatment capacity (e.g., the capacity option itself, and associated administrative costs) and implementation of one of the transmission capacity improvement options listed below, the procedural details of which shall be included in either a project memorandum or development agreement for each project, at the discretion of the City Engineer.</p> <p>In order to mitigate the limited transmission capacity during wet weather from the Precise Plan area to the SBSA treatment plant, implementation of one of the following options would be necessary:</p> <p>(1) Upgrade the influent lifting station at the treatment plant, upgrade the treatment plant itself as necessary, install a new gravity sewer line from the SBSA pump station at Maple</p>	Applicants	

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Maximum Intensity alternative ADDWF increment in addition to existing SBSA commitments. Because the SBSA treatment capacity allocation to Redwood City is already being exceeded, the Precise Plan Maximum Intensity alternative-related and cumulative impacts on <u>wet weather flow</u> treatment capacity are considered to represent a potentially significant project and cumulative impact.</p>		<p>Street, and upgrade the pump station at Maple Street; or</p> <p>(2) Replace 21,000 feet of 6-inch, 3,600 feet of 8-inch, and 2,000 feet of 10-inch pipes within the Precise Plan area, and 24,500 feet of 6-inch pipes outside the Plan area, to reduce the wet weather flows. By replacing existing wastewater collection pipes, and thus reducing infiltration and inflow, the increase in ADDWF from Precise Plan-related growth would be mitigated, and the wet weather flow would not increase from Plan-facilitated development. An additional benefit would be the replacement of all substandard 6-inch pipes with City standard 8-inch pipes.</p> <p>Implementation of this measure would reduce Precise Plan Maximum Intensity alternative and cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment and transmission capacity to a less-than-significant level.</p>		
<p>Impact 10-2: Precise Plan-Related and Cumulative Impacts on Wastewater Treatment and Transmission Capacity--Moderate Intensity Alternative. Preliminary estimates indicate that the Moderate Intensity Precise Plan alternative could generate a total of approximately 507,475 gallons of average daily <u>dry weather flow</u> (ADDWF) per day, for a net increase over existing conditions of</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 10-2. If the Precise Plan Moderate Intensity alternative is adopted, prior to City approval of any individual development proposal in the Precise Plan area, if determined necessary by the City Engineer, the City shall purchase from the SBSA the added treatment capacity necessary to accommodate the projected net increase in wastewater generated by the proposed development. Each future</p>	<p>City; Individual Project Applicants</p>	LS

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>approximately 367,334 gpd. Redwood City already uses all of its allocated capacity from the SBSA treatment plant, but possesses an option to purchase an additional 1.915 million gallons per day (mgd) of dry weather capacity. The project-generated ADDWF increment of 367,334 gpd (0.367 mgd) is less than the City's purchase option of 1.915 mgd.</p> <p>In recent years, wastewater flow to the SBSA collection system from Redwood City has occasionally exceeded the current peak <u>wet weather flow</u> capacity right (exclusive of Redwood Shores) of 25.9 mgd. Since 1994-95, the City has exceeded its allocated capacity nine times during the winter. Since the SBSA treatment capacity allocation to Redwood City is already being exceeded during wet weather, the current allocation from the SBSA is inadequate to serve the project's projected Moderate Intensity alternative ADDWF increment in addition to existing SBSA commitments. Because the SBSA wet weather treatment capacity allocation to Redwood City is already being exceeded, the Precise Plan</p> <p>Moderate Intensity alternative-related and cumulative impacts on <u>wet weather flow</u> treatment capacity are considered to represent a <i>potentially significant project and cumulative impact</i>.</p>		<p>individual development's ultimate treatment capacity requirement shall be calculated in the final permitting stage. The project applicant shall reimburse the City for the costs associated with the individual development's fair share of the purchase of this treatment capacity (e.g., the capacity option itself, and associated administrative costs) and implementation of one of the transmission capacity improvement options listed below, the procedural details of which shall be included in a development agreement for the project.</p> <p>In order to mitigate the limited transmission capacity during wet weather from the Precise Plan area to the SBSA treatment plant, implementation of one of the following options would be necessary:</p> <p>(1) Upgrade the influent lifting station at the treatment plant, upgrade the treatment plant itself as necessary, install a new gravity sewer line from the SBSA pump station at Maple Street, and upgrade the pump station at Maple Street; or</p> <p>(2) Replace 21,000 feet of 6-inch, 3,600 feet of 8-inch, and 2,000 feet of 10-inch pipes within the Precise Plan area, and 6,200 feet of 6-inch pipes outside the Plan area, to reduce the wet weather flows. By replacing existing</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>wastewater collection pipes, and thus reducing infiltration and inflow, the increase in ADDWF from Precise Plan-related growth would be mitigated, and the wet weather flow would not increase from Plan-facilitated development. An additional benefit would be the replacement of all substandard 6-inch pipes with City standard 8-inch pipes.</p> <p>Implementation of this measure would reduce the Precise plan Moderate Intensity alternative and cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment and transmission capacity to a less-than-significant level.</p>		
<p>Impact 10-3: Emergency Response and Evacuation Impacts--Maximum Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. Traffic from potential development under the Maximum Intensity alternative would create additional traffic congestion on local roads, possibly delaying emergency response and limiting the RCPD's ability to evacuate the Precise Plan area safely during an emergency or major disaster. These possible project effects on emergency response and evacuation in the Precise Plan area represent a potentially significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 10-3. Implement mitigation measures identified in chapter 9 (Transportation and Circulation) of this EIR to reduce project-related traffic impacts on local roads to less-than-significant levels. In addition, require City review and approval of proposed emergency access provisions prior to approval of individual development projects in the Precise Plan area. Require individual projects to comply with all applicable City of Redwood City road design and emergency access standards. The City may consider other alternatives to these requirements if it determines that such alternatives are feasible and such access will not jeopardize emergency response. Implementation of these measures</p>	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

-
- S = Significant
 - LS = Less than significant
 - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 - NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 10-4: Emergency Access and Response Impacts--Moderate Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. Traffic from potential development under the Moderate Intensity alternative would create additional traffic congestion on local roads, possibly interfering with emergency access and response by the RCFD. These possible project effects on emergency access and in the Precise Plan area represent a potentially significant impact.</p>	S	<p>would reduce impacts on emergency access and response to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Mitigation 10-4. Implement mitigation measures identified in chapter 9 (Transportation and Circulation) of this EIR to reduce project-related traffic impacts on local roads to less-than-significant levels. In addition, require City review and approval of proposed emergency access provisions prior to approval of individual development projects in the Precise Plan area. Require individual projects to comply with all applicable City of Redwood City road design and emergency access standards. The City may consider other alternatives to these requirements if it determines that such alternatives are feasible and such access will not jeopardize emergency response. Implementation of these measures would reduce impacts on emergency access and response to a less-than-significant level.</p>	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS
<p>Impact 10-5: Emergency Access and Response Impacts--Maximum Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. Traffic from potential development under the Maximum Intensity alternative would create additional traffic congestion on local roads, possibly interfering with emergency access and response by the RCFD. These possible project effects on emergency access and in the</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 10-5. Implement mitigation measures identified in chapter 9 (Transportation and Circulation) of this EIR to reduce project-related traffic impacts on local roads to less-than-significant levels. In addition, require City review and approval of proposed emergency access provisions prior to approval of individual development projects in the Precise Plan area. Require individual</p>	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
Precise Plan area represent a <i>potentially significant impact</i> .		projects to comply with all applicable City of Redwood City road design and emergency access standards. The City may consider other alternatives to these requirements if it determines that such alternatives are feasible and such access will not jeopardize emergency response. Implementation of these measures would reduce impacts on emergency access and response to a <i>less-than-significant level</i> .		
Impact 10-6: Emergency Access and Response Impacts--Moderate Intensity Precise Plan Alternative. Traffic from potential development under the Moderate Intensity alternative would create additional traffic congestion on local roads, possibly interfering with emergency access and response by the RCFD. These possible project effects on emergency access and in the Precise Plan area represent a <i>potentially significant impact</i> .	S	Mitigation 10-6. Implement mitigation measures identified in chapter 9 (Transportation and Circulation) of this EIR to reduce project-related traffic impacts on local roads to less-than-significant levels. In addition, require City review and approval of proposed emergency access provisions prior to approval of individual development projects in the Precise Plan area. Require individual projects to comply with all applicable City of Redwood City road design and emergency access standards. The City may consider other alternatives to these requirements if it determines that such alternatives are feasible and such access will not jeopardize emergency response. Implementation of these measures would reduce impacts on emergency access and response to a <i>less-than-significant level</i> .	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<i>NOISE</i>				
<p>Impact 11-1: Precise Plan-Facilitated Demolition and Construction Period Noise. Demolition and construction activities facilitated by the Downtown Precise Plan could temporarily elevate noise levels at nearby residential and commercial receptors during individual, site-specific project construction periods. Noise levels at 50 feet from the demolition or construction equipment source could reach approximately 105 dBA, resulting in intermittent interference with typical existing residential and business activities, and exceeding the land use/noise level compatibility limits established in the <u>Redwood City Strategic General Plan Noise Element</u>. This possibility represents a potentially significant intermittent and short-term noise impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 11-1. Reduce Precise Plan implementation related individual project demolition- and construction-period noise impacts on nearby residences by incorporating conditions in project demolition and construction contract agreements that stipulate the following conventional construction-period noise abatement measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Construction Plan.</i> Prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. The construction plan shall identify a procedure for coordination with nearby noise-sensitive facilities so that construction activities and the event schedule can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance. ▪ <i>Construction Scheduling.</i> Ensure that noise-generating construction activity is limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and noise levels generated by construction are prohibited on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. (Redwood City Municipal Code Section 24.30) 	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Construction Equipment Mufflers and Maintenance.</i> Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. ▪ <i>Equipment Locations.</i> Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project site. ▪ <i>Construction Traffic.</i> Route all construction traffic to and from the construction sites via designated truck routes where possible. Prohibit construction-related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible. ▪ <i>Quiet Equipment Selection.</i> Use quiet construction equipment, particularly air compressors, wherever possible. ▪ <i>Temporary Barriers.</i> Construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to residences, operational businesses, or noise-sensitive land uses. 		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Temporary Noise Blankets.</i> Temporary noise control blanket barriers should be erected, if necessary, along building facades of construction sites. This mitigation would only be necessary if conflicts occurred which were irresolvable by proper scheduling. (Noise control blanket barriers can be rented and quickly erected.) ▪ <i>Noise Disturbance Coordinator.</i> For larger construction projects, the City may choose to require project designation of 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 complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the Disturbance Coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule. (The project sponsor should be responsible for designating a Noise Disturbance Coordinator, posting the phone number and providing 		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>construction schedule notices. The Noise Disturbance Coordinator would work directly with an assigned City staff member.)</p> <p>Implementation of these measures would reduce this intermittent, short-term project construction-period noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>		
<p>Impact 11-2: Precise Plan-Facilitated Ground-Borne Vibration Levels. Precise Plan implementation related individual project demolition and construction activities could generate substantial vibration (e.g., from potential pile driving) in the project vicinity. These possible intermittent and short-term effects represent a potentially significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 11-2. Reduce ground-borne vibration levels during individual, site-specific future project demolition and construction periods by incorporating conditions in individual project demolition and construction contractor agreements that stipulate the following ground-borne vibration abatement measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restrict vibration-generating activity to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday. Prohibit such activity on weekends and holidays. ▪ Notify occupants of land uses located within 200 feet of pile-driving activities of the project construction schedule in writing. 	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 11-3: Potential Exposure of New, Precise Plan-Facilitated Noise-Sensitive Development to Noise Levels Exceeding Standards. The proposed Precise Plan would facilitate new residential development in downtown Redwood City. Associated new residents, employees, and visitors could be exposed to various existing and projected noise sources, including traffic and Caltrain operations. The compatibility of the Draft Precise Plan proposed land uses with the existing and projected noise environment has been evaluated based on the Redwood City Noise Guidelines for Land Use Planning (see EIR Table 11.4). New residential development is considered normally acceptable in noise environments of less than 55 dBA CNEL, and new commercial or retail development is considered normally acceptable in noise environments of 70 dBA CNEL or less.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Investigate in consultation with City staff possible pre-drilling of pile holes as a means of minimizing the number of percussions required to seat the pile. <p>Implementation of these measures would reduce this potential intermittent and short-term Precise Plan vibration impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Mitigation 11-3. Site-specific noise studies consistent with the requirements of the State Building Code (SBC) shall be conducted for all new Precise Plan-facilitated residential uses in these identified potential land use/noise compatibility impact areas to identify appropriate noise reduction measures to be included in project final design. Each noise study must be submitted to and approved by the Redwood City Building Department prior to City issuance of a residential building permit. Identified noise insulation measures may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site planning to minimize noise in shared residential outdoor activity areas by locating the areas behind the buildings, in courtyards, or orienting the terraces to alleyways rather than streets, whenever possible; 	Individual Project Applicants	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Future noise levels throughout much of the Precise Plan area, especially in the vicinity of the Caltrain line, would exceed 55 dBA CNEL. Land uses proposed within 250 feet of the Caltrain line, 120 feet from the centerline of El Camino Real, or 100 feet from Veterans Boulevard, would be exposed to noise levels of 70 dBA CNEL or higher, thereby exposing new Precise Plan-designated, noise-sensitive residential, commercial, recreational, and public facility land use development to noise levels exceeding the "normally acceptable" threshold. These possible long-term adverse noise effects would represent a <i>potentially significant impact</i>.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Air conditioning in all units so that windows can remain closed to maintain interior noise levels below 45 dBA CNEL; and ▪ Sound-rated windows and construction methods in residential units proposed along streets (or the Caltrain line) where noise levels would exceed 70 dB CNEL. <p>Noise levels at residential property lines around Plan-facilitated development should be maintained at an L_{eq} not in excess of 60 dBA during the daytime hours and 50 dBA during nighttime hours (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM), unless ambient noise levels are higher. In those cases, the ambient noise level would be the noise level standard. The approval of future commercial projects near Precise Plan area residential and other noise-sensitive uses may, at City discretion, require a noise study demonstrating how the project--including associated loading docks, refuse areas, and ventilation systems--would meet these standards.</p> <p>Implementation of these measures to the satisfaction of the Redwood City Building Department would reduce the potential impact</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
on new residential uses to a <i>less-than-significant level</i> .				
<i>AIR QUALITY</i>				
<p>Impact 12-1: Construction-Related Air Quality Impacts. Demolition or construction activities permitted and/or facilitated by the proposed Downtown Precise Plan under both the Maximum Intensity and Moderate Intensity alternatives may generate construction-period exhaust emissions and fugitive dust that could temporarily but noticeably affect local air quality. This would represent a <i>potentially significant impact</i>.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 12-1. For all discretionary grading, demolition, or construction activity in the Precise Plan area, require implementation of the following dust control measures by construction contractors, where applicable: During <i>demolition</i> of existing structures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water active demolition areas to control dust generation during demolition of structures and break-up of pavement. ▪ Cover all trucks hauling demolition debris from the site. ▪ Use dust-proof chutes to load debris into trucks whenever feasible. <p>During <i>all construction phases</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. ▪ Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown by the wind. 	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials, or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard. ▪ Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. ▪ Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. ▪ Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets. ▪ Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more). ▪ Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.). 		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour. ▪ Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways. ▪ Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. ▪ Consult with BAAQMD prior to demolition of structures suspected to contain asbestos to ensure that demolition/construction work is conducted in accordance with BAAQMD rules and regulations. <p>The following are measures to control emissions by diesel-powered construction equipment used by construction contractors, where applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that emissions from all on-site, diesel-powered construction equipment do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired or replaced immediately. 		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors). ▪ Diesel equipment standing idle for more than three minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate, or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site and away from residences. ▪ Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions. <p>Implementation of these measures would reduce the construction-related air quality impact of the Precise Plan to a less-than-significant level.</p>		
Impact 12-2: Long-Term Regional Emissions Increases. Development in accordance with the proposed Downtown Precise Plan under both the Maximum Intensity and Moderate Intensity alternatives would	S	Mitigation 12-2. Apply the following emissions control strategies where applicable to Precise Plan-facilitated discretionary mixed use, residential, office, retail, and lodging development activities within the proposed Plan	City; Individual Project Applicants	SU

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>generate traffic-related regional air pollutant emissions increases that would exceed the applicable thresholds of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrous oxide (NO_x), and particulate matter (PM₁₀). This Precise Plan-related effect is considered to represent a significant project and cumulative impact.</p>		<p>area in order to reduce overall emissions from traffic and area sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where practical, future development proposals shall include physical improvements, such as sidewalk improvements, landscaping, and the installation of bus shelters and bicycle parking, that would act as incentives for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit modes of travel. ▪ New or modified roadways should include bicycle lanes where reasonable and feasible. ▪ Provide transit information kiosks. ▪ Where practical, employment-intensive development proposals (i.e., office and retail) shall include measures to encourage use of public transit, ridesharing, van pooling, use of bicycles, and walking, as well as to minimize single passenger motor vehicle use. ▪ Develop parking enforcement and fee strategies that encourage alternative modes of transportation. 		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parking lots or facilities should provide preferential parking for electric or alternatively fueled vehicles. ▪ Require energy efficient building designs that exceed State Title 24 building code requirements. ▪ Discourage use of gasoline-powered landscape equipment. ▪ Implement and enforce truck idling restrictions of three minutes. ▪ Allow only low-emitting fireplaces for residential uses, such as those that burn only natural gas. ▪ Require large office or commercial land uses (e.g., 10,000 square feet or 25 employees) that would generate home-to-work commute trips to implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. Components of these programs should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a carpool/vanpool program, e.g., carpool ride-matching for 		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>employees, assistance with vanpool formation, provision of vanpool vehicles, etc.;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a transit use incentive program for employees, such as on-site distribution of passes and/or subsidized transit passes for local transit systems; - a guaranteed ride home program; - showers and lockers for employees bicycling or walking to work; - secure and conveniently located bicycle parking and storage for workers; and/or - a parking cash-out program for employees (where non-driving employees receive transportation allowance equivalent to the value of subsidized parking). <p>Implementation of these measures would assist in reducing identified Precise Plan-related and cumulative impacts on long-term regional ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emission levels by perhaps 5 to 10 percent beyond what the proposed Precise</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		Plan itself may achieve through its "trip internalization" and alternative modes effects; however, since reductions of (in some cases) over 70 percent would be required to bring project-related regional emission increases to below BAAQMD significance thresholds, the project and cumulative effects on ROG, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ emission levels would represent a significant unavoidable impact .		
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Impact 14-1: Potential Loss of Heritage Trees. Under either the Maximum or Moderate Intensity Precise Plan alternative, future development in accordance with the Draft Precise Plan may result in the removal of heritage trees as defined by the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code chapter 35). This possibility represents a potentially significant impact .	S	Mitigation 14-1. Prior to, or as a condition of, finalization of plans for future individual development projects in the Precise Plan area, require that any proposed tree removal be subject to the application and review process specified in the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code chapter 35). Implementation of this measure would ensure protection of heritage trees, thereby mitigating potential impacts to a less-than-significant level .	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS
Impact 14-2: Potential Loss of Special-Status Species. Under either the Maximum or Moderate Intensity Precise Plan alternative, future Precise Plan-facilitated development in the vicinity of Redwood Creek may result in the loss of special-status species. This possibility is considered to be a potentially significant impact .	S	Mitigation 14-2. If disturbance of suitable habitat is proposed as part of future individual development projects in the vicinity of Redwood Creek, require surveys prior to finalization of such projects in order to determine definitively whether any special-status species occur in the affected area. Such surveys shall be conducted by a qualified	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
<p>Impact 14-3: Jurisdictional Wetland Impacts. Under either the Maximum or Moderate Intensity Precise Plan alternative, future Precise Plan-facilitated development in the vicinity of Redwood Creek may affect potential jurisdictional wetland habitat. This possibility represents a <i>potentially significant impact</i>.</p>	S	<p>botanist following applicable guidelines of the California Department of Fish and Game and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to provide a conclusive determination on presence or absence. If any populations with legal protective status are encountered, an appropriate mitigation plan shall be developed in consultation with, and meeting the mitigation criteria of, the jurisdictional agencies to provide for their protection (e.g., specific setbacks from the creek, activity restrictions). Implementation of this measure would ensure protection of possible populations of special-status species in the Precise Plan area, mitigating potential impacts to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p> <p>Mitigation 14-3. For any future individual development projects in the vicinity of Redwood Creek that involve modifications to potential wetlands and other waters, coordinate with representatives of the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as required by federal and state law, to ensure that any required mitigation protocols and associated individual project design modifications (e.g., specific setbacks from the creek, activity restrictions) are incorporated into proposed improvement plans during the initial stages of project review. Implementation of this measure would ensure that potential impacts on wetland resources are minimized and adequate</p>	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
---------	--	---------------------	------------------------------	---

replacement is provided, mitigating this potential impact to a **less-than-significant level**.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Impact 15-1: Ground Shaking. Under either the Maximum or Moderate Intensity Precise Plan alternative, future development in accordance with the proposed Draft Precise Plan would place new residences and businesses in a subregion that is expected to experience severe earthquake-induced ground shaking during the useful life of the project improvements. This ground movement could cause differential settlement of any poorly consolidated soils and induce ground failure within alluvial soils that may be prone to liquefaction. These possible responses to anticipated seismic activity represent a **potentially significant impact**.

S

Mitigation 15-1. At the City Building Official's discretion, future discretionary development projects proposed within the Precise Plan area shall be required to undertake *detailed, design-level geotechnical investigations* that include analysis of project site seismic stability, liquefaction potential, and soil response characteristics with respect to ground acceleration, in accordance with Special Publication 112, "Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Liquefaction in California," published by the California Division of Mines and Geology.

City;
Individual
Project
Applicants

LS

The *detailed, design-level geotechnical investigations* should include the following:

- Seismic stability analysis of the existing on-site soil;
- Evaluation of liquefaction potential through the performance of additional cone penetration tests, borings, and/or equivalent methods; and

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Determination of site-specific soil response characteristics and maximum credible ground acceleration for an earthquake recurrence interval specified by the City. <p>Recommendations from the investigations, including appropriate soil stabilization and foundation construction techniques, minimum setbacks around potentially unstable areas, and criteria for the compaction and treatment of on-site fills, shall be incorporated into the final project grading and foundation plans. In general, these recommendations are expected to include the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ that all construction comply with the most current edition of the Uniform Building Code for Seismic Zone 4 , or with the most recently adopted building codes; ▪ that all project structural designs be based on proper estimates by the project geotechnical engineer of peak and maximum repeatable earthquake-induced ground surface accelerations expected to occur on the project site; and 		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ that excavations will be adequately sloped or shored in order to minimize ground movements. <p>Implementation of these measures--combined with conformance with standard Uniform Building Code, City of Redwood City, and other applicable regulations--would reduce the potential effects of ground shaking to a less-than-significant level.</p>		
<p>Impact 15-2: Soil Erosion and Sedimentation. Under either the Maximum or Moderate Intensity Precise Plan alternative, grading for future development in accordance with the proposed Precise Plan would temporarily disturb the site's existing topography and vegetative cover, leaving soils exposed to wind and water erosion during the construction period. Eroded soils could be washed into on-site or off-site drainage facilities. Resulting sedimentation could affect the flows in these drainage facilities, increasing flooding potential and maintenance problems and degrading water quality. These possible effects of soil erosion represent a potentially significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation 15-2. Require applicants for future development projects in the Precise Plan area involving a grading area of one acre or greater to prepare <i>erosion control plans</i> subject to City approval and consistent with the required project <i>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans</i> (SWPPPs) as well as Best Management Practices (BMPs) specified by the Redwood City Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Program (Municipal Code chapter 27A). Implement the plan during construction. Erosion during all phases of construction shall be controlled through the use of erosion and soil transport control facilities. These shall include the use of catch basins and filter fabrics, and the direction of stormwater runoff away from disturbed areas. The plan shall also provide for long-term stabilization and maintenance of remaining exposed soils after construction is completed. Areas disturbed by construction shall be either covered with</p>	City; Individual Project Applicants	LS

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Potential Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Potential Significance With Mitigation
		<p>impervious surfaces (e.g., buildings and pavement) or fully stabilized with landscaping and/or native vegetation. All revegetated areas shall be irrigated and maintained as necessary to ensure the long-term survival of the vegetation. Implementation of this measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>		

S = Significant
 LS = Less than significant
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact
 NA = Not applicable

2.6 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

In addition to the Maximum Intensity and Moderate Intensity Precise Plan alternatives (Alternatives 1 and 2), three more alternatives (Alternatives 3, 4 and 5) are identified and evaluated in chapter 18 of this EIR to provide a basis for further understanding of the environmental effects of the proposed project and possible approaches to reducing identified significant impacts, and to meet CEQA requirements for EIR content. The three additional alternatives are summarized below.

2.6.1 Identified Alternatives

- **Alternative 3: Modified Precise Plan--Reduced Height (9-Story Height Limit).** The City's current zoning ordinance building height limitations for the various existing Downtown zoning districts do not exceed 9 stories. This alternative assumes that the Precise Plan would be revised to keep permissible building heights to the current 9-story maximum; i.e., the currently proposed maximum 12-Story and 10-Story Height Zones would be replaced with a maximum 9-Story Height Zone.
- **Alternative 4: No Project--Existing Land Use Policy (Zoning) Buildout Scenario.** This alternative assumes that a new Downtown Precise Plan would not be adopted, and future development would instead occur to the maximum limits permissible under current Redwood City Strategic General Plan and Redwood City Zoning Ordinance allowances for downtown Redwood City.
- **Alternative 5: No Project--No Change in Existing Development.** This CEQA-required No Project alternative assumes that a new Downtown Precise Plan would not be adopted, and that there would be no change in existing mix of land uses, building coverages, building heights, and other development conditions from what exists now in the Downtown area.

2.6.2 Conclusions: Environmentally Superior Alternative

The CEQA Guidelines (section 15126[e][2]) stipulate, "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." The comparison of alternatives in chapter 18 of this EIR indicates that, of the various scenarios and alternatives evaluated in this EIR other than the No Project--No Change in Existing Development alternative, the **Moderate Intensity project alternative (Alternative 2)**, would result in the least adverse combination of environmental impacts.

2.7 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION

For those mitigation measures identified in this EIR that are adopted by the City, a **mitigation monitoring and reporting program** will be undertaken by City staff to ensure and verify mitigation implementation. Implementation of most of the mitigation measures recommended in this EIR could be effectively implemented through incorporation into the final version of one or more of the various Downtown Precise Plan components (e.g., General Plan Amendments, Planned Community District rezoning) and/or can be implemented (monitored and verified) through the City's normal development review procedures following adoption of these

components. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15087, adoption of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program will be necessary before the Downtown Precise Plan can be adopted by the City Council of Redwood City.

