

**Environmental Assessment 2003-04**

***Project Location:*** 492 Woodside Road , Redwood City, CA 94061 (lead address);  
1620 Hess Road; 1606 Hess Road; 515 Lucerne Avenue; 553  
Lucerne Avenue; 551 Lucerne Avenue; 502 Woodside Road;  
512 Woodside Road

***Project Description:*** The proposed application is to allow the re-zoning of nine (9) existing parcels to a mixed use zoning General Commercial – Residential “CG-R” District; eight of the existing parcels are currently zoned Multi-Family Medium Density “R-4” and the remaining parcel is zoned General Commercial “CG”. Re-zoning of the project site would accommodate the continued use of a commercial garden nursery facility and multi-family residential units on an existing site containing approximately 1.49 acres or 65,119 square feet. The intent of the proposed application is to create a mixed-use project site that would allow for a long term master planning of the existing facility and to mitigate some existing non-conforming land uses (e.g., portions of the commercial nursery that extend onto parcels zoned for residential uses). The proposed project may result in the addition of some off-site street improvements, such as street trees and/or curb and gutter improvements; however, no new structures will be built as part of the rezoning.

***Zoning:*** General Commercial (CG) and Multi-Family Medium Density (R-4) District.

***Lot Area:*** Approximately 1.49 acres

***Adjacent Land Uses and Setting:*** A single story convenience store (7-11); located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Hess Road and Woodside Road, lies adjacent to the eastern border of the commercial portion of the project site and the southern border of the residential portion. The convenience store is located on a parcel zoned for Neighborhood Commercial uses. Further west along the northern side of Woodside Road, abutting the western side of the project site are neighborhood commercial uses. These current land uses consist of a commercial pet supply store, a restaurant and a neighborhood gas station.

The land uses on the northern side and northwestern side of the project site, along Lucerne Avenue and Ebener Street consist of a number of one and two-story, multi-family residential dwelling units. The land uses on the opposing side (east side) of Hess Road also consist of two-story, medium density, multi-family residential

dwelling units; however, the corner of Hess Road and Woodside Road contains several commercial land uses. The opposing side of Woodside Road is currently developed with a residential care facility that provides housing for the elderly.

Overall, the immediate vicinity is characterized by the commercial land uses fronting Woodside Road (a prominent East-West thoroughfare in Redwood City) and the medium and high density housing stemming off of the local connector streets.

**Existing Use:** Commercial Garden Nursery, two (2) multi-family residential units and a residential duplex unit.

**Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None. Development will be subject to entitlements from the Community Development Services Department.

## **Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:**

- (1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- (2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- (3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- (4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- (5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- (6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- (7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- (8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- (9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - (a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - (b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**Issues:**

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS -- <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? <i>The project is not in a scenic vista and will not adversely effect a scenic vista.</i>				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? <i>The project is not within a state scenic highway.</i>				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? <i>The project site is relatively flat with some mature landscaping dispersed throughout. The commercial nursery utilizes the majority of its parcel area for the display and merchandising of plants, flowers and planting materials. The residential units contain some manicured landscaping along the property lines and interspersed throughout the property.</i> <i>The parcels are developed with an existing two-story commercial building and several small accessory commercial buildings; a one-story residential duplex; and two two-story multi-family residential units. The proposal will not add any additional square foot to the existing land uses; however, the re-zoning of the project site would result in some additional improvements to the public right-of-ways surrounding the project site (such as street trees, curb and gutter improvements, etc). In addition, the proposed re-zoning will also allow the applicant to consider some additional modifications to the existing commercial land use; however, any proposed additions or modification that occur as a result of this project would be analyzed on the merits of the application and would be subject to the City's review and approval process.</i> <i>Despite the less than significant impact to the visual character of the site and its surroundings, there are several visual corridors that need to be identified. The primary or most substantial views of the project site are from Woodside Road, in either direction. Given the amount of vehicular traffic it is assumed that the majority of these views will be from pass-by trips. Secondary view corridors are available from both Hess Road and Lucerne Avenue. Given the current urban/suburban character of the existing land uses, the fact that the</i>			X	

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>majority of views will be generated by vehicular traffic, and that any improvements to the site as a result of this project would be limited to streetscape improvements any impacts associated with the re-zoning of the project site would be considered less than significant. Moreover, it is anticipated streetscape improvements to the existing site will further enhance the existing character of the site.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, it can be concluded that the project's effect on the visual character of the site and its surroundings would be considered a less than significant impact.</i></p>				
<p>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p> <p><i>The proposed project would not result in the construction of any additional facilities that would generate a new source of substantial light and/or glare. Thus, it can be concluded that the proposed project will not generate an environmental impact.</i></p>				X
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES --Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p> <p><i>The project would not convert farmland of any kind to a non-agricultural use.</i></p>				X
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p> <p><i>The project will not conflict with any agricultural zoned use or a Williamson Act contract. There are no such land uses or Williamson Act contracts in the vicinity of the project.</i></p>				X

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</p> <p><i>Currently, a commercial nursery and several multi-family residential units occupy the site. There are no current or planned agricultural activities in the project area. See all responses to items II.(a) and II.(b).</i></p>				X
<b>III. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p> <p><i>The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality attainment plan established by the California Air Resources Board, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) or the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).</i></p>				X
<p>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p> <p><i>The project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.</i></p>				X
<p>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative threshold for ozone precursors)?</p> <p><i>There would be no direct air emissions associated with the re-zoning of the existing parcels. Because the operational activities would not result in direct air emissions, no permits would be required from BAAQMD for the proposed project and no mitigation is necessary.</i></p>				X
<p>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p> <p><i>Although the re-zoning of the existing parcels would not directly result in the production of substantial pollutant concentrations, it may result in the City requiring additional street and right-of-way improvements (such as street trees along Woodside Road and/or curb and gutter improvements to Lucerne Avenue) that may result in minor construction activities. These related construction activities would generate fugitive dust. Excavation and fill activities associated with the improvements would entail earth disturbance and potential dust generation. These activities could result in localized dust nuisances near the construction activity. The largest dust particles would be expected to settle out very close to the construction site, but some quantities of dust would be windborne beyond the construction site toward adjacent land uses. There is a slightly increased health risk from breathing such benign dust due to small amounts of active micro-organisms in soil, but the risk factor is considered low.</i></p> <p><i>Project construction would also result in increased levels of equipment exhaust emissions (nitrogen oxides), and to a lesser extent carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and hydrocarbons or reactive organic gases (ROG). Construction employee vehicles and on-site use of pick-up trucks and small vehicles would also result in air pollutant emissions, but the levels would be negligible compared to emissions from on-site heavy equipment and from off-site trucks. Equipment exhaust contains both pulmonary irritants as well as</i></p>			X	

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>hazardous compounds, which may affect sensitive receptors such as young children, senior citizen, or those susceptible to respiratory diseases.</i></p> <p><i>Because of the variability in construction emissions, the BAAQMD emphasizes the implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures rather than the detailed quantification of construction emissions. For construction areas of more than four (4) acres (the project site is 1.49 acres), BAAQMD would require implementation of Enhanced Control Measures. Therefore, implementation of these measures will not be required to minimize particulate emissions and construction-related air quality impacts to a less than significant level.</i></p>				
<p>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p> <p><i>No odor problems would be generated as a result of the re-zoning of the existing project site. Odors from vehicular emissions from Woodside and Hess Roads are sometimes noticeable. This type of odor is common occurrence in the area, and is accepted as a component of living and working in the vicinity. The impact is not considered significant, and no mitigation is necessary.</i></p>				✗
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE -- Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p><i>The construction activities are not expected to result in a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</i></p>			✗	
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p><i>The construction activities are not expected to have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. There are no habitats or sensitive natural communities in the area.</i></p>			✗	
<p>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p> <p><i>The construction activities are not expected to result in a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, march, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling hydrological interruption, or other means because the project site is not located in such a wetland.</i></p>				✗
<p>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory</p>			✗	

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p> <p><i>The construction activities are not expected to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impact the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</i></p>				
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p> <p><i>The project would not conflict with City policy to protect sensitive habitats and trees. The project will comply with the City's provision for tree preservation (Chapter 35 of the Municipal Code).</i></p>			X	
<p>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</p> <p><i>The project would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan in the project area.</i></p>				X
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</p> <p><i>There are no known historical, archaeological or paleontological resources or sites or cemeteries or human remains in the project area and the site is not associated with any unique ethnic cultural values or an existing religious or sacred use. Therefore, the project would not be anticipated to result in an adverse impact on cultural resources.</i></p> <p><i>No excavation is required for the proposed project; however, should any human remains be found during on- or off-site improvements associated with the proposed project, the City of Redwood City Cultural Resources Management Plan guidelines requires that construction activities be halted immediately and the County coroner and a professional archaeologist be consulted to evaluate the significance of the find. If the remains are Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission is required to be notified. Implementation of these measures would result in a finding of less than significant impact to cultural, historical, and paleontological resources.</i></p>			X	
<p>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</p> <p><i>See section V a) above.</i></p>			X	
<p>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p> <p><i>See section V a) above.</i></p>			X	
<p>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p>			X	

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>See section V a) above.</i>				
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>The project would not create new geologic hazards that could damage project facilities. Therefore, this section focuses on the effect of local geologic conditions and activity on the proposed multi-purpose facility.</p>				
<p>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</p> <p><i>The project area is located within the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area. The significant earthquakes that occur in the Bay Area are generally associated with crustal movement along well-defined, active fault zones of the San Andreas Fault system, which trend in a northwesterly direction. The project site is located about three (3) miles southeast of the San Andreas Fault. Two other major active faults in the area are the Hayward fault, located about seventeen (17) miles northeast of the project site, and the San Gregorio fault, located about eleven (11) miles southwest.</i></p> <p><i>The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no known surface expression of active faults is believed to cross the site. Therefore, the potential for fault rupture through the site is considered to be low. In addition, there are no known unique geologic or physical features present in the project vicinity.</i></p>			X	
<p>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</p> <p><i>Strong ground shaking can be expected at the site during moderate to severe earthquakes in the general region. This is common to virtually all developments in the San Francisco Bay Area. Due to the fact that no structures are proposed as a part of the re-zoning of the subject parcels there is no need to mitigate seismic-related hazards at the site. Any future development on the site will be subject to review and approval by the City and shall be designed and constructed in accordance with seismic standards adopted by the City of Redwood City. Implementation of these measures would reduce impacts from seismic ground shaking and other activities to a less than significant level.</i></p>			X	
<p>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p><i>Liquefaction is a process whereby strong ground shaking causes loose, saturated, unconsolidated sediments to lose strength and behave as a fluid. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, saturated, uniformly graded, fine-grained sands. The site is underlain by layers of silty clays, sands and gravels, and bedrock; therefore, the soils are not susceptible to significant liquefaction and densification during earthquake loading.</i></p>			X	

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Landslides? <i>The project site is relatively flat; therefore, landslides are not anticipated.</i>				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? <i>The lack of slope throughout the project site would result in negligible soil erosion or loss. Should, increases in erosion of exposed soils by wind or water occur during the construction of site improvements, the construction contractor will be required to implement San Mateo County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP) Best Management practices.</i>			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? <i>Lateral spreading typically occurs as a form of horizontal displacement of relatively flat-lying alluvial soils toward an open or "free" face such as an open body of water channel or excavation. In soils, this movement is generally due to failure along a weak plane, and may often be associated with liquefaction.</i> <i>Given that the project site is not bounded by a waterway, it is unlikely that subsurface soils would be subject to lateral spreading.</i>			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? <i>The project, as proposed, will not result in the construction of any buildings or structures; therefore, no substantial risk to life or property is anticipated.</i>				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? <i>There would be no use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems for the project.</i>				X
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? <i>The project would not involve routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or the use of hazardous materials or emit hazardous emissions.</i>				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? <i>See section VII a) above.</i>				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? <i>See section VII a) above.</i>				X

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? <i>The project consists of re-zoning an existing site which is not on a list of hazardous materials sites.</i>				✗
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? <i>The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or a private airstrip.</i>				✗
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? <i>See section VII e) above.</i>				✗
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? <i>The project would not impair or interfere with such plans.</i>				✗
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? <i>The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.</i>				✗
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? <i>The project would have no significant effects on water quality.</i>				✗
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? <i>See section VIII a) above.</i>				✗
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? <i>The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or alter the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.</i>				✗

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?  <i>See section VIII c) above.</i>				✗
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  <i>See section VIII c) above.</i>				✗
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  <i>The project would not degrade water quality.</i>				✗
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  <i>The project would not be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area since the site is in an area of minimal flooding (Zone C) as shown on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map 06032500150B effective May 17, 1982.</i>				✗
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?  <i>The project would not be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area since the site is in an area of minimal flooding (Zone C) as shown on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map 06032500150B effective May 17, 1982.</i>				✗
i) Expose people or structure to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?  <i>The project would not expose people or a structure to a significant risk or loss involving flooding. The proposed project would not result in any new construction. Furthermore, the existing site is located in an area of minimal flooding (Zone C) as shown on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map 06032500150B effective May 17, 1982.</i>				✗
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  <i>The project area is not subject to these conditions.</i>				✗
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?  <i>The project would not result in the division of an established community. More specifically, the proposed project would work to bring the existing land uses into a higher level of conformance with the proposed zone. Under the current zoning requirements both multi-family residential structures are non-</i>				✗

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>conforming with respect to density and parking. For example, if both properties were to be redeveloped under current zoning regulations each parcel would only be able to support a single-family dwelling.</i></p> <p><i>While the re-zoning of the property would increase the allowable density on the project site by changing from an “R-4” zoning to an “R-5” zoning it would not alleviate the non-conforming aspects of the existing land use. Should the nine parcels of the project site be merged and redeveloped in the future the increased density permitted under the General Commercial - Residential (CG-R) zoning designation would allow for a similar development of the subject property. Future development would also require that the subject property be conforming with respect to on-site parking requirements, including on-site visit parking.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, the existing commercial use (the garden nursery) is non-conforming with respect to parking and operating a commercial land use within a residential zoning district. Re-zoning of the subject property would bring the commercial land use into conformance with the permitted uses of the General Commercial –Residential (CG-R) zoning district.</i></p>				
<p>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</p> <p><i>The proposed re-zoning of the subject property would require an amendment to the Zoning Map as well as the General Plan Map; however, upon completion of amending the Zoning Map and General Plan Map the existing land use will remain consistent with the surrounding land uses and land use designations. For example, the General Plan land use designations of the properties fronting on Woodside Road, on the adjacent blocks East of Hess Road and West of Hudson Street are designated Commercial-Heavy Mixed Use, which is consistent with the proposed project. The same can be said for the General Plan land use designations for properties on the opposing (South) side of Woodside Road. Therefore, the proposed project would maintain the same land use designation as existing properties within the immediate vicinity of the project site. Furthermore, the “new” zoning classification of General Commercial – Residential (CG-R) would also remain consistent with the surrounding land uses in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The commercial component of the site would remain consistent with the land uses that front on Woodside Road, while the High-Density (R-5) component would be consistent with similar land use, which are zoned R-4, but are legally non-conforming with respect to density.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Land Use Element of the General Plan identifies one of its land use goals to be the protection of residential neighborhoods from incompatible land uses, adequacy of public facilities and services, and integration with commercial and employment centers. High Density Residential, as described in the Land Use Element of the General Plan, refers to the R-4 and R-5 zoning districts. It represents the density found in high-density apartment house and commercial mixed-use areas such as that currently existing on the project site.</i></p> <p><i>The commercial land use objectives and policies reflect the need to locate new commercial uses in the community which facilitate shopping and easy access to professional services. As described in the General Plan, Mixed-Use Commercial describes areas which support central business districts and</i></p>			X	

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>thoroughfare commercial areas. Woodside Road is an example of this commercial thoroughfare; consequently re-zoning the project site to General Commercial – Residential (CG-R) with a Commercial-Heavy Mixed Use General Plan designation would remain consistent with the City of Redwood City’s land use goals.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed project would also be consistent with the land use objectives established in the General Plan. For example, Land Use Objective L-3 states higher residential densities should be promoted at locations near or within commercial and financial centers, employment centers, and transportation terminals. Land Use Objective L-4 states commercial land should be distributed in a manner that maximizes community accessibility to a variety of retail commercial outlets and services and minimizes the need for automobile travel.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to remaining consistent with the land uses designation policies and objectives established in the Land Use Element of the General Plan the proposed project would maintain a land use consistent with the purpose of the General Commercial – Residential Zoning District as established in the Zoning Ordinance; therefore, with the revision of the Zoning Map and General Plan Map as previously stated the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plans, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project and no potentially significant impacts are anticipated.</i></p>				
<p>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</p> <p><i>The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.</i></p>				X
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</p> <p><i>The project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.</i></p>				X
<p>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</p> <p><i>See X a) above.</i></p>				X
<b>XI. NOISE – Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p> <p><i>Noise in Redwood City is regulated by the City’s Noise Ordinance (Chapter 24 of the Municipal Code). In addition, the Noise Element of the City’s General Plan enumerates noise policies. Construction noise is required to less than 110 decibels (dB) within residential districts of the City, and construction activities in residential districts are generally restricted to the weekday hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. The General Plan requires all exterior noise sources (construction operations, air compressors, pumps, fans, and leaf blowers) to</i></p>			X	

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>use available noise suppression devices and techniques to bring exterior noise down to acceptable levels compatible with adjacent land uses.</i></p> <p><i>The primary sources of noise will be construction noise (associated with off-site improvements) and operational noise. Construction noise is largely a function of the construction equipment used, the location and sensitivity of nearby land uses, and the timing and duration of the noise-generating activities. Construction noise levels would vary depending on construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of barriers between noise source and receptor. All noise generating construction activities are anticipated to be conducted on weekdays between the hours of 7a.m. and 8 p.m. in accordance with City requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Moreover, operational noise impacts from the existing land uses will not increase as a result of the proposed project.</i></p>				
<p>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</p> <p><i>The project will not result in an exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</i></p>				✗
<p>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p> <p><i>See XI a) above.</i></p>				✗
<p>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p> <p><i>See XI a) above.</i></p>			✗	
<p>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p> <p><i>The project would not be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.</i></p>				✗
<p>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p> <p><i>See XI e) above.</i></p>				✗
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</p> <p><i>The project would not induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly.</i></p>				✗

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <i>See XII a) above.</i>				✗
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <i>See XII a) above.</i>				✗
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:  <i>The proposed re-zoning would not result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for a new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives given that the project site is served by the City of Redwood City police and fire department; no schools will be impacted as a result of this project and the project would not result in the need for new park services.</i>				✗
Fire protection? <i>See XIII a) above</i>				✗
Police protection? <i>See section XIII a) above.</i>				✗
Schools? <i>See section XIII a) above.</i>				✗
Parks? <i>See section XIII a) above.</i>				✗
Other public facilities? <i>See section XIII a) above.</i>				✗
<b>XIV. RECREATION -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?  <i>Given that the proposed project will not intensify the existing land use it is not anticipated that the project would increase the use of existing neighborhood</i>				✗

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.</i>				
<p>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</p> <p><i>The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. As a result, it is not foreseen that the project would have an adverse physical effect on the environment.</i></p>				X
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</p> <p><i>Woodside Road, a major arterial street also designated as State Highway 84, provides local access to the site. The posted speed limit on Woodside Road is 35 miles per hour (mph). There is an existing sidewalk on the north and south sides of Woodside Road, and portions of the subject site about the sidewalk on the north side of Woodside Road. Hess Road provides one (1) access point to the subject site. Hess Road is a two (2)-lane collector street that connects Poplar Avenue to Woodside Road. The speed limit is 25 miles per hour on Hess Road. Lucerne Avenue provides one (1) access point to the subject site. Lucerne Avenue is a two (2)-lane collector street that extends from Hess Road about a half block to the West and terminates into a residential property. A majority of Lucerne Avenue remains unimproved (the roadway is paved, but no curb or gutter system has been constructed).</i></p> <p><i>To describe the operation of a local roadway network, transportation engineers and planners commonly use a grading system called Level of Service (LOS). The LOS grading system qualitatively characterizes traffic conditions associated with varying levels of traffic. These levels range from LOS A, which indicates free-flow traffic conditions with little or no delay experienced by motorists, to LOS F, which describes congested conditions where traffic flows exceed design capacity, resulting in long queues and delays.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed re-zoning of the project site will not result in the generation of any new trips; therefore the existing Level of Service at the intersections surrounding the project site will not be impacted.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, the distribution and assignment of existing traffic will not be impacted as a result of the proposed re-zoning of the project site. As a result, the project would not cause an increase in traffic and no impacts would occur to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.</i></p>			X	
<p>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</p> <p><i>Since the project will not generate any additional traffic as a result of the re-zoning the proposed project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, levels of service standards established by the San Mateo County Congestion Management and Transportation Planning Unit and City/County</i></p>				X

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Association of Governments alongside Woodside Road or Hess Road.</i>				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? <i>Given the height and location of the site, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that that results in substantial safety risks.</i>				✗
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? <i>Given that the proposed project will not result in the addition of any new structures or land uses to the existing site, the project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.</i>				✗
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? <i>The project will maintain existing emergency access; therefore the project would not result in inadequate emergency access and no potential impacts would occur.</i>				✗
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? <i>The existing site provides twenty-two (22) parking spaces for the retail use, two (2) garage spaces for the existing duplex, five (5) on-site spaces for the 5-unit multi-family residence and six (6) on-site spaces for the 6-unit multi-family residence, for a total of thirty-five (35) on-site parking spaces. All of the existing land uses on the project site are considered to be legal non-conforming with respect to parking given the current requirements of the Redwood City Zoning Ordinance; however, because the land uses were constructed legally under a previous set of zoning regulations they are able to retain the non-conforming status.</i> <i>The proposed re-zoning of the project site will not require the addition of any on-site parking spaces. Additional mention should be given to the fact that the proposed project will require some off-site improvements, which will result in improvements to Lucerne Avenue. The installation of these improvements to Lucerne Avenue, such as a City engineered curb and gutter system, will provide for some additional off-site (on-street) parking. The existing conditions are such that parking occurs on the unimproved portion of Lucerne Avenue at random (without any organized stall widths or defined parking spaces).</i> <i>Furthermore, any additional structural improvements or further intensification of the site would require additional on-site parking. As a result the proposed project or any future project would not generate any potentially significant impacts.</i>			✗	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? <i>Re-zoning of the project site would not require on- or off-site improvements that would result in the degradation of existing policies, plans, or programs that support alternative transportation. Woodside Road is a State highway</i>				✗

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>and currently provides bus transportation.</i>				
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICES SYSTEMS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  <i>The South Bayside System Authority (SBSA) operates the regional wastewater treatment facility, located at the eastern end of the Redwood Shores peninsula. Redwood City is a member agency of this authority, and has adequate capacity rights for the existing land uses. Given the fact that no intensification of land uses are associated with the implementation of this project no impact is anticipated. Should the re-zoning of the property result in future development of the site, the potential impacts of that project would be assessed at the time of the future projects entitlements.</i>				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?  <i>See section XVI a) above.</i>				X
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?  <i>See section XVI a) above.</i>				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  <i>The San Francisco Hetch Hetchy regional water system is the source of Redwood City's drinking water supply. According to the Public Works Department, the City is consuming one-thousand (1000) acre-feet per year over the contractual supply assurance 12,243 acre-feet per year from the Hetch Hetchy regional water system. The proposed project will not result in the addition of any structures or land uses that would place additional demand on the water supply of the existing land uses; therefore no impact will occur as a result of the proposed project.</i>  <i>Although staff has determined that no increase in water demand is expected and the proposed project will have little effect on the existing supply of water, staff recommends that the project proponents participate in the City's sponsored Water Conservation Program for indoor and outdoor water use.</i>				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?  <i>See section XVI a) above.</i>				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  <i>Operation of the existing facility produces solid waste, which would be collected and transported to an appropriate landfill by the City's solid waste</i>			X	

	Summary of Impacts			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>collection company, BFI. There is sufficiently permitted landfill capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. In addition, project construction will comply with all applicable solid waste regulations.</i>				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? <i>See section XVI a) above.</i>			X	
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?  <i>Given the nature of the project and the suggested mitigation measures, it has been determined that the project will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.</i>			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?  <i>Given the nature of the project and the suggested mitigation measures, the project will not have cumulatively considerable impacts.</i>			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  <i>The project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.</i>				X

**Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics            | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality       | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality           | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning             | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources  | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources    | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Geology/Soils

Population/Housing

No Potentially Significant Impacts

## Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

### RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED RE-ZONING OF NINE (9) PARCELS LOCATED AT 492 WOODSIDE ROAD (WEGMAN’S NURSERY)

*Subject to approval of the proposed re-zoning project the City will be requiring several off-site improvements such as street trees along Woodside Road and the improvement of Lucerne Avenue. The following mitigate measures will work to minimize the environmental impacts associated with the construction / implementation of these off-site improvements as part of the proposed re-zoning project. The following mitigation measures shall be utilized to the extent that they apply to the scope of work as determined by the City of Redwood City.*

#### AESTHETICS

- The specific location and species of street trees shall be determined by the City Arborist and shall be consistent with the requirements of the Local Development Standards.

#### AIR QUALITY

For all project related on- or off-site improvements the construction contractor shall implement the following Enhanced Control Measures recommended by the BAAQMD to the extent that they are applicable to the project:

- Construction vehicles shall be properly maintained and tuned to minimize exhaust emissions.
- Vehicle idling time shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible.
- Water trucks or sprinklers shall be used in sufficient quantities to keep exposed soil surfaces damp enough to prevent dust. Watering should increase frequency when the wind speed exceeds 15 miles per hour (mph).
- Pave, apply water three (3) 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 street daily if visible soil materials is carried onto adjacent public streets.

- Any dust production materials shall be covered while being hauled. When necessary, loads shall also be watered down to reduce dust.
- The contractor shall designate a person or persons to monitor the emission control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more)

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- Construction activities shall be limited to daytime work hours, and construction equipment shall be properly muffled and maintained.
- Project related construction shall comply with the City’s tree preservation regulations (Chapter 35 of Redwood City Municipal Code)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- Should any human remains be found during on- or off-site improvements associated with the proposed project, the City of Redwood City Cultural Resources Management Plan guidelines requires that construction activities be halted immediately and the County coroner and a professional archaeologist be consulted to evaluate the significance of the find. If the remains are Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission is required to be notified.

GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEIMICITY

- Contractor shall be required to implement San Mateo County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP) Best Management Practices to minimize erosion and site run-off impacts.

NOISE

- Normally scheduled construction activities should adhere to the City’s Noise Ordinance. If possible, the noisiest construction activities would be scheduled for daytime hours when the ambient noise levels are highest.
- All construction equipment operated at the project site should be equipped with manufacturer’s standard noise control devices (i.e. mufflers, engine enclosures, etc.)
- The scheduling of events of the facility shall be sensitive to the noise levels of adjoining residential properties.
- All construction equipment shall be inspected by the contractor at periodic intervals to ensure proper maintenance and hence, lower noise levels.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- All street, curb and gutter, and sidewalk improvements shall be constructed in accordance with the City of Redwood City’s standards per the Engineering and Construction Services Department specifications.

WATER

- Proponent shall be required to follow the City of Redwood City’s Water Conservation Program, which includes all of the Best Management Practices identified in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Regarding Urban Water Conservation as overseen by the California Urban Water Council.
- A storm drainage plan and site drainage plan shall be submitted to the Engineering and Construction Services Department to mitigate the impacts of storm water run-off and to ensure adequate accommodations of on-site and off-site drainage.

_____ Signature	_____ Date
_____ Blake Lyon Printed Name	_____ October 7, 2003 Date