

Meridian 25 Questions

From May 31, 2016 Study Session and Members of the Public

Q.1 How many employees are expected to work there once it is fully leased and operational? How does the /mechanical HVAC System limit the number of employees on the site? How does the TDM plan work in this regard?

A: The HVAC/Electrical/Plumbing systems for the project are designed to handle an occupancy load consistent with a Class A office building. The building systems, as well the project design, is intended to serve 1,600 employees. Occupancy is further regulated by building, and fire codes. In addition, the TDM plan limits the total number of vehicle trips as discussed below, the site can generate, further limiting any potential traffic impact if future occupancy exceeded the current intent of the design and what Code currently allows.

The TDM Plan requires a 20 percent trip reduction compared standard ITE trip generation rates and in accordance with City Codes, resulting in fewer than or equal to a daily maximum of 3,722 trips (580 AM Peak and 536 PM Peak Hour trips). A trip is defined as a single or one-way directional vehicle movement with either the origin or destination at the project site. In other words, a trip can be either “to” or “from” the site. In addition, a single patron visit to a site is counted as two trips (i.e. one to and one from the site). This requires annual monitoring to ensure compliance with this requirement in the following way:

This TDM Program requires the submission of an annual report, “documenting the TDM activities undertaken and their results.” Additionally, there will be a full review of the effectiveness of all TDM activities, plus suggested modifications and additions to the TDM program. Both reviews would evaluate the TDM Program in meeting the objective of achieving the required 20% reduction in trips.

The number of vehicle trips associated with the project will be tracked using an annual hose count through the first five-year evaluation period. The hose count will be managed and overseen by the site-wide TDM coordinator. The purpose of the hose count is to determine how many vehicles are entering and exiting the site during the peak hour. The hose count will be conducted over a 3-day period; Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday during a normal business week. Data on vehicle entries and exits will be collected at all entry and exit points to the site continuously over the 3-day period. An average of the peak hour data for the three days will be taken to determine the number of peak hour vehicle trips. The hose count will be conducted during the same month each year and the initial hose count should commence within a year of the certificate of occupancy. The target of 20% trip reduction, as required by the City TDM ordinance. If the TDM project is not achieving the trip reduction target, the City may impose reasonable changes to assure the program’s objectives will be met.

Q.2: Can you provide more information on water conservation (recycled water/rainwater harvesting) and project water usage?

A: The project will generate a net increase in water given the additional square feet of office uses proposed as part of the project in comparison to the square footage of uses currently on the project

site. As part of the LEED design requirements for the building, water conservation measures will be implemented in both the building and site/landscaping design to maximize water conservation, and minimize water use. In addition, upon receiving comments from the Planning Commission, the project proposes to provide landscape irrigation infrastructure (piping, meters, etc.) to allow for the use of recycled water when this becomes available in San Carlos.

The project will be conditioned to require the installation of recycled water infrastructure for landscape irrigation.

In addition, all the planting will be low or medium water use, and per CalGreen standards, the irrigation design will have: low-water consumption, with subsurface drip irrigation for shrubs and targeted bubblers at trees (as opposed to spray irrigation that can just evaporate); weather or soil moisture based controllers (ie, watering is based on how wet the climate is, and adjusted accordingly based on local weather patterns); weather based 'smart' controllers with integral rain sensors (ie, account for local rainfall and has a separate rain sensor and adjust based on how much it rains).

Q.3: Can you provide additional information on impervious surfaces, drainage and water retention?

A: The site is currently developed and consists of mainly impervious surface. The post-development peak runoff rate will be less than or equal to the pre-development runoff rate, so there is no net impact on the existing City storm drain system. This is achieved because the project is increasing the pervious area of the site, as well as the storage provided by the ponding depth in the bioretention areas, and storage in the on-site pipe network. The current impervious area on the site is 327,769 square feet or 95 percent. The project will decrease the amount of impervious area on the site by 20 percent, so it will be reduced to 75 percent or 261,990 square feet. In addition, this results in a reduction of the peak flow rate by approximate 13% compared to the existing condition.

The project will be conditioned to meet the above requirement per the included Condition of Approval as shown below:

“To comply with the City’s policy, the applicant’s civil engineer must submit a drainage report, hydrologic study, hydraulic calculations, and drainage improvement plans. Private drainage system that pumps to the City drainage system are not allowed. Storm water shall, under no circumstances, be introduced into the sanitary sewage system, but shall be confined to surface and subsurface drainage facilities provided. Applicant must provide pre- improvement runoff and post-improvement runoff calculations. Post improvement runoff totals cannot exceed pre-improvement runoff totals.

The project will also be required to meet the Municipal Regional Permit C.3 regulations for treating stormwater runoff prior to discharging it to the City system, thereby increasing the quality of the water that flows to the local creeks and ultimately the Bay.

Q.4: What is the proposed process for environmental clean up of the site?

A: The current condition of the site is environmentally impacted due to the dumping of recycled oil in the 1950’s. The current development on the site acts as a cap, keeping the contaminants in place. The

Remediation Action Work (RAW) which the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) oversees, requires only monitoring of the site, to maintain the current condition.

Prior to site disturbance, a remediation agreement with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will be in place to direct removal and remediation of soils at the site. The agreement will specify standards and conditions with which the remediation must take place and include measures to protect the future project users, including measures such as the use of vapor barriers to protect air quality inside the buildings. This plan is specific to the expected and potential contamination at the site and will include measures to address on-site worker safety and prevent off-site migration of contaminated materials.

While the details of the remediation plan must be coordinated and approved by EPA specific to the situation, such a plan would be anticipated to include limiting access to any contaminated portions of the site and requiring appropriate worker gear and equipment cleaning in those areas, limiting actively disturbed areas and preventing dust through covering or binding of soils (with tents, tarps, foams, clean soils, etc., as appropriate), appropriate preliminary on-site risk-reduction as necessary (such as mixing with clean soils or neutral fillers, or appropriate neutralizing solutions), and methods for safe off-site transportation.

Q.5: Can you provide more information on the potential to install solar panels and generate power for the building?

A: Upon receiving feedback from the Planning Commission, the applicant is proposing to install a 10,000 square foot area with solar panels and infrastructure to generate power for the building. This area could be constructed on the garage or on top of either of the buildings. The project team will work with the city staff to determine the best location for this area to best integrate it into the design of the building and to reduce visibility from adjacent uses.

The project will be conditioned to require the installation of this solar panel area.

Q.6: Why was Commercial Street selected for pedestrian and bicycle improvements? Is Commercial Street the right street to invest in with regard to the proposed community benefit improvements?

A: Based on discussion with city staff, Commercial Street has been determined to provide the most benefit with regard to pedestrian and bicycle improvements in the project area for the following reasons:

- Commercial Street lines up directly to the southern portion of the project site. It will be just as easy for pedestrians/bicyclists to access this street as Bransten Street located at the northern portion of the site. The main project entry or paseo, leads people to Industrial Road at the center of the site and crossing Industrial Road north or south is equidistant from this point. In addition, a building entry, pocket park, bicycle parking and other amenities are located at this portion of the project site, directly adjacent to the crossing of Commercial Street. This crossing be further enhanced and made safer with the proposed crosswalk improvements.
- The Commercial Street improvements will allow for a safer, more pleasant walking experience that can't be achieved on other streets due to existing land uses (heavy industrial uses) located

on other streets. In addition, wayfinding signage can be installed in the project area to further guide and direct pedestrians and bicyclists to use Commercial Street.

- The proposed improvements will tie in directly with the Arroyo Street underpass and Old County Road improvements already constructed and will allow for the most direct access to both the downtown and Caltrain station.
- Since the proposed improvements are intended to serve the larger project area, the location of these improvements can serve pedestrians and bicyclists from the existing retail/commercial uses to the south of the project site, as well as additional new users, if sites to the south of the project site are redeveloped in accordance with the zoning for those areas.

Q.7: How does weather affect people’s use of transit and the effectiveness of the proposed TDM Measures?

A: Given the climate and topography of San Carlos, as well as the adjacency to transit and downtown amenities, weather is not considered a significant factor affecting transit use and alternative methods of transportation. The main factors influencing the effectiveness of TDM measures are proximity to transit and infrastructure that supports pedestrians and bicyclists. This has been shown by studies on the use of mass transit and the effectiveness of TDM measures in other cities with more varied topography and inclement weather. However, as part of the TDM plan, the project proposes to have umbrellas in the lobby available for use in case of rainy weather.

Q.8: Is there any plan to address the housing impact of this project (i.e. a Housing Impact Fee)?

A: The City Council has formed a Housing Subcommittee that is looking into a range of ways to address the housing needs of the community. It may include consideration of a fee that would require commercial/office development to contribute to the creation of affordable housing. If such a fee were developed, it would not apply to this project.

Q.9: How much is the applicant paying in Traffic Impact Fees?

A: The estimate is \$1.7 million. Traffic Impact Fees are required for new development projects that result in an increase in the number of trips compared to the previous use, even if the project does not result in a significant impact under CEQA.

Q.10: Are there limitations in the General Plan or General Plan EIR related to office space limits? How were the General Plan EIR Planning Areas utilized in the transportation analysis?

A: The Future Development section of the General Plan located on pages 52-53 “... quantifies the growth *that is likely to occur* under this General Plan.” [Emphasis added.] Table 3-4 projects that an additional 572,006 sf of office space *would be likely to occur* by 2030. However, projected likely development should not be interpreted as a limit on allowable total development. Development constraints are codified as FAR limits and zoning regulations. The General Plan or related rules and regulations do not state that office development should be limited to a certain amount. Conversely, a General Plan may allow dramatically more development than would be anticipated to actually occur, because only some portion of already-developed sites would move forward with redevelopment in the time frame of a

General Plan. It would not be reasonable or useful to assume the entire City would be developed or redeveloped to the maximum allowed development intensities. Instead, the General Plan provides an overall picture of the development that is likely to occur.

Even if the projections included within Table 3-4 were interpreted as a cap to office development, there is sufficient capacity to allow the Meridian 25 development. The table projects 572,006 sf of office space, while the project would add a net of 460,480 sf (528,520 proposed – 68,040 existing). Therefore, there is 111,526 sf of capacity remaining.

Regardless of what would be *allowed* under the General Plan, a reasonable assumption of *likely development* is made to determine what to analyze in the associated EIR. It is possible that an EIR could reach the point where constructed/approved development maxes out the total level of development analyzed under the EIR and that new projects would no longer be within the impacts analyzed in the General Plan EIR analyses. In that case, cumulative analyses for that project would account for both full development assumed under the General Plan plus the Project separately.

A General Plan, as opposed to a proposed project, is intended to be general, or to use a CEQA term for the related analyses, programmatic. Unless specified as conditions or mitigation, assumptions related to specifics of development in a General Plan EIR are not intended to be proscriptive, because it is recognized that the specific details of projects that will occur over the next 20+ years are not and cannot be reasonably known. Instead, for any particular project moving forward under a General Plan, an assessment is made whether the project being proposed (along with the other projects that have been constructed or approved) could be reasonably determined to fall within the scope of impacts analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Such an assessment was made for the proposed project as detailed where relevant throughout the IS/MND. Additionally, the IS/MND, being completed on a less general level than the General Plan analysis, considered whether the specific details of the project could result in additional impacts and mitigation, including consideration of additional intersections, contaminants on the site, and the safety of the project access.

The project is located in Planning Area 7 of the General Plan and EIR. Planning Area boundaries were drawn based on where different development characters and rules would occur, and not based on areas that would affect shared impacts. The traffic analysis has referenced Planning Areas 7, 8, and 9, which are the non-residential Planning Areas along Industrial Road south of Holly Street. These three Planning Areas are referenced in the context of the traffic study because the employment-generating uses from these areas (mostly office and light industrial) would be expected to have similar traffic patterns and contribute together to impacts at nearby intersections. Commercial (retail) development would also contribute to impacts, but the traffic patterns of these trips would be different than those for office and light industrial, so are treated differently in the traffic model. The likely development in these areas that was analyzed under the General Plan is detailed in the table below:

Land Use	Area (ksf)*	Daily Trips	AM Trips	PM Trips
Area 7				
Commercial (Retail)	317	13,532	315	1,176
Office	223	2,457	346	332
Light Industrial	428	2,982	394	415
Subtotal	967	18,971	1,055	1,923
Office & Light Industrial (subportion)	651	5,439	740	747
Area 8				
Office	3	37	5	5
Light Industrial	53	371	49	32
Office & Light Industrial (subportion)	57	408	54	37
Area 9				
Commercial (Retail)	86	3,676	86	319
Office	60	657	93	89
Light Industrial	181	1,264	167	176
Subtotal	327	5,597	346	584
Office & Light Industrial (subportion)	241	1,921	260	265
Total of Areas 7, 8 and 9				
Commercial (Retail)	403	17,208	401	1,495
Office	286	3,151	444	426
Light Industrial	662	4,617	610	623
Subtotal	1351	24,976	1,455	2,544
Office & Light Industrial (subportion)	948	7,768	1,054	1,049
Meridian 25 Project	529	2,017	492	364

* Ksf stands for thousand square feet

As shown in the above table, 967,000 sf of development was considered likely in Planning Area 7, 651,000 sf of which was assumed to be employ-generating use with similar trip distributions (office and light industrial). This is more square-footage and more trips than would occur from the proposed project. Looking at all three planning areas that would be contributing trips to the same portion of the circulation system, development was considered likely to total 1,351,000 sf, with the office/light industrial portion totaling 948,000 sf. Again, the project would be within the area and trips assumed from these areas. While the assumptions related to the specific distribution of office vs. light industrial space does not accurately describe the project, this distinction makes no difference from the perspective of the impact of trips, and it can be concluded that the scope of impacts analyzed includes the level of development currently proposed.

To summarize, the fact that the project was not specifically identified as likely development under the General Plan EIR does not innately create a conflict with allowable development or result in greater intensity of impacts. As demonstrated above, the project would be within the overall intensity of development/impacts identified in the General Plan EIR and would fall within the scope of that analysis.

Q.11: How many projects over the last twenty years have exceeded the zoned height limit and by how much?

A: The projects that exceeded the height allowed in the base zoning were all approved with a Planned Development Plan.

Project	Approved Building Height	Parapet Height	Allowed height in base Zoning District (at time of approval)
1001 Laurel Street	53' (roof height)	N/A	50' (CS-H, CP, R-4)
PAMF	68'	82'	75' (M-1)
Wheeler	54'-3" 60' to tower (Used height exceptions allowed in Municipal Code.)	N/A	50' (MU-DC)
Circle Star	70'	66'	50'(PM)
959 Skyway	50'	55'	50' (M-2)
PACHAC Walnut Bldg.	52' (tower roof)	48'	50' (CR-H Surrounding District)

Q.12: Why is the dirt haul proposed to start at 7 am? How would the schedule differ if the dirt haul started after the morning commute?

A: The project proposes off-hauling hours from 7 am to 4 pm during the weekdays. This amount of time is considered a way to optimize these activities during the day, while avoiding the PM peak traffic hour and minimizing the overall duration of time that off-hauling takes place in order to construct the project. In addition, the off-hauling route will avoid the Holly Street interchange and sensitive residential uses in San Carlos.

With the proposed hours, off-hauling is anticipated to last a total of 4 months. If the number of hours are decreased (limiting time from 9 am to 4 pm) the overall duration of time will increase by 23 days, extending the overall time period to almost 5 months

	Trucks Per Day	Hours Per Day	Trucks Per Hour	Days of Excavation	Total Duration
Weekday 7am-4 pm Hours	78	9	8.7	80	4 months
Weekday 9 am-4pm hours	60.9	7	8.7	103	5 months

Q.13: How many shuttles serve the San Carlos Caltrain Station and where do they pick up and drop off?

A: Four public, commuter shuttles serve the San Carlos Caltrain Station. All four transport passengers to and from businesses on the east side of Highway 101. Two of these shuttle pick up and drop off passengers on Old County Road, adjacent to the Caltrain Station. The other two pick up and drop off in the Caltrain parking lot along El Camino Real, on the west side of the Caltrain Station. There is also a private shuttle, serving Palo Alto Medical Foundation patients and employees, which picks up and drops off passengers in the Caltrain parking lot along El Camino Real.

Beginning in September 2016, a fifth public, commuter shuttle will begin operating. It will serve businesses clustered in northeast San Carlos, along Industrial Road, including the Palo Alto Medical Foundation. This new shuttle will pick up and drop off in the Caltrain parking lot along El Camino Real, on the west side of the Caltrain Station.

Q.14: Are shuttles restricted as to where they can pick up and drop off, and the route they can take?

A: Yes. Only four shuttles are allowed to pick up and drop off on Old County Road, adjacent to the Caltrain Station. This was codified in San Carlos City Council Resolution 2014-044. The shuttles that are allowed to pick up and drop off on Old County Road are: the Electronic Arts Shuttle, the Oracle Shuttle, The Redwood Shores (Clipper) Shuttle, and the Redwood Shores Twin Dolphin Area Shuttle. However, because of the reduced shuttle space available on Old County Road after the East Side Connect street redesign, only two shuttles routes are currently picking up and dropping off on Old County Road. The other two, like any shuttles created after Resolution 2014-044 was adopted by the City Council on May 12, 2014, pick up and drop off in the Caltrain parking lot along El Camino Real on the west side of the Caltrain Station.

Additionally, public shuttle routes, like most of those serving commuters at the San Carlos Caltrain Station, must receive a letter of concurrence from the San Mateo County Transit District prior to commencing operations. This letter serves to guarantee that the proposed route does not overlap with existing bus service or double-up service to a given area without demonstrated need for additional capacity.

Q.15: Has the City studied the impact of the project on water, storm drains and sewer services?

Utilities were considered as part of the project application and environmental review (page 53 of the IS/MND). Utility plans were prepared by professional civil engineers and reviewed by the City's Public Works department. Supporting technical materials include an analysis of the water supply by Cal Water, hydrological calculations as part of the Stormwater Control Plan, and a sewer main capacity analysis. While the project would increase demand for utilities, this demand could be accommodated with the project and related planned improvements.

Q.16: Has the City considered the impact of CO₂ emissions?

Yes. Greenhouse gas emissions (which include CO₂) were assessed as part of the environmental analysis on pages 30 through 31 of the IS/MND with technical documentation in Attachment A, including modeling using the CalEEMod emission model as recommended by the Air District. The Air District recommends comparison of large projects against an efficiency threshold to determine whether projected emission levels would support greenhouse gas reduction efforts or result in significant impacts. Greenhouse gas impacts are considered an innately regional and cumulative issue and the consideration and analysis of greenhouse gas emissions addresses the cumulative condition. The modeling performed for the project would be considered conservative, because it assumed only the minimum required building energy, water, and waste efficiency, and only partial effectiveness of the required TDM trip reduction (at 10.9% compared to the required 20%). Even so, project emissions would be within efficiency levels determined by the Air District to support regional greenhouse gas reduction efforts.

Additionally, San Carlos City Council adopted the City's Climate Action Plan in 2009 that includes measures to reduce greenhouse gas emission within the City to meet reduction goals. While not all measures apply to the project (some are related to City operations or initiatives and some to residential or other types of development), the project supports applicable measures through energy and waste reduction, and infill/higher density development near transit including improvement of bicycling and walking connections to transit. Consistency with the City's Climate Action Plan is discussed in more detail on page 32 of the IS/MND

Q.17: What was the vacancy rate at the site in October 2015 when the traffic counts were conducted and what types and intensity of uses currently exist on the site?

A: The vacancy rate was 8 percent and consisted of a wide mix of uses, including retail, fitness, office, industrial and commercial service uses. Some of these uses included retail/service that included the sale and installation of building materials. As a result, these uses resulted in frequent company vehicle trips for service calls, in addition to trips from retail customers. In anticipation of developing the project, many of the tenants have opted to relocate and the current vacancy rate is 40 percent.

Q.18: How was the trip credit for the property's existing use calculated?

A: Trip rates for the existing building spaces at the site were calculated based on industry-standard trip rates -- specifically data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, or ITE, which are used in the vast majority of environmental analyses. ITE data, resulting from monitoring of multiple spaces of the same types of use, are considered representative of the anticipated likely trip generation of such building space. Conversely, especially with vacancies on the site because of the current proposal to remove those buildings, counts of existing traffic would not be considered representative of the condition that would occur were the project to be rejected and the existing spaces to be fully utilized.

To summarize, utilizing ITE rates for the trip credit for the property's existing building space accurately reflects the likely trip generation that would occur at the site if the project were not to be approved.

This approach for environmental analysis is consistent with the current recommendations under CEQA and relevant case law including North County Advocates v. City of Carlsbad 241 Cal.App.4th 94 (2015).

The following discussion further addresses the question of whether the specific ITE rates that were utilized appropriately characterize the reality of the use of the building space. Based on current (and when vacant, previous) usage of the building space, the types of uses were generally characterized as follows:

Type of Use	Building Area (in ksf, which stands for thousand square feet)
Light Industrial	31.837 ksf
Fitness	5.165 ksf
Office	68.040 ksf
Shopping	29.145 ksf

The first three uses above are relatively straightforward, and won't be further discussed here. The questions have focused on the shopping use specifically. The ITE trip rate used for the shopping spaces was the one titled "Shopping Center." ITE includes numerous different rates for retail uses, some of which are more general and some of which are more specific as to the type of retail. "Shopping Center" is one of the general rates. A general "center" rate is used in two circumstances: 1) when multiple types of retail occur on the same site with shared vehicle access and parking, and/or 2) when a retail use does not otherwise fall under a more specific retail use. As described in ITE for the "Shopping Center" use:

"Shopping centers, including neighborhood centers, community centers, regional centers, and super regional centers were surveyed for this land use. Some of these centers contained non-merchandising facilities, such as office buildings, movie theaters, restaurants, post offices, banks, health clubs, and recreational facilities (for example, ice skating rinks or indoor miniature golf courses). The centers ranged in size from 1,700 to 2.2 million square feet gross leasable area."

As described above, the project site would be considered a "center" because it has shared vehicle access and parking, and the "Shopping Center" use is general enough to encompass the past, current, and potential future retail uses at this site.

More specific retail uses generally have higher ITE trip rates. To respond to how the analysis may have differed if the ITE rates for more specific retail uses were assigned to the existing spaces, the following comparison is provided. The retail uses at the site currently or previously included "Ina", which can be most closely represented by the ITE use "Arts and Craft Store," and "My Race Car Parts," which can be most closely represented by the ITE use "Automobile Parts Sales." The previous BlueSky Outdoor use does not fit well with any specific ITE Use, so the general "Shopping Center" rate was retained for this space. (It should also be pointed out that BlueSky Outdoor was a previous use and the space they occupied is currently vacant and could house an unknown tenant/specific use if leased in the future. This is further argument for the appropriateness of the general "Shopping Center" rate.) Some of this space had been previously utilized for various small tile/stone/flooring, or plumbing supply stores, which

would most closely be represented by the ITE rates for “Building Materials/Lumber” which has a PM trip rate of 4.49, which is also higher than that for “Shopping Center.”

ITE Use	Building Space (ksf)	PM Peak Trip Rate (per ksf)	PM Peak Trips (vehicle trips)
<u>As Calculated in the MND</u>			
Shopping Center	29.1	3.71	109
<u>Alternate Trip Rates (More Specific Retail Uses Where Available)</u>			
Shopping Center	19	3.71	70
Automobile Parts Sales	7	5.98	42
Arts and Crafts Store	3.1	6.21	19
Total Shopping Uses	29.1		131

As has been demonstrated in the table above, while “Shopping Center” is a general use, the use of more specific retail use trip rates would have likely resulted in a higher estimation of vehicle trips for the existing buildings at the site.

As discussed and demonstrated in this response, the use of the “Shopping Center” ITE trip rate is appropriate under CEQA; is accurate to characterize the site and type of uses that were, are, or would be expected to be located on the site; and that the use of this rate in particular results in a conservative (on the low end) estimation of the trip credits for the existing buildings.

Q.19: Has anyone studied the impact the project will have on emergency services response times? Will project traffic interfere with emergency services trying to get to accidents or fires from Station 13?

Emergency vehicles utilize sirens and the ability to change or drive through red lights and/or use opposite direction vehicle lanes or median/shoulder areas for passing traffic and do not experience traffic delays as non-emergency vehicles would. That being said, even for normal traffic, the project would not significantly increase vehicle delay at area intersections.

From a CEQA perspective, impacts to emergency services could occur if vehicle access to the project site would interfere with access to an emergency station site. The project is not located proximate to the closest emergency services stations such that activities at and around the project site could affect operation at an emergency services station site including the referenced Station 13 on Laurel Street. Impacts to emergency services could also be determined to occur if the project site does not provide safe or adequate access to emergency vehicles. Site access was assessed and determined to be adequate (page 46 of the IS/MND). Finally, if the proposed development could not be served by existing emergency services facilities and would require construction of additional emergency services facilities, the impact of those new facilities would need to be considered. The proposed project is within the existing service area and would not require the construction of new emergency services facilities (page 42 of the IS/MND).

Q.20: Will project vehicle or pedestrian traffic impact the Greater East San Carlos neighborhood?

The Greater East San Carlos neighborhood is adjacent to the Caltrain station and concerns have been expressed that project workers will use neighborhood streets to go between the project site and the Caltrain station.

Project vehicles would not generally be expected to drive between the project site and the Caltrain station. While there could arguably be some vehicles that could pick up or drop off coworkers at the Caltrain station, and there is no physical barrier or regulations preventing vehicles from utilizing neighborhood streets for such trips, the number of trips would not be expected to be of such a substantial level to significantly impact neighborhood streets or intersections from an environmental (as opposed to social) perspective.

The applicant has agreed to fund pedestrian and bicycle improvements to Commercial Street and Old County Road to provide a safe and continuous connection to the Caltrain station to provide an attractive route to the Caltrain station for project workers. That being said, there are no physical barriers or regulations preventing pedestrian or bicyclist use of neighborhood streets. However, there would be no potential for environmental impacts (as opposed to social concerns) associated with such use of public streets.