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1 Introduction
This document is the Final Negative Declaration (ND) prepared for the proposed San Mateo Setout Track Project in the City of San Mateo, San Mateo County, California. An Initial Study (IS) supporting a proposed ND was prepared for the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) is the CEQA lead agency for the proposed project.

The new setout track would be used to store track maintenance equipment and would be positioned to the west of the existing mainline tracks, extending approximately 1,000 feet. The northern limit of the setout track would be 10th Avenue, and it would extend to 200 feet from 14th Avenue. This proposed project would also include a gravel access road from 11th Avenue to 14th Avenue, fencing, utility relocations, drainage modifications and tree trimming. The proposed project would be built on the existing Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) right-of-way. No railroad track reconfiguration is associated with the proposed project with the exception of the turnout (connection) to southbound mainline (MT2) tracks.

2 Organization of the Final ND
This Final ND contains the following sections:

- Section 1 Introduction, including a summary of the project purpose and need
- Section 2 Organization of the Final ND
- Section 3 Process and Regulations
- Section 4 Findings and Determination
- Attachment A Notice of Availability–Notice of Intent / Newspaper Proof
- Attachment B March 2018 Final Initial Study

3 Process and Regulations
Section 15073 of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a lead agency shall provide a public review period for a proposed ND pursuant to Section 15105(a) of not less than 20 days when not submitted to the State Clearinghouse. The Draft IS/ND for the San Mateo Setout Track Project was circulated for public review and comment for 20 days (January 29 to February 19, 2018).

A Notice of Availability (NOA) and Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration (NOI) was sent to the San Mateo County Clerk, and was published in the San Jose Mercury News on January 29, 2018. The NOA–NOI and newspaper proof are provided in Attachment A.

The JPB received no comment letters from organized groups, individuals, or state or local agencies. The Final IS is included in Attachment B.

The Final ND has been prepared pursuant to requirements of CEQA, Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et al, and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et al.
4 Findings and Determination

As lead agency for compliance with CEQA requirements, the JPB finds that the proposed project would not cause a significant adverse impact on the environment. This finding is based on the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Section 15064 (Determining the Significance of Environmental Effects), Section 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and Section 15070 (Decision to Prepare a Negative or Mitigated Negative Declaration), as well as on the results of the Final Initial Study prepared for the project, included in Attachment B.

On the basis of this evaluation, the JPB concludes:

- The proposed project would not 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- The proposed project would not achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- The proposed project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- The proposed project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
- No substantial evidence exists to demonstrate that the proposed project would have a substantive negative effect on the environment.
Attachment A: Notice of Availability–Notice of Intent
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Notice of Availability and Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

Project Title: San Mateo Setout Track

Location: City of San Mateo, San Mateo County, California

APN: 035200999

Contact Person/Phone Number: Hilda Lafebre, Manager, Capital Projects & Environmental Planning/ (650) 622-7842

Review Period: January 29, 2018 to February 19, 2018

Project Description: The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), which operates the San Francisco Bay Area’s Caltrain passenger rail service, proposes to install a setout track for temporary staging of track maintenance equipment in the City of San Mateo. The new setout track would be positioned to the west of the existing mainline tracks and extend from about 10th Avenue to about 14th Avenue. The project would also include the construction of a gravel access road within this corridor. The project would be built entirely within the existing railroad right-of-way. The purpose of the proposed setout track is to improve the efficiency of maintenance operations by providing a location for equipment to be temporarily staged near the location where work is scheduled. Project construction will take place in Summer 2018 and last for 4 months.

Negative Declaration: In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA guidelines, the JPB prepared a Draft Initial Study/ Negative Declaration (IS/ND) for the San Mateo Setout Track. Based on the Initial Study, staff determined that the project could not have a significant impact on the environment as noted in the IS/ND.

Public Comment Period: January 29, 2018 to February 19, 2018. The public and all affected agencies are hereby invited to review the IS/ND and submit written comments. The Draft IS/ND is available for review at the offices of the San Mateo County Transit District, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070. Comments are due February 19, 2018 and should be sent to Hilda Lafebre, Caltrain, P.O. Box 3006, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306 or lafebreh@samtrans.com.
**Arthritis or Joint Pain?**

If you have any of these symptoms, YOU NEED TO ATTEND THIS EVENT

- Neck or Shoulder Pain
- Elbow, Hand or Wrist Pain
- Lower Back or Hip Pain
- Knee Pain
- Foot Pain or Ankle Pain
- Torn Cartilage
- "Bone-on-Bone"

**Treat Arthritis Naturally**

**FOR THOSE WHO ATTEND THE SEMINAR: Receive a free copy of Dr. Coye's Book: "How to Reclaim Your Health and Longevity..." ($19.89 Value) Limited Quantity**

**Summary**

- Learn about the latest non-surgical, drug-free treatments for arthritis and joint pain.
- Understand the importance of early intervention to avoid surgery or long-term pain.
- Discover natural solutions for arthritis and joint pain that don’t involve prescription medications.

**Details**

**FREE Educational Seminar & Lunch**

**"Regenerative Medicine" The Latest Non-Surgical, Non-Drug Solution for Arthritis, Joint Pain, Neuropathy and Other Chronic Health Problems...**

**SCHOOLS**

**Los Gatos Union School district first held vote on Monday**

By Judy Paterson

The Los Gatos Union School District board of trustees has decided to terminate its contract with Assistant Superintendent Abbati, and unannounced and unheralded, paid the 90-day administrative leave.

After that, Abbati is no longer an employee and gets no further notices, through her contract specifies that she does not have a severance package or significant more years.

The school district, in an interview with the Los Gatos Elementary Teachers Association, said it was not an easy decision.

Many employees said they were concerned about the impact of the contract's expiration and the available parking space for teachers.

The school district said it was not an easy decision.

Abbati's contract was due to expire June 30. Her 2014 pay, board president Peter Abbati, and unanimously voted to place her on a paid suspension.

After the vote was "the culmination of Abbati's leadership," the board said it was not an easy decision.

Abbati, 60, said in an email that she would continue to be the principal at Los Gatos Elementary School for two years, followed by a period of time working with the teachers.

The decision was made following a vote by the teachers at the school district.

Abbati's tenure as principal has been marked by her "history of un-collaborative behavior."

The teachers voted to "no confidence" in Abbati, and unanimously voted to place her on a paid suspension.

The board's statement said it was not an easy decision.

Abbati said she was disappointed in the board's decision and will not return to the district.

The next step will be for the district to begin the search process for a new superintendent for the 2018-19 school year.

The board is continuing its search for a new superintendent.

The district said it was not an easy decision.

In the meantime, the district is working to provide input to the state department of education on the search process for a new superintendent.

As in the past, the state department of education will have the opportunity to provide input to the search process.

**SCHOOLS**

**A board statement said it was not an easy decision.**

The Latest Non-Surgical, Non-Drug Solution for Arthritis, Joint Pain, Neuropathy and Other Chronic Health Problems...
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PART I  ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: San Mateo Setout Track

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Hilda Lafebre, Manager, Capital Projects & Environmental Planning (650) 622-7842

4. Project Location City of San Mateo, San Mateo County, California

5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
   1250 San Carlos Ave.
   San Carlos, CA 94070-1306

6. General Plan Land Use Designations: Transportation Corridor¹

7. Zoning: Transportation Corridor²

8. Description of Project:
The San Mateo Setout Track project (or proposed project) would be located in the City of San Mateo, in San Mateo County, California (Figure 1). The new setout track would be used to store track maintenance equipment and would be positioned to the west of the existing mainline tracks, extending approximately 1,000 feet. The northern limit of the setout track would be 10th Avenue, and it would extend to 200 feet from 14th Avenue. This proposed project would also include a gravel access road from 11th Avenue to 14th Avenue, fencing, utility relocations, drainage modifications and tree trimming. The proposed project would be built on the existing Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) right-of-way.

No railroad track reconfiguration is associated with the proposed project with the exception of the turnout (connection) to southbound mainline (MT2) tracks. A plan sheet for the proposed project is provided in Figure 2.

Proposed Project Area
The proposed project area would be located in an urban environment in the City of San Mateo, restricted to the existing active railroad right-of-way. Land uses immediately east of the railroad right-of-way include commercial, manufacturing, and residential. Land uses to the west of the right-of-way are residential. The existing right-of-way contains two mainline tracks.

¹ https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/DocumentCenter/View/7206
² https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/578
For the analysis of potential environmental impacts, the proposed project area is generally defined as the western side of the 100-foot right-of-way, as shown in Figure 1.

Construction Staging

Construction of the proposed project is estimated to take approximately 4 months and is anticipated to begin in summer 2018. Construction work elements would include tree trimming; relocating utilities; grading; and installing the setout track, fences and gates, and a gravel access road. Access to the right-of-way by all vehicles and equipment would be limited to the southern end of the project area from Railroad Avenue between 11th and 14th Avenues.

The project is currently in preliminary design. If, based on final design, it is determined that construction could affect existing trees within or near the right-of-way, pre-construction surveys would be undertaken for nesting birds, and construction controls would be implemented to protect birds during nesting season. Tree protection zones would be established around trees to be retained.

Purpose and Need

JPB has completed operational analyses that indicate the need for the setout track south of the interlocking CP Palm in San Mateo, CA. The purpose of the proposed project is to create a storage space for track maintenance equipment, including hi-rail trucks of various sizes, tampers, regulators, stabilizers, ballast cars, and flat cars. The proposed setout track would improve the efficiency of maintenance operations by providing a location for equipment to be temporarily staged near the location where work is scheduled. The setout track would likely be used approximately 1 to 2 days per week by maintenance crews.
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ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project (i.e., the project would result in at least one potentially significant impact to the resource). Please see the checklist on the following pages for additional information.

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Agriculture and Forestry  ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Cultural Resources  ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials  ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Mineral Resources  ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing  ☐ Public Services  ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic  ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources  ☐ Utilities/Service Systems
☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

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.

[Signature]
Hilda Lafebre

Date 2/28/18

Printed Name

[Signature]
Hilda Lafebre

Date 2/28/18

Initial Study
PART II EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This Initial Study (IS) uses the environmental checklist form presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The following terminology is used to evaluate the level of significance of impacts that would result from the proposed project:

- A finding of *no impact* is made when the analysis concludes that the project would not affect the particular environmental issue.

- An impact is considered *less than significant* if the analysis concludes that there would be no substantial adverse change in the environment and that no mitigation is needed.

- An impact is considered *less than significant with mitigation* if the analysis concludes that there would be no substantial adverse change in the environment with the inclusion of the mitigation measure(s) described.

- An impact is considered *significant* or *potentially significant* if the analysis concludes that there could be a substantial adverse effect on the environment.

- *Mitigation* refers to specific measures or activities adopted to avoid an impact, reduce its severity, or compensate for it.
I. AESTHETICS:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project, which is oriented roughly northwest-southeast, is located in an area of mixed land use, featuring commercial, manufacturing, and residential properties. South Railroad Avenue runs adjacent to the railroad right-of-way to the northeast, and manufacturing and light industrial facilities are located on the opposite side of the street. North of the proposed project area, at the at-grade intersection with 9th Avenue, a commercial node includes a veterinary clinic, beauty salon, martial arts studio, auto repair shop, restaurant, and plant nursery. On the southwest side of the railroad right-of-way, residential buildings with back yards abut the railroad right-of-way between 9th Avenue and 10th Avenue. South of 10th Avenue, Railroad Avenue runs immediately parallel to the railroad right-of-way to Hanrahan Court. A single-story, multi-family residential building abuts the railroad right-of-way between Hanrahan Court and 12th Avenue. Railroad Avenue continues immediately parallel to the railroad right-of-way from 12th Avenue to 14th Avenue.

Vegetation in the proposed project area is primarily landscaping. Trees and fences at the perimeter of the railroad right-of-way create a screen for some homes on the western side of the rail right-of-way. The topography is consistently flat. The area consists of a loose grid network of streets with a majority of single-family, one-story homes on small lots and pockets of office/industrial areas and commercial corridors. Figure 2 and Figure 3 provide representative views of the project area.
Figure 2. Railroad Right-Of-Way, Showing Tree Screen Abutting Backyards along Western Border

Figure 3. View South Along Railroad Avenue from 10th Avenue, West of the Railroad Right-Of-Way
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Existing views in the study area are dominated by commercial and residential buildings, the existing railroad right-of-way, the at-grade crossing at 9th Avenue, and other roadways. The proposed project would not occur in the vicinity of scenic vistas; therefore, it would have no impact on scenic vistas.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

The proposed project would not be located in proximity to a state scenic highway. The railroad was present prior to the construction of the residential uses, and the addition of a setout track within the existing railroad right-of-way would not result in any damage to those uses. Isolated trees in the existing railroad right-of-way could be trimmed, but such work would not substantially damage the aesthetic values of the area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The proposed project would not result any significant, long-term change in the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because it would be located within the existing railroad right-of-way. The new setout track would be consistent with the existing character and appearance of the railroad. The 1,000 feet of new track and occasional storage of maintenance equipment would not substantially change the visual character of the right-of-way; therefore, the overall long-term impact would be less than significant on the existing visual character.

Temporary impacts on visual character would occur as a result of construction activity and views of construction equipment. Once construction is complete, construction equipment would be removed. Overall, visual character and quality would not be “substantially degraded” because of the temporary nature of construction in any one area and the highly urbanized character of the proposed project setting. Therefore, temporary impacts be less than significant.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Construction of an additional track could require new ground-level signals. The minimal lighting associated with railroad signals would not result in glare or a noticeable change in nighttime or daytime views in the area because of the large number of human-made light sources already present the proposed project area. Night construction that would entail the temporary use of lights would be limited to a minimal amount of track work that cannot be completed during active rail service. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

3 http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

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?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☒ No Impact

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☒ No Impact

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☒ No Impact

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☒ No Impact

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
- ☒ No Impact

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?

The proposed project area and the adjacent land is currently not used for agriculture; consequently, the construction of the new setout track and the storage track maintenance equipment would not entail converting Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance into non-agricultural uses. According to the 2014 Important Farmland Map for San Mateo County, the land in the vicinity of the project is classified as “Urban and Built-up Land.” Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

The proposed project would not conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.5

---

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?  

Because the proposed project area is an existing railroad right-of-way and is designated for such use, it would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, any forest land or timberland. Therefore, it would have no impact.

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The proposed project area is an existing railroad right-of-way. The proposed project would not remove or convert any forest land. Therefore, it would have no impact.

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The proposed project would not involve changes that result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.
III. AIR QUALITY:

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections describe the attainment status of the project area, existing air quality monitoring data, and the meteorology of San Mateo County.

The project area is in San Mateo County where air quality is managed and monitored by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).

San Mateo County is designated as marginal nonattainment for federal and state ozone and moderate nonattainment for PM$_{2.5}$ (fine particulate matter up to 2.5 micrometers in size) standards and for state PM$_{10}$ (inhalable particulate matter from 2.5 to 10 micrometers in size) standards.\(^6\)

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Operation

The proposed project would not change operational rail service. The availability of the setout track would reduce trip lengths for maintenance equipment, which could reduce associated criteria air pollutant emissions. Diesel-powered track maintenance equipment would not idle for extended periods on the setout track, the equipment would be turned off once it is “parked” on the setout track for storage. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable local and regional air quality policies; therefore, it would have no impact.

\(^6\) [http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/select8/sc8start.php](http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/select8/sc8start.php)
Construction
The project would result in temporary emissions from equipment and fugitive dust during the 4-month construction duration; however, given the small area of construction and minor nature of construction (e.g., no major excavation), emissions would not conflict with implementation of the BAAQMD air quality plan.

In addition, Caltrain would implement the basic best management practices included in the BAAQMD Air Quality Guidelines\(^7\) to further control temporary construction emissions:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping would be prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
8. A publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints shall be posted. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

In summary, the proposed project would be consistent with the relevant local and regional construction air quality policies; therefore, there would be no impact.

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Operation
The proposed project would not increase train operations or associated emissions. Caltrain optimizes the storage of track maintenance equipment throughout the system. There would be no impact.

Construction

BAAQMD 2010 construction impact significance thresholds are as follows: 54 pounds per day of reactive organic gases, 54 pounds per day of nitrogen oxides, 82 pounds per day of PM$_{10}$ (exhaust only), or 54 pounds per day of PM$_{2.5}$ (exhaust only). Given the small area of construction and minor nature of construction, emissions of criteria air pollutants would be below applicable thresholds. Therefore, temporary construction air quality impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

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 which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Operation

See the response to item III(b). There would be no impact.

Construction

Emissions of criteria pollutants for which the area is in nonattainment (ozone, PM$_{2.5}$, and PM$_{10}$) would temporarily increase during construction; however, the magnitude of the increase would be negligible because of the limited extent of construction activities for the proposed project and the incorporation of BAAQMD-recommended basic construction best management practices. Therefore, the temporary construction impact would be less than significant.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Operation

The proposed setout track would be positioned in the southwestern portion of the rail right-of-way, slightly closer to the existing residences along South B Street and Railroad Avenue than the existing mainline tracks. Equipment emissions along the setout track would only occur during the one or two times per week when such equipment would be moved onto or off the setout track. After moving into position, equipment stored at the site would be shut down and would not emit pollutants. In addition, overall emissions along the right-of-way would be reduced relative to existing conditions with the gradual phase out of diesel Caltrain locomotives beginning in 2019. Sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations, and the impact would be less than significant.

Construction

Because of the limited extent of construction and the incorporation of construction air quality best management practices (BMPs) pursuant to BAAQMD guidance, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Operation

Operation of the proposed project track would entail emissions only when moving equipment on or off the setout track. Such emissions would be brief and would not result in substantial
objectionable odors; therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

Construction
During construction of the proposed project, diesel odors from the operation of heavy equipment would be generated in the project area. Diesel odors would be limited in both temporal and geographic extent by the number of pieces of construction equipment operating at any one time, and they would be reduced through implementation of air quality BMPs pursuant to BAAQMD guidance. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

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?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

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?

The project area was reviewed by certified biologist on January 3, 2017. The proposed project area is primarily surrounded by lands that are developed for residential and commercial uses. These areas support common plant and animal species that are adapted to the urban environment.

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

A search was conducted of the California Natural Diversity Database and the California Native Plant Society’s Rare Plant Inventory for special-status species occurrences within 5 miles of the proposed project area. Based on these searches, 18 special-status plants and 25 special-status animals occur within 5 miles of the site. However, none of the occurrences are within or adjacent to the proposed project area and the site does not have suitable habitat to support any of these special-status species. No US Fish and Wildlife Service-designated Critical Habitat exists in the proposed project area; therefore, no impact would occur.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

No riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities are present in or near the proposed project area; therefore, **no impact would occur**.

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?

No wetlands or waters under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, US Army Corps of Engineers, or the Regional Water Quality Board are present in or near the proposed project area; therefore, **no impact would occur**.

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

The proposed project would be located within the existing railroad right-of-way and would not result in the construction of any new significant barriers to wildlife movement. If, based on final design, it is determined that construction could affect existing trees within or near the right-of-way, pre-construction surveys would be undertaken for nesting birds, and construction controls would be implemented to protect birds during nesting season. The project would not substantially interfere with the movement of species, nursery sites, or corridors. **There would be no impact**.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies or ordinances, such as the City of San Mateo’s Heritage Tree Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 13.52, *Heritage Trees*). Many of the coast live oak trees in the proposed project area meet the City of San Mateo’s definition for heritage trees based on size. If necessary based on final designs, JPB would coordinate tree removal/pruning with the City of San Mateo Director of Parks and Recreation, and tree protection zones would be established around trees to be retained. **There would be no impact**. Note that as a joint powers authority, JPB is not required to obtain permits under local tree ordinances.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

The proposed project does not fall within any local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. **There would be no impact**.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

An architectural survey of structures on all parcels in proximity of the proposed project area was conducted. The field reconnaissance was accompanied by a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System for previous investigations and recorded resources. Historical background research was conducted at the San Mateo County Museum archives. No previously recorded structures or other architectural features are located within the proposed project area, and no individual structure or feature recorded appears to constitute a historical resource.

The proposed project’s direct impacts would be contained within the existing railroad right-of-way southeast of 10th Avenue, and the construction of the setout track would not result in the physical destruction of any historic resource. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impact to historic resources.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

A records search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System identified a potential archeological resource north of the project area. A visual inspection of the resource was undertaken, which confirmed its location.

During project planning, the proposed setout track was sited between 11th and 14th Avenue, which would avoid the archaeological resource. Construction access to the right-of-way by all vehicles and equipment would be limited to the southern end of the project area from Railroad Avenue between 11th and 14th Avenues, which would also avoid the resource.

No other surface indications of archaeological resources were identified within the proposed project area. The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change to known archaeological resources. Caltrain standard procedures would be followed in the event of unanticipated findings of archaeological resources, including stopping work and review of the finding by a qualified archaeologist. Therefore, there would be no impact.
c. **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

No paleontological resources are known to occur in the City of San Mateo. The proposed project site has been previously disturbed, and construction would not entail deep excavation such that paleontological resources would be encountered. There would be **no impact**.

d. **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?**

No currently or historically used cemeteries are located within the proposed project area, which has been occupied by the railroad right-of-way for more than 150 years. There would be **no impact** to human remains. Caltrain standard procedures would be followed in the event of unanticipated findings of human remains.

---
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VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

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?

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?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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?

No known active faults or Alquist-Priolo earthquake hazard zones exist in the proposed project area, and older, inactive faults present in City of San Mateo do not show signs of recent movement. The closest zoned active fault to the proposed project area is the San Andreas fault zone, approximately 3.5 miles to the southwest. Accordingly, a fault rupture in the Plan Area is not anticipated. There would be **no impact**.

ii. **Strong seismic ground shaking**?

The proposed project area is within areas identified in the 2030 City of San Mateo General Plan⁹ as susceptible to very high shaking amplification during earthquakes. The proposed project comprises a setout track to be used for maintenance storage, which would not increase the

⁹ https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/2021/2030-General-Plan
potential for exposing people or structures to seismic-related ground failure. Appropriate seismic parameters would be included in the proposed project design. There would be no impact.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

The proposed project area is in a zone designated by the 2030 City of San Mateo General Plan\(^{10}\) as having a moderate risk of liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. However, the proposed project comprises a setout track used for maintenance storage. This track would not increase the potential for exposing people or structures to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. There would be no impact.

iv. Landslides?

The proposed project area is flat and well removed from any steep slopes, and it is outside the seismic landslide hazard zones maps published by the California Geologic Survey.\(^{11}\) Therefore, there would be no impact.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Temporary soil disturbance would occur during construction of the proposed setout track; however, the proposed project construction would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. SamTrans would implement approved BMPs at all disturbed areas when construction is completed or prior to the onset of fall storms. In addition, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (issued by the Regional Water Quality Board) is required for construction projects resulting in the disturbance of 1.0 or more acres. SamTrans would be required to prepare a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) that identifies BMPs to limit soil erosion during project construction. During construction, adherence to provisions of the NPDES permit and applicable BMPs contained in the SWPPP would ensure that impacts are less than significant.

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?

The proposed project would not be located on any unstable soil or geologic units subject to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. As indicated above under VI(a)(iii), the use of a setout track for maintenance storage would not result in adverse impacts related to liquefaction i. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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?

The terrain of the proposed project area is generally flat and underlain by alluvial fan and fluvial deposits of Holocene age. The Holocene alluvial fan and fluvial deposits consist mostly of medium dense to dense, gravely sand or sandy gravel that generally grades upward to sandy or silty clay. They do not have a significant potential for shrink/swell movement. The project comprises a setout track to be used for maintenance storage, which would not entail substantial risks to life or property if located on expansive soils. Geotechnical considerations would be

\(^{10}\) ibid

\(^{11}\) http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=landslides
included in the final project design. Therefore, the proposed project would not involve significant risks related to expansive soils. There would be no impact.

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems are associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no impact would occur.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

**Operation**

The proposed project would reduce maintenance equipment trips; consequently, equipment could be stored at the proposed project location instead of being taken back to its current storage location and returned the next day; the overall emissions would be reduced from a basin-wide perspective. The proposed project would have **no impact** on greenhouse gas emissions.

**Construction**

The proposed project would result in greenhouse gas emissions during the 4-month construction period. However, temporary greenhouse gas emissions are not considered significant; the BAAQMD CEQA threshold for land use projects applies to long-term emissions only. Some of the air quality construction best practices commitments described in the air quality section (such as restrictions on idling time) would also serve to reduce construction-related greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, temporary construction emissions of greenhouse gasses would be **less than significant**.

b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The proposed project would be consistent with elements of the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan related to construction emissions (see the air quality section). Therefore, **no impact** would occur in terms of consistency with local and regional plans.

Additionally, the City of San Mateo has adopted a Sustainable Initiatives Plan that provides recommendations for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the City. The plan includes targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions below the state-mandated targets (emissions at 1990 level in 2020 and 80 percent below 1990 level in 2050). Specific policies include implementing measures to support bicycle/pedestrian mode share, increasing building energy efficiency, and reducing single-occupant vehicle trips. The proposed project would be consistent with these policies by improving track maintenance and focusing on mass transit rail infrastructure. The proposed project would also be consistent with the similar transit and bicycle/pedestrian supportive policies of 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Operation

Maintenance equipment and locomotives regularly transport small quantities of hazardous materials associated with track maintenance, such as lubrication for switches and spraying with herbicides. The proposed project would not result in any increase in the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, which would continue as under existing conditions. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Construction

The proposed project area occupies an existing railroad right-of-way. The project area’s historical and current use of rail service creates the potential for the occurrence of elevated quantities of petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and other chemicals commonly found along rail corridors, including creosote-treated wood. These types of materials are routinely addressed in construction projects through the implementation of standard BMPs in accordance with federal
and state regulations. Construction would occur entirely within the railroad right-of-way, away from public areas. There would be no impact.

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?

**Operation**

The proposed project would not create conditions that would create a significant hazard to resulting from the accidental release of hazardous material, so there would be no impact to the public or environment.

**Construction**

Small quantities of potentially toxic substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain construction equipment) would be used in the project area and transported to and from the area temporarily during construction. The construction contractor would comply with applicable federal and state laws and regulations for handling of such materials. There is no reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions that could affect the public or the environment. There would be no impact.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Six schools fall within 0.25 mile of the proposed project area (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Distance from Project Area (feet)</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+ Immersion Preschool</td>
<td>356.10</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universe of Colors</td>
<td>818.67</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnybrae Elementary School</td>
<td>868.35</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Mozart Music School</td>
<td>1,114.39</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy’s Learn and Play Daycare</td>
<td>1,156.59</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Montessori School</td>
<td>1,224.47</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other than temporary handling of potential railroad-related hazardous materials during construction, no change in hazardous materials management would occur as a result of the proposed project. Temporary construction handling of potentially contaminated materials would comply with state and federal handling requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impact associated with hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school.
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Cortese List sites occur in the project area; therefore, there would be **no impact**.

An environmental database search was conducted.\(^{12}\) No known contaminated properties are located within the project area. The search identified several automobile and manufacturing-related hazardous material sites that have been the subject of remediation near the project area. These types of contaminated sites are common in urbanized areas.

These potentially contaminated sites would continue to be considered as the project design is developed, but they do not present an unusual or significant risk to project development. There would be **no impact**.

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?

The project area is not located within the safety zone of either San Francisco International Airport\(^ {13}\) or San Carlos Airport.\(^ {14}\) Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

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?

The project area would not be located in any private airport land use or safety zone; therefore, there would be **no impact** to public safety.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Operation**

The proposed project would occur entirely within the railroad right-of-way and would not block or close streets or impede implementation of or otherwise interfere with the San Mateo County Emergency Operations Plan.\(^ {15}\) Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

**Construction**

No lane closures or detours are planned. Construction-related traffic would not affect emergency access to and in the vicinity of the proposed project area. As noted in the Transportation/Traffic section, a Traffic Management Plan would be implemented to ensure that no interference with emergency vehicles/services or response/evacuation plans occurs. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

---

\(^{12}\) EDR, 2017. Caltrain San Mateo Set-Out Track. EDR NEPASearch™ Map Report, Inquiry Number: 5010349.5s


\(^{15}\) [http://hsd.smcsheriff.com/emergency-plans](http://hsd.smcsheriff.com/emergency-plans)
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?

No designated Wildland Fire Hazards Areas\textsuperscript{16} are located in or adjacent to the proposed project area. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with wildland fires.

\textsuperscript{16} https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/2021/2030-General-Plan
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

No surface waters are located in the proposed project area. The nearest water resource is Leslie Creek, which is generally located 0.12 mile southeast of the proposed project limits and is a tributary to Seal Slough. Several underground storm drains run in the proposed project area. The proposed project would include an access roadway that would increase impervious surfaces, but not to the level that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems. Caltrain design criteria require that all designs for projects involving the creation or replacement of 5,000 square feet of impervious surface comply with Low Impact Development Design Standards contained in the MS4 permit. Adherence to these requirements, as well as implementation of standard best practices, such as implementing measures required in the SWPPP, would ensure that temporary construction water quality impacts would be **less than significant**.
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)?

The proposed project would not use groundwater supplies, and it would not result in substantial new impervious surfaces that would interfere with groundwater recharge. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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 which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

The proposed project would occur entirely within the existing railroad right-of-way and would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or affect the course of any waterbody in a manner that would result in substantial erosion either on- or off-site. Therefore, there would be 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?

As indicated in the above response, the proposed project would not substantially affect the existing drainage pattern of the project area; therefore, there would be no impact.

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?

The proposed project would include an access roadway that would increase impervious surfaces, but not to the level that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems. Caltrain design criteria require that all designs for projects involving the creation or replacement of 5,000 square feet of impervious surface comply with Low Impact Development Design Standards contained in the MS4 permit. There would be no impact.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

As indicated above, implementation of standard BMPs, such as those required in the SWPPP, would ensure that construction would not violate quarterly quality standards, and the project would not result in substantial new impervious surfaces that would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater systems. The project would not otherwise degrade water quality. There would be no impact.

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?

No housing structures are planned as part of the proposed project; therefore, there would be no impact.
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

The proposed project area is not located within the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s 100-year floodplain;\textsuperscript{17} therefore, there would be no impact.

i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

The proposed project area is not located in the inundation area of any levee or dam. Therefore, there would be no impact.

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

San Francisco Bay is vulnerable to tsunami or seiche by its connection to the Pacific Ocean at the Golden Gate Bridge; however, it is estimated that such a wave would decay by the time it reached the portion of the San Francisco Bay near the proposed project area, which is located outside the predicted flooding inundation areas for a tsunami;\textsuperscript{18,19} therefore, there would be no impact.

\textsuperscript{17} https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=9th%20avenue%2C%20san%20mateo%2C%20ca#searchresultsanchor

\textsuperscript{18} http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geologic_hazards/Tsunami/Inundation_Maps/SanMateo/Documents/Tsunami_Inundation_SanMateo_Quad_SanMateo.pdf

\textsuperscript{19} http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geologic_hazards/Tsunami/Inundation_Maps/SanMateo/Documents/Tsunami_Inundation_SanMateo_Quad_SanMateo.pdf
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **Physically divide an established community?**

The proposed project would be located within the existing railroad right-of-way. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any residential or business displacements or changes in access or use of nearby properties that could divide the community. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

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?**

The proposed project would maintain all existing land uses, and the setout track would be located within the existing railroad right-of-way. The right-of-way is designated as a Transportation Corridor in the San Mateo General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with land use plans, and there would be **no impact**.

c. **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans are applicable to the proposed project area. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

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?

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?

and

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?

No known mineral resources occur in the proposed project area. The California Division of Mines and Geology has classified the area as MRZ1—areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence\(^{20,21}\). Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

---


\(^{21}\) ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR_96-03/OFR_96-03_Text.pdf
## XII. NOISE:

Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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?

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?

The setout track would be located within the active rail corridor, which is subject to regular noise of passing trains. Operation of the project would contribute minor additional noise and vibration one or two times per week when trains are moved on and off the setout track, which would not substantially affect daily noise levels. Construction of the project would temporarily generate noise. Although construction of the proposed project would be noticeable during brief periods over the 4-month construction duration, and would cause some temporary annoyance, construction noise would not exceed applicable thresholds. Overall, noise impacts would be **less than significant**. Further detail is available below.

The following noise descriptors are adopted for the computation and assessment of transit noise in this document:

- **The hourly equivalent sound level (Leq (h))** describes a receiver's cumulative noise exposure from all events over a 1-hour period. For assessment, Leq is computed for the loudest transit facility hour during the hours of noise-sensitive activity.

- **The day-night sound level (Ldn)** describes a receiver’s cumulative noise exposure from all events over a full 24 hours, with events between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. increased by 10 decibels to account for greater nighttime sensitivity to noise. Ldn is computed to assess transit noise for residential land uses.

- **The maximum sound level (Lmax)** describes the maximum A-weighted noise level during the measurement period.

Train activity and traffic on main highways and major arterials nearby are the major contributors to the noise environment near the proposed project area. Residential land use is adjacent to the west project boundary, while a mix of residential and commercial uses (largely auto repair
businesses) occupy property east of the mainline tracks, approximately 100 feet from the proposed construction activity.

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?

Criteria
According to the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project can result in significant adverse impacts. For the proposed project, a “substantial” temporary increase in noise levels was considered to occur if:

- Major construction noise sources (such as pile drivers) are operated during times when construction is prohibited by the City of San Mateo’s construction noise code (which limits hours of construction to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. weekdays), or
- Construction is inconsistent with Section 14-8.02, Noise Control, of Caltrans standard specifications, which include not exceeding 86 A-weighted decibel (dBA) at 50 feet from the job site activities from 9:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. and using appropriate mufflers on construction equipment.

Operation
The proposed project would not increase the number of mainline trains per day or mainline train speed. The new setout track would be used 1 or 2 days per week for equipment storage. Given the infrequent usage of the setout track relative to the existing noise sources in an urbanized environment, the impact would be less than significant.

Construction
Construction noise levels are regulated by Section 7.30.060, Special Provisions, in the San Mateo Municipal Code. Construction, alteration, repair or land development activities that are authorized by a valid city permit are allowed on weekdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., on Saturdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., and on Sundays and holidays between the hours of noon and 4:00 p.m., or at such other hours as may be authorized or restricted by the permit, if they meet at least one of the following noise limitations:

1. No individual piece of equipment shall produce a noise level exceeding 90 decibels at a distance of 25 feet. If the device is housed within a structure or trailer on the property, the measurement shall be made outside the structure at a distance as close to 25 feet from the equipment as possible.

2. The noise level at any point outside the property plane of the project shall not exceed 90 decibels.

Construction of the proposed project is estimated to take approximately 4 months and is anticipated to begin in summer 2018. Construction work elements would include tree-trimming; utility relocations; grading; and installation of the setout track, fences and gates, and gravel access road.
Construction noise was assessed using the Federal Highway Administration’s Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM). Input variables used in the RCNM include:

- Equipment acoustic usage factors (provided by the construction equipment database): percentage of time during a construction noise operation that a piece of construction equipment is operating at full power,

- Number of pieces of equipment used concurrently, and

- Distances to nearby noise sensitive receptors.

It is expected that the noisiest construction activities for the proposed project would involve excavation and grading and the installation of heavy rail infrastructure using a crane. (No pile driving would be necessary for construction of the proposed project.) Other activities—such as mobilizing for construction, relocation of fences and utilities, and demobilization—require only few pieces of equipment and are expected to be far less noisy. The construction schedule may include tasks that overlap, creating conditions during which equipment from one task is being used concurrently with equipment for another task. In these instances, the noise from all equipment expected to be on the site was modeled. Modeling results were recorded for the worst construction scenario where concurrent tasks overlapped within the same week. The worst-case scenario selected is the construction period where the following equipment would be used simultaneously: excavator, crane, dump truck, generator, and welder.

These pieces of equipment were modeled at distances ranging from 25 feet to 40 feet from the residential receptors adjacent to the proposed project area. At these distances, the RCNM predicts noise levels of 86.3 dBA Leq at the nearest residential receptors. This conservative noise level estimate assumes that all the equipment would be in operation at the same time, which is unlikely. Noise levels from individual pieces of equipment would range from the mid-70s to the low 80s dBA Leq.

The RCNM was also run to determine whether any single piece of equipment would exceed the City of San Mateo thresholds outlined above. Noise levels from individual pieces of equipment would range from the mid-70s to the low 80s dBA Leq. No individual piece of equipment would exceed 90 dBA Leq at a distance of 25 feet.

Typically, some portion of track work will need to be conducted at night for safety and track operation considerations. According to Caltrain standard procedures, residents of the affected area would be notified in advance of any potential nighttime work requirements. Although construction of the proposed project would be noticeable during brief periods over the 4-month construction duration, and would cause some temporary annoyance, the impacts would be less than significant.

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Construction of the proposed project would not require pile driving, blasting, or any other similar high-vibration activities. Upon completion of construction, the new setout track would be used 1 or 2 days per week for equipment storage. The proposed project would not increase the number of mainline trains per day or mainline train speed. Therefore, vibration caused by the project would be less than significant.
c. **A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

The proposed project involves the addition of a new siding track and would not increase the number of mainline trains per day or train speed. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less than significant impact** on the ambient noise levels in the proposed project area.

d. **A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

As indicated under topic (a), above, temporary construction noise impacts would be **less than significant**.

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?**

The proposed project is not located within any of the San Mateo County airport land use plans. It would not add any new residential uses and would not expose project area residents or workers to excessive noise levels. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant**.

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?**

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, there would be **no impact**.
### XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Wold the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)?**

The proposed project would not induce population growth in the area. It does not include the addition of homes or businesses. The proposed project would improve the existing local transportation infrastructure. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with induced population growth.

**b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

The proposed project would not result in the displacement of any existing housing. Therefore, there would be no impact with regard to housing availability.

**c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

The proposed project would not displace any existing residents. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with housing displacements.
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 following public services:**

**Fire and Police Protection**

The proposed project area is entirely with the City of San Mateo and is served by the San Mateo Fire Department and San Mateo Police Department. Construction of the proposed project would not require any street closures or detours. If partial lane closures are required temporarily during the delivery of materials to the construction site, a flagman would guide traffic around the delivery zone. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

**Schools**

The three schools closest to the proposed project area are the A+ Immersion Preschool on South B Street near 15th Avenue, approximately 356 feet to the south; Universe of Colors on South Boulevard, approximately 820 feet to the south; and Sunnybrae Elementary School, approximately 870 feet to the east on South Delaware Street. Six schools fall within 0.25 mile of the proposed project area. The proposed project would not provide or alter any school facilities, result in new housing construction, or induce growth in the area. Therefore, there would be **no impact** on schools.

**Parks**

Hayward Square is a small neighborhood park located on the south side of the tracks just north of 12th Avenue, separated from the proposed project area by a residence. Aside from this designated “mini-park,”

22 https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/3318/Parks-and-Picnic-Areas
Park to the southeast). Several parks are planned as part of the Bay Meadows project, but they would not be located adjacent to the project limits. The proposed project would not provide or alter any park and recreational facilities, result in new housing construction, or induce any growth in the area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**Other Public Facilities**

The proposed project would not require additional public services; therefore, it would have no impact on other public facilities.
XV. RECREATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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?

The proposed project does not include any residential or commercial development that could increase use of an existing park or recreational facility. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The proposed project would not result in the construction of any new recreational facilities or the expansion of any existing recreational facilities; therefore, it would have no impact.

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?

The proposed project does not include any residential or commercial development that could increase use of an existing park or recreational facility. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The proposed project would not result in the construction of any new recreational facilities or the expansion of any existing recreational facilities; therefore, it would have no impact.
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a.  Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Long-Term Impacts

The proposed project would not result in any increase in existing traffic and would not be in conflict with San Mateo’s 2030 General Plan or the Rail Corridor Transit-Oriented Development Plan. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Temporary Construction Impacts

Project-related construction would generate traffic temporarily (such as from haul trucks and construction worker commuter vehicles) but would not require any street closures or detours. Partial lane closures may be required temporarily during the delivery of materials to the construction site. During such closures, a construction flagman would guide traffic in the delivery zone. Therefore, there would be no impact related to conflict with plans or policies.

---

23 https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/2021/2030-General-Plan
24 https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/1899/Rail-Corridor-Transit-Oriented-Development
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Long-Term Impacts

The proposed project would not have any long-term effect on traffic congestion, so it would be consistent with all programs and policies related to congestion management. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Temporary Construction Impacts

A negligible increase in traffic may occur during construction. There would be no impact related to conflict with a Congestion Management Plan.

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?

The proposed project does not involve changes in air traffic. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The proposed project would neither create hazardous design features nor introduce any incompatible or hazardous uses. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Long-Term Impacts

The proposed project would not affect emergency access; the existing at-grade crossing at 9th Avenue would remain in its current form and no new at-grade crossings would be created. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Temporary Construction Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would not require any street closures or detours. Partial lane closures may be required temporarily during the delivery of materials to the construction site. During such closures, a construction flagman would guide traffic in the delivery zone. Therefore, there would be no impact to emergency access.
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

The addition of the setout track and new signal controls would not conflict with San Mateo’s 2030 General Plan, the Rail Corridor Transit-Oriented Development Plan, or other adopted policies, plans and programs supporting active transportation. This project would be supportive of transit system reliability. Construction site and staging area would be within the railroad right-of-way, so no impacts on parking or the performance or safety of active transportation modes would occur.

25 https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/2021/2030-General-Plan
26 https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/1899/Rail-Corridor-Transit-Oriented-Development
## XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

| ☐                             | ☐                                    | ☐                           | ☒         |

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

A records search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System for previous investigations and recorded resources in the proposed project area. Based on the records search, no known tribal cultural resources are listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR or in a local register of historic resources. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

A Sacred Lands File search request was submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission. No cultural resources were listed in Sacred Lands File as being located within the proposed project area. Therefore, no resources in the proposed project area are anticipated to be culturally significant to a California Native American Tribe. Therefore, there would be no impact.
## XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

The proposed project would not produce any wastewater; therefore, there would be **no impact**.

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?**

The proposed project would neither produce any wastewater nor result in an increase in water demand; therefore, there would be **no impact**.

c. **Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

The proposed project would include an access roadway that would increase impervious surfaces, but not to the level that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems. Caltrain design criteria require that all designs for projects involving the creation or replacement of 5,000 square feet of impervious surface comply with Low Impact Development Design Standards contained in the MS4 permit. The project would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities. There would be **no impact**.

d. **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**
The proposed project would not generate any new water demand. Water required for the project during construction (e.g., for dust control) would be minimal. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which 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?

The proposed project would not produce any wastewater; therefore, there would be no impact.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Solid waste generated by the proposed project would be limited to construction waste. Disposal of demolition and construction materials, including any hazardous wastes that may be encountered, would occur in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations at permitted landfills. Operation of the setout track would not result in additional solid waste disposal needs. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The proposed project would comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations related to the disposal of solid waste; therefore, there would be no impact.
**XXIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, substantially 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?

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)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

---

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, substantially 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?

Section 15065(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a finding of significance if a project “has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment.” In practice, this is the same standard as a significant effect on the environment, which is defined in Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines as “a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.” This IS Negative Declaration, in its entirety, addresses and discloses all potential environmental effects associated with construction and operation of the proposed project. No significant effects on the environment are expected to occur, and the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment.

Air quality would be protected through implementation of best management practices during construction.

The proposed project would not reduce the habitat for fish or wildlife species. No wetlands or waterbodies are present the proposed project area, which is entirely urbanized. The proposed project would not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

The proposed project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
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)?

This section summarizes the incremental effect of the proposed project in the context of other reasonably foreseeable projects occurring in the same area. Topics for which the proposed project are expected to have no impact are not discussed because no potential for contribution to cumulative impacts would occur. CEQA court cases have confirmed that absent substantial evidence that a project would have a considerable incremental effect, an in-depth study of potential cumulative impacts is not a prerequisite to preparing a Negative Declaration. For this analysis, past and present projects are not quantified; rather, they are considered to have contributed to the existing conditions outlined in this IS. The Caltrain Modernization Program and Caltrain/HSR blended system are the reasonably foreseeable future actions considered in this analysis.

Aesthetics

Although the reasonably foreseeable future projects would contribute to changes in the aesthetics of the area, none of them would degrade the aesthetic condition of the area. The Caltrain Modernization Program and Caltrain/HSR blended system would change the visual setting by introducing overhead catenary systems. In the context of these other changes in the visual environment, the incremental impact of construction to accommodate the setout track would be less than cumulatively considerable. Cumulative impacts on aesthetics are not anticipated to be significant.

Air Quality

No project-related, long-term impacts on air quality are anticipated; therefore, cumulative effects on long-term air quality levels are not evaluated in this analysis. Construction-related impacts on air quality from the proposed project would be less than significant. In addition, the other reasonably foreseeable future projects would include construction best management practices to ensure potential construction-related impacts are minimized. It is possible that project construction could overlap, but is unlikely. Even though construction could overlap among the projects, the potential, incremental proposed project-related impacts on air quality would be less than cumulatively considerable. Cumulative impacts on construction-related air quality are not anticipated to be significant.

Geology and Soils

Impacts to geology and soils would be related to erosion. The would be localized to the project site and would be less than significant. The project would not considerably contribute to cumulative impacts to geology and soils.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Numerous policy and regulatory actions address greenhouse gas emissions, including the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan, Assembly Bill 32, and Senate Bill 375. At the same time, population and employment growth create upward pressure on the demand for energy and associated greenhouse gas emissions. No long-term, project-related impacts on greenhouse gas emissions are expected because the number of trains and locomotive operating parameters would not change. The proposed project would contribute greenhouse gas emissions during construction, but temporary greenhouse gas emissions are not considered significant. Therefore, the impact of the project is expected to be less than cumulatively considerable.
Hydrology and Water Quality
Impacts to hydrology and water quality would be addressed through adherence to standard best management practices and requirements of the MS4 permit. Impacts would be localized to the project site and less than significant. The project would not considerably contribute to cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality.

Noise
The proposed project would have no long-term, project-related impacts from noise levels; therefore, long-term, cumulative effects from noise are not evaluated in this analysis. Construction-related noise impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant. In addition, the other reasonably foreseeable future projects would include noise mitigation measures to ensure potential construction-related impacts are minimized. As mentioned previously, it is possible that construction of the proposed setout track could overlap with the other reasonably foreseeable future projects. However, the potential, incremental project-related impacts on noise levels would be mitigated to a level that is less than significant and would be less than cumulatively considerable. Cumulative impacts on construction-related noise levels are not anticipated to be significant.

Utilities and Service Systems
The project would result in construction and demolition waste, but this waste would not considerably contribute to area landfills. The project would have no impact on other utilities, and it would not considerably contribute to cumulative impacts to utilities and service systems.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The proposed project would result in temporary (construction-related) and air quality and noise impacts. These effects would not be substantial or adverse; there would be no impact.