COUNTY OF SAN MATEO PARKS DEPARTMENT

DATE: July 26, 2018

TO: Parks and Recreation Commission

FROM: Peggy Jensen, Acting Parks Director

SUBJECT: Final Environmental Impact Report for the Flood County Park Landscape

Plan

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Receive and accept the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Flood County Park Landscape Plan; and

2. Make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve the Landscape Plan, certify the Environmental Impact Report, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Consideration.

BACKGROUND

Flood County Park is located entirely within the City of Menlo Park and is surrounded primarily by single family residences, as shown in Exhibit A attached. A San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) right-of-way for water pipelines traverses the center of the park in an east-west direction.

Flood County Park was created in 1936 as part of the New Deal Works Project Administration when an administrative building, swimming pool, maintenance area, caretaker's residence, two restrooms and picnic sites were constructed. In the early 1950s parking was improved and a baseball field, softball field and tennis courts were added. The most recent renovations to the park, which occurred in the 1980s, consisted of a modernization process with a focus on facilities designed to accommodate visitors with physical limitations.

Upon the Department assessing the condition of Flood County Park in 2014, it was determined that a complete overhaul of the park was needed. This initiated a process to determine how best the park could serve the broader community. Extensive outreach was conducted in order to identify the needs and desires of visitors to the park. Public engagement included six public meetings (over 500 attendees) with participants from Menlo Park and North Fair Oaks, the Siena Youth Center, the Sheriff's Activities League parents, Menlo Legends baseball club, youth soccer advocates, little league teams, and Master Gardeners. Additionally, a survey was opened up to all interested parties and was available on-line and in paper form (220 responses). Additionally, the Department coordinated with the City of Menlo Park and the North Fair Oaks community to gather feedback. Through this process, the Department, working with Gates and Associates, developed the Landscape Plan shown in Exhibit B attached.

The goals of the Landscape Plan are to update failing park features optimize preservation of large oak, bay, and redwood trees, meet area demands for sports facilities, and provide a variety of active and passive recreation opportunities for all park visitors.

The largest recreational facilities would be sited in the northern portion of the park. It is proposed that the existing baseball field be reconstructed and a multi-purpose soccer and lacrosse field be installed at the northeast corner, replacing the existing pétanque court and a portion of the existing tennis courts. A promenade would run eastward across the center of the park from the parking lot and picnic areas located in the southern half of the park would be improved. The Department would preserve existing adobe buildings, with the exception of the adobe restroom located west of the existing tennis courts. The adobe administrative building in the southwest part of the park would be evaluated for seismic upgrades. In April 2016, the Parks and Recreation Commission approved this Landscape Plan and directed staff to initiate the environmental impact analysis.

DISCUSSION

1. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Department contracted with Rincon Consulting, Inc. to conduct an environmental impact analysis of the Landscape Plan. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for this project and distributed in accordance with applicable requirements. A 30-day public review period began on November 17, 2016. The County received 20 comment letters responding to the NOP as well as oral comments from the public at an EIR Scoping Session on December 6, 2016. Comments focused on the following impacts: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, land use, noise, transportation/traffic, and utilities. This public input provided content for a Draft EIR, which was prepared in September 2017 and released for a 45-day public review period thereafter. The EIR addressed the following 10 environmental issues that the County identified as potentially significant:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Traffic
- Tribal or Cultural Resources

A total of 78 comment letters were received during the public comment period and were responded to in the Final EIR A subsequent letter, Letter 79, was received after the close of the comment period, but was accepted and responded to in the Final EIR.

The consultant's analysis determined that most of the environmental impacts are less than significant or will be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the discussed mitigating measures.

To evaluate the impacts of the Landscape Plan on traffic flow at key area intersections, the consultants used industry best practices to estimate the number of participants accessing the sports programs during the weekday late afternoon and early evening peak hours of 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. This anticipated that an impact on traffic flow will occur at the intersection of Bay Road and Ringwood Avenue. As congestion currently exists at this intersection, future congestion levels cannot be solely attributed to the project. The County and City of Menlo Park plan to hold staff meetings to further discuss traffic flow impacts and mitigation options.

A summary of all identified impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts after mitigation can be found in Exhibit C attached.

2. ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED

The EIR is required to evaluate the potential impacts of three potential alternatives in addition to the Landscape Plan. The three alternatives evaluated were a No Project Alternative, a Reduced Athletic Programming Alternative, and a Multi-use Field Alternative.

The No Project Alternative is unable to achieve most of the objectives and needs identified through the public engagement process. While it would not impact oak woodlands, this alternative would not achieve the repair or upgrade of park features, satisfy demand for additional active recreation facilities in the region, or provide a greater variety of uses for a range of user groups.

The Reduced Athletic Programming Alternative would meet the proposed objectives of repairing and updating park features, providing a variety of uses for a range of user groups, and optimize preservation of oak woodlands. However, by closing athletic fields to programming use during weekday late afternoons, it would not meet demand for active recreation facilities to the same extent as the Landscape Plan.

The Multi-Use Field Alternative would introduce a new multi-use athletic field in the location of the existing ballfield, eliminating the Landscape Plan's proposed soccer/lacrosse field. This alternative would meet all four proposed objectives, but would meet demand for active recreational facilities to a lesser degree than the Landscape Plan.

Next Steps

After review by the Parks and Recreation Commission, the EIR will be brought to the Board of Supervisors for certification. Once the Board of Supervisors certifies the EIR, the Department will issue a Request for Proposals for a design firm to develop the final design and associated plans and specifications for the redevelopment of Flood County Park. The design phase will include a robust public engagement process, which will consist of workshops with neighbors, park-user groups, and other stakeholders. During the design phase, specific park features, and their location and dimensions will be determined.

Fiscal Impact

Appropriations for the design phase are included in the Department's FY 2018-19 Approved Recommended Budget and will be included in the Department's FY 2018-19 Adopted Budget. The Department and the San Mateo County Parks Foundation will collaborate to fund raise as anticipated construction costs exceed current budgeted amounts.





The summary table lists impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation and circulation, and tribal cultural resources. Impacts related to other resource areas were determined to be less than significant in Section 5, *Effects Found Not to Be Significant*, and are discussed there.

Table 1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
Aesthetics		
Impact AES-1: The Landscape Plan would not affect scenic vistas or corridors; however, it would alter views from existing residences, primarily by the removal of mature trees and installation of netting around the proposed soccer/lacrosse field. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation for tree replacement and appropriate netting design.	Mitigation Measure AES-1: Athletic Netting Color. If the County installs athletic netting around the proposed soccer/lacrosse field, this netting shall have a neutral color (e.g., forest green, black, gray) that blends in with the natural environment at Flood County Park. Mitigation Measure BIO-2(a): Tree Replacement (see full measure under Impact BIO-2)	Less than significan after mitigation
Impact AES-2: While the Landscape Plan would largely preserve historic adobe building, it would involve removal of mature trees that serve as scenic resources. This impact on scenic resources would be less than significant with mitigation to replant trees of suitable species and protect remaining trees from construction activity.	Mitigation Measure BIO-2(a): Tree Replacement (see full measure under Impact BIO-2) Mitigation Measure BIO-2(b): Tree Avoidance and Minimization Measures (see full measure under Impact BIO-2)	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact AES-3: The Landscape Plan would preserve the majority of scenic mature trees and adobe buildings as well as open fields for passive recreational use, maintaining the park's overall existing visual character. The impact on visual character or quality would be less than significant.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Air Quality		
Impact AQ-1: The project would not contribute to population growth and would be consistent with the growth assumptions in the BAAQMD 2017 Clean Air Plan. This impact would be less than significant.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact AQ-2: While Project construction would generate temporary increases in localized air pollutant emissions, These emissions would not exceed BAAQMD's significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. However, implementation of BAAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures and measures to reduce NO _x emissions is recommended to further reduce	None required; however, the BAAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures are recommended to reduce fugitive dust emissions.	Less than significant without mitigation

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
construction emissions.		<u></u>
Impact AQ-3: Operation of the proposed project would generate air pollutant emissions, but emissions would not exceed BAAQMD significance thresholds. Impacts related to operational emissions would be less than significant.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact AQ-4: The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with construction dust, CO hotspots, or toxic air contaminants. Impacts related to these localized pollutants would be less than significant.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1: The Landscape Plan may result in direct and indirect impacts to listed special-status species. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation to protect nesting birds and roosting bats.	 Mitigation Measure BIO-1(a): Bird Protection Measures. This mitigation measure shall apply to all proposed Phase I, II, and III recreational elements. a. If possible, trees and shrubs that would be impacted by construction activities shall be removed during the non-nesting season (typically between September 1 and January 31). b. If trees and shrubs are removed during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31), all suitable nesting habitat within the limits of work shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist prior to initiating construction-related activities. A pre-construction survey shall be conducted within five days prior to the start of work. If no nests are observed, construction activities shall be initiated within five days. If more than five days pass and construction has not been initiated, another survey will be required. c. If, during the nesting season, an active nest is discovered in trees or shrubs to be removed, the vegetation shall be protected using orange construction fence or the equivalent. The protective fencing shall be placed around the vegetation at the following distance(s) depending on species and upon recommendation from a qualified biologist: 100-250 feet from the drip line of the vegetation for raptors. No parking, storage of materials, or work would be allowed within this area until the end of the nesting season or until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist. Mitigation Measure BIO-1(b): Bat Protection 	Less than significant after mitigation
	Measures. This mitigation measure shall apply to	

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
- Impact	construction under the Landscape Plan that involves tree removal. a. A qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for roosting bats at least two weeks prior to, but not more than 30 days prior to, the start of construction. The pallid bat could potentially roost in hollow trees. The survey shall be conducted within 200 feet of all planned construction activities within two weeks prior to any removal of trees (particularly trees 12 inches in diameter or greater at 4.5 feet above grade with loose bark or other cavities). b. A buffer zone of 100 feet that excludes construction activities or other disturbances shall be established around active bat roosts. c. If active maternity roosts or non-breeding bat hibernacula are found in trees scheduled to be removed, relocation or other measures shall be determined in consultation with the County of San Mateo and/or CDFW, as appropriate, and a qualified biologist.	Residual Impact
Impact BIO-2: Construction of proposed recreational improvements may directly or indirectly affect heritage trees protected by San Mateo County. The impact on protected trees would be less than significant with mitigation to replace protected trees that are removed and to protect remaining trees during construction.	Mitigation Measure BIO-2(a): Tree Replacement. The County shall replace protected trees that are removed from Flood County Park at 1:1 ratio. Suitable replacement trees shall be those species specified as heritage trees. Where mature trees are removed within 25 feet of residential property lines, the County shall plant replacement trees that upon maturation would be sufficient to restore the pre-existing level of privacy of adjacent residents. Mitigation Measure BIO-2(b): Tree Avoidance and Minimization Measures. The following measures to avoid and protect trees shall apply to individual recreational elements of all proposed Phase I, II, and III improvements:	Less than significant after mitigation
	 a. The County shall monitor heritage trees with CRZs impacted by construction activities (canopies and roots) during construction for signs of distress. The CRZ is defined as the area of soil around a tree trunk where roots are located that provide stability and uptake of water and minerals required for tree survival by the ISA's Best Management Practices – Managing Trees During Construction handbook. b. Excavation/Trenching shall avoid CRZs to the greatest extent feasible. The following measures shall be applied when excavation and trenching occurs near heritage trees: Where appropriate tunneling shall be used to preserve roots two inches in diameter, and wherever possible underground lines shall occupy common trenches. 	
· ··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 When root cutting occurs, exposed major roots (greater than two inches in diameter 	_

Impact Mitigation Measure Residual Impact

or within five feet of the trunk) shall not be ripped by construction equipment. Roots shall be cleanly cut and made at right angles to the roots.

- A Certified Arborist shall be present if more than 30 percent of the root zone is impacted or roots greater than two inches or within five feet of the trunk will be cut, to document impacts to the CRZ.
- Absorbent tarp or heavy cloth fabric shall cover new grade cuts and be overlain by compost or woodchip mulch.
- c. The County shall stage construction equipment outside of the CRZs and apply precautions, such as steel traffic plates and fencing, to protect sensitive root zones.
- d. The County shall install protective fencing around heritage trees prior to any earthwork and remain until all work is complete, or until adjacent construction activity no longer threatens tree health. Fencing shall be six foot high chain link fencing (or comparable material) and installed at the outermost edge of the CRZ, or eight feet from the trunk of the heritage tree, whichever is greatest. Signs stating "Tree Protection Zone Keep Out" shall be posted on the fence.
- e. Pruning for clearance, if needed, shall be done to prevent damage to branches with large equipment. All above-ground pruning shall be in accordance with the Tree Pruning Guidelines (International Society of Arboriculture) and/or the ANSI A300 Pruning Standard (American National Standard for Tree Care Operations) and adhere to the most recent edition of ANSI Z133.1. Pruning cuts or damaged bark shall be cut clean to heal. No tree seal or paint shall be used after pruning.

Cultural Resources

Impact CUL-1: The Landscape Plan would preserve existing adobe buildings that contribute to Flood County Park's eligibility as an historical resource, except for the proposed demolition of the Restroom D building. By documenting historical resources for archival purposes and adhering to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation of the administrative office building, the project would have a less that significant impact on historical resources with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1(a): Historic Documentation Package. Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the County shall ensure that documentation of the buildings proposed for demolition is completed in the form of a Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-like documentation that shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation (National Park Service [NPS] 1990). The documentation shall generally follow the HABS Level III requirements and include digital photographic recordation, detailed historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian

Less than significant after mitigation

Impact Mitigation Measure Residual Impact

who meets the Secretary of the Interior's *Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History* (NPS 1983). The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to the County of San Mateo Parks Department where it would be available for current and future generations. Archival copies of the documentation also shall be submitted to the City of San Mateo Library and the San Mateo County History Museum where they would be available to local researchers. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the lead agency.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1(b): Standards of Review. The seismic retrofit of the adobe administrative office building shall be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Standards), thereby avoiding significant adverse direct or indirect impacts to historical resources. An architectural historian or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards shall be retained to prior to the start of the seismic retrofit to review proposed plans and provide input to the County to avoid any direct or indirect physical changes to the building. The findings and recommendations of the architectural historian or historic architect shall be documented in a Standards Project Review Memorandum, at the schematic design phase. This memorandum shall analyze all project components for compliance with the Standards. Should design modifications be necessary to bring projects into compliance with the Standards, the memorandum shall document those recommendations. The document shall be subsequently submitted to County of San Mateo Parks Department for review and comment.

Impact CUL-2: Ground-disturbing activities under the Landscape Plan could result in damage to or destruction of unanticipated archaeological resources or human remains. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2(a): Archaeological Resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area shall be halted and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (NPS 1983) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for CRHR eligibility. If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA and cannot be avoided by the proposed project, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted to mitigate any significant impacts to historical resources.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2(b): Unanticipated

Less than significant after mitigation

Impact Mitigation Measure Residual Impact Discovery of Human Remains. If human remains are found, State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Unanticipated Impact CUL-3: Ground-disturbing Less than significant activities associated with development Discovery of Paleontological Resources. In the after mitigation under the Landscape Plan could result in event of a fossil discovery by construction damage to or destruction of potential personnel, all work in the immediate vicinity of the fossil resources within rock units or find shall cease and a qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find before restarting geologic features. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation work in the area. The qualified paleontologist shall incorporated. be an individual with an M.S. or Ph.D. in paleontology or geology who is experienced with paleontological procedures and techniques, who is knowledgeable in the geology of California, and who has worked as a paleontological mitigation project supervisor for a least one year (SVP 2010). If the qualified paleontologist determines that the fossil(s) is (are) scientifically significant, the find shall be recovered under his/her supervision. The paleontologist shall have the authority to temporarily direct, divert or halt construction activity to ensure that the fossil(s) can be removed in a safe and timely manner. Once salvaged, significant fossils shall be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curationready condition and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection (such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology), along with all pertinent field notes, photos, data, and maps. Fossils of undetermined significance at the time of collection may also warrant curation at the discretion of the project paleontologist. Geology and Soils Impact GEO-1: The Landscape Plan would None required Less than significant reconstruct or rehabilitate some existing without mitigation recreational facilities and on-site

structures and would add new recreational facilities. Redevelopment of Flood County Park would result in an incremental increase in recreational users

at the park, which would slightly increase the number of people at the project site that could be exposed to strong ground shaking. However, redevelopment of the park would not include construction of habitable structures and impacts related to strong ground shaking would be less	
than significant.	
Impact GEO-2: Flood County Park is None reconstructed in a mapped Liquefaction Zone and redevelopment of the park could result in damage to reconstructed or rehabilitated structures due to seismically induced liquefaction. However, redevelopment of the park would not include the construction of habitable structures and adherence to California Building Codes would minimize the potential for damage of uninhabited structures from liquefaction. Impacts related to seismically induced liquefaction would be less than significant.	uired Less than significant without mitigation
Impact GEO-3: Implementation of the Landscape Plan would involve soil disturbance that could result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, compliance with existing regulations, including the NPDES Construction General Permit, would ensure that disturbed soil is properly managed to minimize the potential for erosion. Impacts related to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.	uired Less than significant without mitigation
Impact GEO-4: The Landscape Plan would involve the rehabilitation or reconstruction of structures that could be located on expansive soils. However, soils would be evaluated for their expansive potential during grading and would be removed and replaced with non-expansive soils as necessary. Also, the Landscape Plan would not include construction of habitable structures and therefore would not place people at risk to safety hazards from expansive soils. Adherence to California Building Codes would ensure that impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.	juired Less than significant without mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact GHG-1: Construction and None recoperation of the proposed recreational facilities in the Landscape Plan would generate GHG emissions. These emissions	uired Less than significant without mitigation

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
by AB 32 or SB 32. Therefore, the project's impact to climate change would be less than significant.		
Impact GHG-2: Construction and operation of the proposed recreational facilities in the Landscape Plan would be consistent with the San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan. Therefore, the project's impact related to consistency with plans to address climate change would be less than significant.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HWQ-1: Construction and operation of the proposed recreational facilities could result in storm water runoff of pollutants such as sediment and nutrients. However, compliance with NPDES permit requirements and County landscaping standards would control sediment flow and maintain water quality. The project would have a less than significant impact on water quality.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact HWQ-2: The proposed recreational improvements would incrementally increase the area of impervious surface at Flood County Park but to the extent that groundwater recharge would be reduced. The project also would not draw its water supply from groundwater. Therefore, the Impact to groundwater supply and recharge would be less than significant.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact HWQ-3: The Landscape Plan would alter existing drainage patterns by grading activity and the addition of impervious surfaces. However, compliance with NPDES requirements would minimize erosion and avoid a substantial increase in surface runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Noise		
Impact N-1: Construction of proposed recreational facilities would generate high noise levels on and adjacent to the project site. However, construction noise would be temporary, and adherence to the County's allowed hours of construction would prevent noise disturbance during sensitive evening and nighttime hours. Therefore, the impact from construction noise would be less than significant.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
Impact N-2: Grading activity would temporarily generate groundborne vibration on and adjacent to Flood County Park. Because construction of proposed recreational elements would occur inside the hours allowed in the County Code of Ordinances, it would not generate vibration when people normally sleep. Construction vibration would not exceed levels that may cause structural damage to historic adobe buildings on-site. The Landscape Plan would have a less than significant vibration impact.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact N-3: The Landscape Plan would add new sources of on-site operational noise from organized practices and games at the proposed athletic fields and performances at the proposed gathering meadow. Noise from whistles, sound amplification equipment, or air horns could disturb nearby residents. The impact from on-site operational noise would be less than significant with mitigation to prohibit the loudest equipment and restrict the timing of athletic events.	Mitigation Measure N-3(a): Prohibit Sound Amplification Equipment and Air Horns. The County shall only allow the use of sound amplification equipment and air horns at organized athletic games and practices and at the gathering meadow with the procurement of a special event permit in accordance with City of Menlo Park procedures. The County shall notify all groups using the proposed soccer/lacrosse field, ballfield, and gathering meadow of this requirement. County staff shall periodically patrol the park during organized athletic events and performances to verify that park users are not operating such equipment without an approved special event permit. Mitigation Measure N-3(b): Timing of Athletic Events. To minimize noise that may disturb neighbors of Flood County Park, the County shall restrict athletic practices and games at the park to the hours of 9 A.M. to 8 P.M.	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact N-4: Vehicle trips associated with operation of the proposed recreational elements would increase traffic volumes on nearby roadways, resulting in greater traffic noise audible to existing noisesensitive residences. However, the increase of vehicle trips from the project relative to existing traffic would be incremental and would not exceed the applicable FTA standard of 1 dBA Leq. Therefore, traffic noise impacts would be less than significant.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Transportation and Circulation		
Impact T-1: Traffic generated by the project would cause traffic delay exceeding the City of Menlo Park's standards at the intersection of Bay Road and Ringwood Avenue under all modeled traffic scenarios. Queuing of vehicles at the park's entrance gate also would cause temporary traffic delay on Bay Road. Although new parking fee collection	The installation of a northbound left-turn lane at the intersection of Bay Road and Ringwood Avenue would improve traffic conditions during PM peak hours from LOS D to B under existing plus project conditions, from LOS E to C under near-term 2021 plus project conditions, and from LOS F to D under cumulative 2040 plus project conditions. However, physical constraints at the affected intersection could make implementation of such a measure	It may be infeasible to reconfigure the intersection of Bay Road and Ringwood Avenue to avoid a significant impact from traffic congestion.

Impact practices would minimize queuing, mitigation measures at the affected intersection would be infeasible. Therefore, the project would have a significant and unavoidable impact on traffic under existing plus project conditions.	infeasible. To minimize queuing on Bay Road, Mitigation Measure T-1 would be required. Mitigation Measure T-1: Parking Fee Collection Practices. The County shall implement parking fee collection practices to avoid the back up of vehicles entering Flood County Park onto local streets. These practices may include automated fee machines, paying upon exiting the park, or a combination of both to move the queues associated with fee collection off of City streets and on-site.	Residual Impact Landscape Plan would have a significant and unavoidable impact
Impact T-2: Project-generated traffic would have a negligible effect on vehicle miles traveled in San Mateo County. Therefore, the Landscape Plan would have a less than significant impact related to vehicle miles traveled.	None required	Lessthan significant without mitigation
Impact T-3: Vehicle trips generated by implementation of the Landscape Plan would not adversely affect roadways designated under the Congestion Management Plan for San Mateo County. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with this plan.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact T-4: The project would not introduce design features that increase traffic hazards. No impact would occur.	None required	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact T-5: The project would not decrease the performance of existing or planned transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. However, the lack of bicycle storage on-site and a sidewalk gap on Bay Road could result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians accessing the park. Impacts to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian systems would be less than significant with mitigation to install bicycle storage and pedestrian signage.	Mitigation Measure T-5(a): Bioycle Storage. The County shall install a minimum of six bicycle racks near the proposed gathering plaza. Mitigation Measure T-5(b): Pedestrian Sgnage. The County shall coordinate with the City of Menlo Park to install signage along the north side of Bay Road between Del Norte Avenue and Ringwood Avenue, informing motorists and bicyclists of pedestrians walking along the should and in the bike lane.	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact T-6: While the proposed on-site parking supply would be adequate based on standard parking demand rates for parks, the Landscape Plan could result in increased parking on local residential streets. The impact on parking capacity would be less than significant impact with mitigation measures to facilitate on-site parking and discourage on-street parking by visitors to Flood County Park.	Mitigation Measure T-1: Parking Fee Collection Practices (see full measure under Impact T-1) Mitigation Measure T-6: Parking Education and Enforcement. The County shall develop a mechanism to inform park visitors of on-street parking restrictions on nearby residential streets and shall post this information in a clearly visible location on-site. The County also shall coordinate with the City of Menlo Park to encourage increased random enforcement of on-street parking restrictions.	Less than significant after mitigation

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
Tribal Quitural Resources		
Impact TCR-1: Construction of recreational improvements proposed in the Landscape Plan would involve surface excavation, which has the potential to impact previously unidentified tribal cultural resources. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation to protect such resources in the event of their discovery.	Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Protection of Tribal Cultural Resources. In the event that archaeological resources of Native American origin are identified during construction of recreational improvements proposed in the Landscape Plan, the qualified archaeologist will consult with the County to begin or continue Native American consultation procedures. If, in consultation with the County, a discovery is determined to be a tribal cultural resource and thus significant under CEQA, the County shall avoid the resource if feasible. If the resource cannot be avoided, the County shall prepare and implement a mitigation plan in accordance with State guidelines and in consultation with Native American groups.	Less than significant after mitigation