

- **Block 15**, bounded by Mathilda Avenue, Iowa Avenue, Charles Street and McKinley Avenue;
- **Block 16**, bounded by Mathilda Avenue, McKinley Avenue, Charles Street and Washington Avenue.

The DSP calls for high-density residential development on these blocks, with up to 173 units planned for Blocks 14 and 16 and 152 units for Block 15. Additionally, up to 10,000 square feet of ground-floor retail space is allowed, located on corners facing Mathilda (DSP, page 84). The DSP encourages below-grade or podium parking structures on these blocks, with entrances on the side streets (i.e. north and south-facing block faces) and limited access via Charles Street (page 85). Land use assumptions for Year 2035 conditions are summarized in Appendix A, *Fehr & Peers, Mathilda Avenue Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, Table 3*. While the DSP traffic analysis completed in 2003 was based on forecasted 2020 land use assumptions, the current 2013 traffic analysis employed updated land use assumptions for the year 2035 since the regional model from which the City's model derives regional traffic information has been updated to a 2035 future year.

The DSP calls for a one-way frontage road on the west side of Mathilda Avenue, with an 8 foot wide parking lane, a 15 foot wide travel lane and a 7 foot wide landscaped median separating the frontage road from through travel lanes. The Specific Plan does not provide a detailed description of how the frontage road would operate. The frontage road dimensions described in the DSP require a dedication of 33 feet on the west side of Mathilda Avenue to construct the frontage road. On the east side of Mathilda Avenue, 27 foot wide sidewalks would be constructed using a 10 foot dedication along with the fourth northbound travel lane and existing right-of-way. The existing center median would be narrowed to accommodate wider travel lanes. The conceptual design of the Specific Plan frontage road is summarized in Appendix A, **Table 7** and in **Figure 8**. The DSP's frontage road concept would add parking spaces to the west side of Mathilda Avenue, where on-street parking is currently prohibited. Currently, parking is only present on the east side of Mathilda Avenue between El Camino Real and Olive Avenue.

A proposed housing development application has been filed with the City by Summerhill Homes on a 1.61 acre site on Block 14. The site has a General Plan Designation of *Very High Density Residential* and a zoning designation of *Downtown Specific Plan Block 14*, and the project is currently undergoing review by the City for conformance with the DSP and is the subject of a separate Initial Study evaluating the project's environmental impacts, tiered from the DSP EIR. The proposed housing project design assumes the Mathilda Avenue frontage road is not implemented, and therefore land area that would have been dedicated for right-of-way for the frontage road, discussed above, is instead utilized for improved pedestrian and bicycle amenities and by the private development project.

Surrounding Uses and Setting

Mathilda Avenue runs for approximately half a mile through downtown Sunnyvale, from El Camino Real to the Caltrain tracks overcrossing north of Washington Avenue. Sunnyvale's Civic Center complex lies to the west of Mathilda Avenue, between Olive Avenue and El Camino Real; north of Olive Avenue, Mathilda Avenue's west side is bordered by single-family homes, offices, banks and small commercial developments. The east side of Mathilda Avenue contains a mixture of low-density residential development and small commercial enterprises south of Olive Avenue. North of Olive Avenue, Mathilda Avenue's east side is generally bordered by office buildings. East of Mathilda Avenue and north of Iowa Avenue, commercial developments include Macy's and Target department stores and the small businesses of the Murphy Station Heritage Landmark District. The Sunnyvale Caltrain Station is located on Evelyn Avenue less than a quarter-mile east of Mathilda Avenue.

In the Downtown area, Mathilda Avenue has three southbound lanes, a landscaped center median that narrows to accommodate left turn pockets, and four northbound lanes. Travel lanes vary in width between ten and fourteen feet, averaging a width of eleven feet. South of Olive Avenue, the fourth northbound lane is used as a parking lane. **Table 1** of Appendix A provides a schematic cross-section of Mathilda Avenue in the study area.

Sidewalks are continuous within the study area and are generally about five and a half feet wide, although they widen to ten feet north of Booker Avenue, adjacent to new development on Mathilda Avenue's east

side. There are five bus stops on Mathilda Avenue within the downtown area; bus service is infrequent, with Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) buses arriving approximately twice per hour during the AM and PM peaks. Within the study area, Mathilda Avenue does not currently have bicycle facilities.

Existing Traffic Conditions

Traffic operations at five study intersections along Mathilda Avenue were evaluated during the morning peak-hour occurring between 7:00 am to 9:00 am and evening peak-hour occurring between 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm. Additionally, traffic operations at two intersections on Charles Avenue were evaluated. Vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle counts were conducted in November 2012 during the AM (7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) peak periods at the following five study intersections:

1. Mathilda Avenue and Washington Avenue
2. Mathilda Avenue and McKinley Avenue
3. Mathilda Avenue and Iowa Avenue
4. Mathilda Avenue and Olive Avenue
5. Mathilda Avenue and El Camino Real

Additional AM and PM peak period counts were conducted in February 2013 at the following two study intersections:

6. Charles Street and Iowa Avenue
7. Charles Street and Olive Avenue.

To measure existing traffic levels using driveways along Mathilda Avenue, driveway counts were also conducted in February 2013 at twelve driveways along Mathilda Avenue between Washington Avenue and Olive Avenue. The locations of study intersections are shown in **Figure 1** of Appendix A.

Field observations were conducted during the AM peak hour (8:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM peak hour (5:00 PM - 6:00 PM) in December 2012 to evaluate intersection operations and vehicle queuing and to confirm street geometry. Subsequent field observations were conducted in March 2013 to observe the influence of driveway operations on southbound vehicle traffic.

Observations confirmed that traffic flow along Mathilda Avenue is heaviest in the northbound direction during the AM peak hour and in the southbound direction during the PM peak period. During the AM peak hour, northbound vehicles were observed to occasionally slow after departing the intersection of Mathilda Avenue and Washington Avenue, which indicates that delay from intersections north of the study corridor are influencing traffic in the downtown area. All intersections operate at LOS D or better under Existing conditions, except the intersection of Mathilda Avenue/El Camino Real, which operates at LOS E during the PM peak hour, with an average delay of 58.7 seconds.

Proposed Action

The project involves an amendment to the DSP, specifically modifying the DSP to remove a planned frontage road on the west side of Mathilda Ave between Evelyn Ave and Olive Ave. A decision on the pending Summerhill Homes housing development application for a portion of Block 14 will be made separately and subsequently from the proposed DSP frontage road amendment.

The frontage road is a DSP plan element, not a mitigation measure for planned growth, and elimination of a plan element has no direct environmental impacts in that the proposed action is to not implement an improvement. The potential for secondary effects (i.e. from future diverted traffic that would have utilized the frontage road) is discussed below to determine if there are any new impacts and/or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts disclosed in the 2003 DSP EIR. The proposed change in the project would be limited to elimination of a planned frontage road from the DSP and

Initial Study/Addendum
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road Removal Project
Page 4 of 25

1. would not expand the project (DSP) area,
2. would not introduce a new land use,
3. would not increase or intensify the amount of DSP development,
4. would not result in a larger project (DSP) resident population,
5. would not reconfigure the approved DSP land use plan, and
6. would not disturb additional land area,

beyond what was proposed and evaluated in the adopted 2003 DSP EIR. For these reasons, the revised project (i.e. implementation of the 2003 DSP without a frontage road on the west side of Mathilda Ave) would not result in new or substantially increased impacts in the following areas:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems

On-site Development: None proposed/required (amendment of a plan)

Construction Activities and Schedule: None proposed/required (amendment of a plan)

Off-site Improvements: None proposed/required (amendment of a plan)

Previous Environmental Review:

In 2003, the City prepared and certified an EIR covering the DSP. As part of the traffic analysis, a total of 33 intersections were analyzed for level of service during the AM and PM peak hours, along with seven neighborhood street segments and four freeway segments. Conditions assuming DSP implementation were forecast for 2020 using the City of Sunnyvale traffic model. Level of service impacts were shown for the intersection of Sunnyvale Avenue and El Camino Real, for which mitigation was incorporated into the DSP.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 6. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 7. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 8. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project
 9. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (see checklist for further information):

Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Yes
 No

Mandatory Findings of Significance? 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 the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? Yes No

Mandatory Findings of Significance? Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Yes No

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 "potential 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 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.

Checklist Preparer: Gerri Caruso Date: 8.29.13

Title: Principal Planner City of Sunnyvale

Signature: 

The CEQA Guidelines §15162 state that when an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR (or negative declaration) shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

Initial Study/Addendum
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road Removal Project
Page 7 of 25

2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

CEQA Guidelines §15164 state that the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously adopted Negative Declaration (or EIR) if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in §15162 (as described above) calling for preparation of a subsequent Negative Declaration (or EIR) have occurred.

Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
1. Aesthetics -Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, historic buildings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale General Plan Map, Community Character and Land Use and Transportation Chapters of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
2. Aesthetics -Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings including significant adverse visual changes to neighborhood character	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Downtown Specific Plan 2003 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Sunnyvale General Plan Map, Community Character and Land Use Chapters of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
3. Aesthetics -Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Downtown Specific Plan 2003 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com General Plan Map, Community Character and Land Use and Transportation Chapters of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
4. Population and Housing - 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) in a way that is inconsistent with the Sunnyvale General Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Downtown Specific Plan 2003 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Land Use and Transportation Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan, General Plan Map
5. Population and Housing -Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Downtown Specific Plan 2003 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Housing Chapter, Land Use and Transportation Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan and General Plan Map www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
6. Population and Housing -Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Downtown Specific Plan 2003 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Housing Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com

Initial Study/Addendum
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road Removal Project
Page 9 of 25

7. Land Use Planning - Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Downtown Specific Plan 2003 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Sunnyvale General Plan Map www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
8. Land Use Planning conflict - With the Sunnyvale General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) area or related specific plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land Use and Transportation Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com Title 19 (Zoning) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
9. Transportation and Traffic - Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Downtown Specific Plan, 2003. www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
10. For a project located the Moffett Field AICUZ or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Moffett Field Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Map, Santa Clara County ALUC Moffett Field CLUP, Sunnyvale Zoning Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com Sunnyvale General Plan Map www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
11. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There are no private airstrips in or in the vicinity of Sunnyvale
12. For a project within the vicinity of Moffett Federal Airfield, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Moffett Field Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Map, Santa Clara County ALUC Moffett Field CLUP
13. Agricultural Resources - Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Zoning Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
14. Noise - Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Noise Sub-Element, Noise limits in the Sunnyvale Municipal Code, or applicable standards of the California Building Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i>
15. Noise -Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Safety and Noise Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com

16. Noise - A substantial permanent or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i>
17. Biological Resources - Have a substantially adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Sunnyvale Zoning Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
18. Biological Resources -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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Sunnyvale Zoning Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
19. Biological Resources -Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Sunnyvale Zoning Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
20. Biological Resources -Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Municipal Code 19.90 Tree Preservation Ordinance http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/ Sunnyvale Inventory of Heritage Trees
21. Biological Resources -Conflict with the provisions of an-adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Sunnyvale Zoning Map www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
22. Historic and Cultural Resources - Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or a substantial adverse change in an archeological resource?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Community Character Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com Sunnyvale Inventory or Heritage Resources The United States Secretary of the Interior's "Guidelines for Rehabilitation" Criteria of the National Register of Historic Places
23. Historic and Cultural Resources - Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description.

Initial Study/Addendum
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road Removal Project
Page 11 of 25

<p>24. Public Services - Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or expanded public schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Project Description The following public school districts are located in the City of Sunnyvale: Fremont Union High School District, Sunnyvale Elementary School District, Cupertino Union School District and Santa Clara Unified School District.</p>
<p>25. Air Quality - Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the BAAQMD air quality plan? How close is the use to a major road, hwy. or freeway?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Sunnyvale General Plan Map Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com 2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i></p>
<p>26. Air Quality - Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines AB 32, 2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i></p>
<p>27. Air Quality -Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of any agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines CA AB 32 Global Warming Solutions Act, 2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i></p>
<p>28. Air Quality -Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Sunnyvale Air Quality Sub-Element, 2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i></p>
<p>29. Air Quality -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)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com 2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i></p>
<p>30. Air Quality -Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com 2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i></p>

Initial Study/Agendum -
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road Removal Project
Page 12 of 25

31. Seismic Safety -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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety and Noise Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
32. Seismic Safety - Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety and Noise Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
33. Seismic Safety-Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety and Noise Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
34. Seismic Safety-Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety and Noise Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com

Further Discussion if "Less Than Significant" with or without mitigation:

9. Parking capacity (Less than Significant Impact) - The DSP's frontage road concept would have the benefit of adding parking spaces to the west side of Mathilda Avenue, where on-street parking is currently prohibited. Currently, parking is only present on the east side of Mathilda Avenue between El Camino Real and Olive Avenue. However, foregoing potential future parking benefits provided by the frontage road is not an impact to the existing environment. Compared to baseline environmental conditions, alternative cross sections for Mathilda Avenue (in lieu of a frontage road on the west side) that lack on-street parking will not result in inadequate parking capacity in that they will simply maintain the status quo, which includes no on-street parking on the west side of the street. This is not an environmental impact under CEQA. Future development on Blocks 14-16 will be reviewed by the City and conditioned to provide adequate off-street parking consistent with City requirements.

14, 16. Noise (Less Than Significant Impact)- As discussed in Appendix A, the removal of the planned frontage road on the west side of Mathilda Avenue from the DSP will not result in a significant re-distribution in travel patterns, either under existing or future 2035 conditions with full implementation of the DSP, that would cause a substantial increase in traffic on the surrounding streets serving the downtown, and therefore there would be no substantial increase in noise levels beyond conditions disclosed in the 2003 DSP EIR.

25 - 30. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Less Than Significant Impact): The frontage road would not increase trip generation associated with the DSP; the potential for distributing traffic from not implementing the frontage road that could lead to increased vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and/or decreased average speeds, and resulting increases in vehicle-generated air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) was analyzed. However, as discussed in Appendix A, re-directed traffic from not implementing the frontage road would not increase VMT associated with the DSP and therefore would not lead to any new air quality or GHG impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts disclosed in the 2003 DSP EIR.

Initial Study Checklist
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road
Removal Project
Page 13 of 25

Transportation	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
35. Exceeds the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all modes of transportation including nonmotorized travel and all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i>
36. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measurements, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i>
37. Results in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in air traffic levels or a change in flight patterns or location that results in substantial safety risks to vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description 2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR,
38. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i>
39. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit or nonmotorized transportation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i>
40. Affect the multi-modal performance of the highway and/or street and/or rail and/or off road nonmotorized trail transportation facilities, in terms of structural, operational, or perception-based measures of effectiveness (e.g. quality of service for nonmotorized and transit modes)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i>
41. Reduce, sever, or eliminate pedestrian or bicycle circulation or access, or preclude future planned and approved bicycle or pedestrian circulation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i>

Initial Study Checklist
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road
Removal Project
Page 14 of 25

Transportation	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
42. Cause a degradation of the performance or availability of all transit including buses, light or heavy rail for people or goods movement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Transportation Evaluation, Fehr & Peers

Further Discussion if "Less Than Significant" with or without mitigation:

35. Existing Circulation System Capacity (Less Than Significant Impact) - The City's intent to modify the DSP to eliminate the planned frontage road on Mathilda Avenue could have secondary effects by diverting traffic compared to what was assumed in the 2003 DSP EIR traffic analysis. Appendix A provides an analysis of future DSP traffic conditions with and without the frontage road that is compared to existing conditions. The results of this analysis (not implementing the frontage road) indicate no new impacts nor a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts disclosed in the Table 7.11 of the 2003 DSP EIR.

Automobile trip generation estimates for Year 2035 conditions were developed using land use intensities described in the 2003 DSP and standard vehicle trip rates. In total, new land uses on Blocks 14, 15 and 16 are expected to generate 370 new AM peak hour vehicle trips and 711 PM peak hour vehicle trips. Trip generation for Year 2035 conditions is summarized in Appendix A, Table 4.

Year 2035 No Frontage Road (Charles Access)

Level of service analysis was conducted for Year 2035 No Frontage Road (Charles Access) conditions. Under this scenario, the intersection of Mathilda Avenue and El Camino Real is forecasted to operate at LOS E during the AM peak period, with an average vehicle delay of 73.8 seconds, and at LOS D during the PM peak hour, with an average vehicle delay of 51.2 seconds. The remaining study intersections would operate at LOS D or above during both AM and PM peak hours. See Appendix A, Table 9. The intersection of Mathilda Avenue and El Camino Real is a Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP) intersection, and LOS E is the minimum acceptable level of service for CMP intersections. Therefore, assuming planned development consistent with the DSP, the study intersections would operate at acceptable levels, and the elimination of the planned frontage road would not cause any secondary transportation impacts.

36. Conflict with Congestion Management Program (Less Than Significant Impact) - as noted above, in 2035 assuming development consistent with the DSP and no frontage road on the west side of Mathilda Avenue, the study intersection of Mathilda Ave/El Camino Real, which is the only CMP intersection that could be affected by the project, would operate at an acceptable LOS E.

38. Roadway Hazards (Less Than Significant Impact) - Amending the DSP to not include a frontage road on the west side of Mathilda Avenue will not introduce a hazardous design feature, such as a sharp curve or dangerous intersection, or an incompatible use that would increase road hazards. Without the frontage road, the new development planned on Blocks 14, 15, and 16 will have access on Mathilda, cross streets, and/or Charles Street, and each development project design will be reviewed and permitted by the City to ensure adequate sight distances, turn movements, etc. for vehicles entering and exiting Mathilda Avenue, to avoid increasing hazards. The frontage road was not an essential element to avoiding road hazards on Mathilda Avenue. In fact, the Fehr & Peers Mathilda Avenue Transportation Evaluation (Appendix A, pg.34), found the frontage road has the potential for conflicts at intersections as vehicles enter the through-traffic stream from the frontage road, and recommended further study of operations and traffic control if the frontage road were to remain under consideration.

39. Conflict with Transit Policies or Programs - Amending the DSP to not construct a frontage road on the west side of Mathilda Avenue will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit or nonmotorized transportation in that the frontage road was not designed primarily as a transit-supportive feature, rather the frontage road design (as noted in Appendix A) was intended to separate 'local' from 'through' traffic, and would have reduced the space

Initial Study Checklist
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road
Removal Project
Page 15 of 25

available to transit riders waiting at bus stops. Developing alternative future roadway cross sections will allow opportunities to maintain or enhance transit features along Mathilda Avenue, such as bus duck-outs and bus shelters with ample space for transit riders.

40. Multi-modal Performance Effectiveness (Less Than Significant Impact) – CEQA requires an evaluation of a project's impacts as measured against baseline (typically existing) environmental conditions, which was discussed in the preceding paragraphs under Question #35. **Existing Circulation System.** However, discussion of the comparative impacts of proceeding to implement the planned frontage road would also be useful for the decision-making process. Based on the results presented in Appendix A (pages 27-29), the addition of a frontage road would not substantially affect vehicle capacity on Mathilda Avenue and would therefore have no substantial effect on vehicle level of service. However, the presence or absence of a frontage road may have other effects on vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle circulation. Access and traffic circulation effects are discussed below.

Access and Traffic Circulation Effects of Frontage Road

While vehicle capacity would not be substantially affected, a frontage road may slightly reduce travel speeds for through-moving vehicles by reducing the number of access points on the main thoroughfare. As a result, it would slightly increase the delay caused by vehicles entering the frontage road from the southbound right turn lane of Mathilda Avenue. Forecasts of corridor travel speeds and times (see Appendix A) indicate that intersection travel times on the corridor could be slightly longer with a frontage road than without one. During the PM peak hour, southbound travel times on Mathilda Avenue in Year 2035 are forecasted at 240 seconds under Frontage Road conditions, and 237 seconds under No Frontage Road (Charles Access) conditions. It is therefore unlikely that adding a frontage road would substantially improve travel speeds and vehicle throughput in Year 2035.

Block Access without Frontage Road

Assuming that the frontage road is not developed, it is anticipated that vehicle access to land uses within the study area will be primarily via driveways on Mathilda Avenue and side streets, with the exception of Block 14. On Block 14, there would be no vehicle access via Mathilda Avenue, and the majority of vehicle trips will enter and exit through driveways on Charles Avenue. This is consistent with current development proposal by Summerhill Homes, which calls for mid-block driveways on Charles Street only.

41. Pedestrian or Bicycle Circulation or Access (Less Than Significant Impact) – CEQA requires an evaluation of a project's impacts as measured against baseline (typically existing) environmental conditions. On that basis, deciding to not implement the frontage road will have no direct effects on existing conditions.

However, discussion of the comparative impacts of proceeding to implement the planned frontage road would also be useful for the decision-making process. The addition of a frontage road has the potential to improve conditions for some bicyclists and pedestrians traveling on the west side of Mathilda Avenue. New development anticipated in the DSP is likely to bring more pedestrians to the downtown area, which could increase the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. Because vehicles traveling on the frontage road would typically move more slowly than vehicles traveling on the main roadway, adding a frontage road would tend to improve pedestrian comfort and reduce conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. Lower speeds and volumes of vehicle traffic on the frontage road would also improve perceived safety for bicyclists. As a result, the main benefits of adding a frontage road are separation of local and through traffic, improved conditions for bicyclists that choose to use the frontage road and pedestrian travel, and the addition of on-street parking to serve local businesses and new residential developments. However, foregoing potential future benefits is not an impact to the existing environment under CEQA.

42. Performance or Availability of Transit (Less Than Significant Impact) – the proposed DSP amendment to eliminate the planned frontage road from the west side of Mathilda Avenue would not affect the existing or future *demand* for transit (which is based on land use), or the *availability* of transit serving the downtown area. The alternative designs available for Mathilda Avenue in lieu of constructing a frontage road would have adequate right-of-way to allow for the efficient performance of existing and planned transit, including bus stops/duckouts, shelters, etc.

Initial Study/Addendum
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road Removal Project

Building	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
43. Hydrology and Water Quality - Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map Effective 5/18/09 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com , California Building Code, Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/
44. Hydrology and Water Quality - Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map Effective 5/18/09 www.sunnyvaleplanning.com , California Building Code, Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/
45. Hydrology and Water Quality - 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1995 ABAG Dam Inundation Map www.abag.ca.gov , California Building Code, Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/
46. Geology and Soils -Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sunnyvale Municipal Code 12.60, Storm Water Quality Best Sunnyvale Management Practices Guideline Manual http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/
47. Geology and Soils -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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Safety and Noise Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan, www.sunnyvaleplanning.com California Plumbing, Mechanical, and Electrical Codes and Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/
48. Geology and Soils -Be located on expansive soil, as defined by the current building code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description California Plumbing, Mechanical, and Electrical Codes and Title 16 (Building) of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/

Further Discussion: None required.

Initial Study/Addendum
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road Removal Project

Engineering	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
49. Utilities and Service Systems: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
50. Utilities and Service Systems: Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
51. Utilities and Service Systems: 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
52. Utilities and Service Systems: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
53. Utilities and Service Systems: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description. Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
54. Utilities and Service Systems: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
55. Hydrology and Water Quality - Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Region 2 Municipal Regional Permit

Initial Study/Addendum
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road Removal Project

Engineering	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
56. Hydrology and Water Quality - Substantially degrade 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Santa Clara Valley Water District Groundwater Protection Ordinance www.valleywater.org
57. Hydrology and Water Quality - Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Description Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com
58. Hydrology and Water Quality - Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems in a manner which could create flooding or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RWQCB, Region 2 Municipal Regional Permit, Stormwater Quality BMP Guidance Manual for New and Redevelopment Projects www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
59. Hydrology and Water Quality - Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams www.valleywater.org City of Sunnyvale Stormwater Quality Best Management Practices (BMP) Guidance Manual for New and Redevelopment Projects www.sunnyvaleplanning.com
60. Utilities and Service Systems: Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Environmental Management Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com

Initial Study/Addendum
Mathilda Avenue Frontage Road Removal Project

<p>61. Public Services Infrastructure? Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Project Description Safety and Noise Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com</p>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Further Discussion if "Less Than Significant" with or without mitigation: None required.

Public Safety	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Sig. With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Source Other Than Project Description and Plans
<p>62. Public Services Police and Fire protection - Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Safety and Noise Chapter of the Sunnyvale General Plan www.generalplan.inSunnyvale.com</p>
<p>63. Public Services Police and Fire protection - Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>2003 Downtown Specific Plan EIR, 2013 Mathilda Ave Carriage Road Transportation Evaluation, <i>Fehr & Peers</i></p>

Further Discussion if "Less Than Significant" with or without mitigation:

63. Emergency Access (Less than Significant) – Amending the DSP to not implement a frontage road would not directly modify baseline conditions and therefore would not result in inadequate emergency access. The alternative street section designs available for Mathilda Avenue in lieu of constructing a frontage road would maintain adequate emergency access.