CITY OF PALO ALTO

Parking Structure at 375 Hamilton Avenue

(Downtown Parking Garage)

Final Environmental Impact Report

State Clearinghouse No. 2017052040



City of Palo Alto

Prepared by

August 2018

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

City of Palo Alto

Parking Structure at 375 Hamilton Avenue (Downtown Parking Garage)

Final Environmental Impact Report

State Clearinghouse No. 2017052040

Prepared For

CITY OF PALO ALTO
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301
Contact: Holly Boyd
Phone 650-329-2612

Prepared By:

WSP USA
425 Market Street, 17th Floor
San Francisco, California 94105
United States
(415) 243-4600

August 2018

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 - Overview of the Final EIR 1

1.1 - Format of the Final EIR 1

1.2 - Purpose of the Final EIR 2

Chapter 2 - List of Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Receiving the Draft EIR or Notice of Availability . 4

2.1 - State Agencies 4

2.2 - Local Agencies 4

Chapter 3 - Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR 5

3.1 - List of Draft EIR Commenters 5

3.2 - Responses to Comments from the June 20, 2018 ARB Meeting 6

Chapter 4 - Revisions to the Draft EIR 9

Acronyms

ARB	Architectural Review Board
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act

CHAPTER 1 - OVERVIEW OF THE FINAL EIR

The City of Palo Alto (City), the Lead Agency, prepared the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the proposed City of Palo Alto Downtown Parking Garage, in keeping with State environmental documentation requirements set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, including sections 15086 (Consultation Concerning Draft EIR), 15088 (Evaluation of and Responses to Comments), and 15132 (Contents of Final Environmental Impact Report). In conformance with these guidelines, the Final EIR consists of the following two volumes:

1) The Draft EIR (including its appendices), which was circulated for the mandatory 45-day State agency and public review and comment period, beginning on May 18, 2018, and ending on July 2, 2018, and

2) The Final EIR "responses to comments" document, which includes a list of all commenters to the Draft EIR during the Draft EIR public review period and speaker comments from the June 21, 2018, City of Palo Alto Architectural Review Board (ARB) public meeting on the Draft EIR.

Please note that no letters or emails were received from the public during the Draft EIR public review and comment period.

1.1 - Format of the Final EIR

This document, which includes responses to comments and text revisions, has been prepared in accordance with Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines. In addition to Section 1.0, describing an overview of the purpose and format of the Final EIR, the Final EIR includes the following sections:

- Section 2.0 List of Agencies and Individuals Receiving the Draft EIR: The agencies, organizations, and individuals who received copies of the Draft EIR are listed in this section. The locations where the Draft EIR could be reviewed during the public circulation period are also included in this section.

- Section 3.0 Response to Comments: This section contains a transcript of the comments received on the Draft EIR at the City of Palo Alto ARB Meeting on June 20, 2018, and the responses to those comments.

- Section 4.0 Revisions to the Draft EIR: The section contains text revisions to the Draft EIR. Text revisions can be made as a result of comments received during the Draft EIR public review process, corrections or clarifications to the text, or to reflect modifications that have been made.

None of the revisions to the Draft EIR represents a substantial increase in the severity of an identified significant impact or the identification of a new significant impact, mitigation, or alternative considerably different from those already considered in preparing the Draft EIR. Therefore, the Draft EIR did not require public recirculation.

1.2 - Purpose of the Final EIR

In conformance with the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15151), EIRs should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decisions-makers with information which enables them to make a decision on the project that takes into account environmental consequences. The Final EIR also is required to examine mitigation measures and alternatives to the project intended to reduce or eliminate significant environmental impacts.

The Final EIR is used by the City and other Responsible Agencies in making decisions regarding the project. The CEQA Guidelines require that, while the information in the Final EIR does not control the agency's ultimate discretion on the project, the agency must respond to each significant effect identified in the Draft EIR by making written findings for each of those effects. According to the State Public Resources Code (Section 21081), no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:

a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:

    1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

    2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

    3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities of highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

All documents referenced in this EIR are available for public review in the Planning and Community Environment Department office (5th floor) at 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94301, during normal business hours. The Final EIR is also available for review on the City's website, https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/depts/pwd/infrastructure_plan/new_downtown_garage.asp, and at the following public library:

Downtown Public Library
270 Forest Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR will be made available to the public a minimum of ten days prior to the EIR certification hearing.

CHAPTER 2 - LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING THE DRAFT EIR OR NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

2.1 - State Agencies

After completion of the Draft EIR, the Lead Agency (the City of Palo Alto) is required under CEQA Guidelines sections 15086 (Consultation Concerning Draft EIR) and 15088 (Evaluation of and Response to Comments) to consult with and obtain comments from other public agencies having jurisdiction by law with respect to the project, and to provide the general public with an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR. Under CEQA Guidelines section 15088, the Lead Agency is also required to respond in writing to substantive environmental points raised in the Draft EIR review and consultation process.

The Draft EIR was submitted to the following State agencies by the State Clearinghouse:

- California Highway Patrol
- California Department of Transportation, District 4
- Caltrans Division of Aeronautics
- California Department of Fish and Game, Region 3
- California Native American Heritage Commission
- California Office of Historic Preservation
- California Public Utilities Commission
- Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2
- San Francisco Bay Area Conservation & Development Commission
- California State Lands Commission
- Office of Emergency Services
- California State Clearinghouse

2.2 - Local Agencies

The Draft EIR was submitted to the County of Santa Clara Office of the County Clerk-Recorder.

Note

Additional individuals and groups were notified of the availability of the Draft EIR by e-mail and postal mail, and the Draft EIR has been posted on the City's website and in the Palo Alto Main and Downtown Libraries.

CHAPTER 3 - RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 (Contents of Final Environmental Impact Report), subsection (b), requires that the Final EIR include the full set of "comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary"; Section 15132, subsection (c), requires that the Final EIR include "a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR"; and Section 15132, subsection (d), requires that the Final EIR include "the responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation". In keeping with these guidelines, this Responses to Comments chapter includes the following sections:

1) A list of Draft EIR commenters (Section 3.1), which lists each individual who commented during the ARB public meetings and each individual, agency, and organization that submitted written comments (letters/emails) to the City during the Draft EIR public review period;

2) Responses to the June 20, 2018, ARB public meeting comments, which includes each verbal comment received on the Draft EIR during the public meeting, followed by the response to the comment, pertaining to Draft EIR content or adequacy or on a substantive environmental point;

3.1 - List of Draft EIR Commenters

The individuals who commented at the public meetings, and each individual, agency, and organization that commented in letter/email form during the Draft EIR public review period, are listed below by personal name or agency/organization name. After the person's name, each meeting comment and each letter/email comment received is also identified in parenthesis by a code number, e.g. ARB comments ARB-1, ARB-2.

Comments on the Draft EIR were submitted in the form of comments from individuals attending the June 20, 2018, ARB public hearing.

No comments on the Draft EIR were received from any of the above State agencies nor local agencies.

No public comments on the Draft EIR were received during the draft EIR public review period.

ARB Public Meeting Commenters (June 20, 2018)

- ARB Vice Chair Baltay (ARB-1)
- ARB Board Member Gooyer (ARB-2)
- ARB Chair Furth (ARB-3)

3.2 - Responses to Comments from the June 20, 2018 ARB Meeting

The following section includes each verbal comment received during the June 20, 2018 ARB public meeting pertaining to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR or on a substantive environmental point, followed by the response to the comment.

3.2.1 - ARB Vice Chair Baltay (ARB-1)

Comment ARB-1

Comment ARB-1a: The gist of my comments is I think this building does have an impact on the post office, and I don't think that's adequately addressed in here. I think the architect has mitigated those impacts, but I think it needs to be discussed in a neutral and thorough way here.

I think the building is as tall as it can possibly be. I don't think it's doing anything to, special consideration for the area. I don't think that's a mitigation. It's implying that includes consideration of the height. It says further [reading]: The building will be 49 feet 10 inches below the citywide 50-foot height limit. That's not including the solar panels, again.

The gist of my statements on all this is that the building is massive, and I don't think we should sugarcoat that and try to say no, it's not actually that big. I think we do ourselves a disservice. And a big building, especially across the street from probably the most important historic building in town, I think it's important to acknowledge that. Further down, the third, fourth paragraph, the proposed project, etc. [Reading] Furthermore, given the restrained height and compatible design...I don't think this building has a restrained height.

Comment ARB-1b: I'm looking at page 2 out of 5 of a tree report regarding the condition of the oaks. [Reading] The three Holly Oaks and one Coast Live Oak tree were determined to be in good health condition. Fair enough. The trees are in need of appropriate repruning, etc. Poor pruning in the past has contributed to Fair structures. I'd like to see that last sentence just struck from the statement. The tree is in good health. Anybody who goes and looks at it can see that. And we're going to mitigate the removal of the tree, but I don't think we should try to spin it to say it's somehow not okay.

Comment ARB-1c: Add a statement about the sidewalks becoming wider. The widened sidewalks actually do one thing towards helping the historic building across the street. It just gives you a little more space to have that civic breathing room.

Response ARB-1

Response ARB-1a: Section 3.4 Cultural, Paleontological, and Tribal Cultural Resources, p.93 has been revised to clarify that the height of the future photovoltaic panels would be 56 feet and that the height of the elevator penthouse would be 63 feet. However, several sections of the Draft EIR, including but not limited to Section 2.5, Project Description, Section 3.1, Aesthetics, and Section 3.9, Land Use, provided detailed information on the height of each component, including the penthouse and the future

photovoltaic structures, and assessed the project based on the proposed maximum height of all of these components. As was already stated in Section 3.4 Cultural, Paleontological, and Tribal Cultural Resources, p.93, the proposed building would have a lower height than the existing building to the west, which is 75 feet tall. Therefore, although the penthouse and future photovoltaic structures would be taller than the height limits typically allowed in this zone district, this height would be consistent with the development pattern of adjacent buildings, specifically the existing 75-foot tall AT&T building immediately abutting this property, which also faces the Post Office. Page 93 has been revised to provide additional clarity as to why the proposed height of this building, including these additional features, would not result in a significant impact on the adjacent historic buildings. In addition, reference to the restrained height has been removed in response to this comment. The Draft EIR concludes that the proposed project would not have a significant impact on adjacent historic buildings, including the U.S. Post Office; no changes have been made to this conclusion. Other potential impacts (e.g. impacts due to construction vibrations or impacts due to aesthetics) on nearby historic buildings, are further discussed in each respective resource section.

Response ARB-1b: The arborist report, included as Appendix D of the Draft EIR, concludes that the oak trees have been poorly pruned recently, which contributes to these trees being in only fair health. Because this statement reflect the professional opinion of the Qualified Arborist that prepared the report, this requested revision to remove the statement that "Poor pruning in the past has contributed to Fair structures" has not been made. Other factors that lead to poorer health of the protected Live Oak tree include lions-tailing, a defective branch attachment known as "Included Bark", and a trunk wound, as stated in Table 1 of the Arborist Report included in the Draft EIR. Regardless of the findings of the health of this tree, and as the commenter accurately notes, Section 3.4 Biological Resources, p.83, of the Draft EIR discusses the fact that the project is designed to include three new oaks on Hamilton Avenue to replace this protected Live Oak tree. Therefore, no changes to the Draft EIR or Arborist Report have been made to reflect this comment.

Response ARB-1c: This comment was addressed in response ARB-3b.

3.2.2 - ARB Board Member Gooyer (ARB-2)

Comment ARB-2

Comment ARB-2a: I pretty much had no specific comments, but sort of the same concept of what I've read, that you're trying to sugarcoat the size of this place. No matter what you do, you can't sugarcoat that. It's huge. The reality is, we need the thing, so you have to just be a little bit more blunt about stating that that's the requirement.

Response ARB-2

Response ARB-2a: Refer to response ARB-1a.

3.2.3 - ARB Chair Furth (ARB-3)

Comment ARB-3

Comment ARB-3a: Provide more accurate description-It is a really big building.

Comment ARB-3b: Include verbiage that the extra wide sidewalk on Hamilton complements the Post Office (a stepped-back civic building).

Comment ARB-3c: Emphasize non-parking upside such as improvements for cyclists, bigger trees, wider sidewalk.

Response ARB-3

Response ARB-3a: Refer to response ARB-1a.

Response ARB-3b: Consistent with this comment, additional language was added in Section 3.4 Cultural, Paleontological, and Tribal Cultural Resources on p.93 to describe the widened, 12-foot sidewalk and to explain that the visual impact of the proposed garage will be softened by the widened sidewalks on Waverley Street and Hamilton Avenue. The widened sidewalk on Hamilton Avenue will complement the two-story U.S. Post Office across Hamilton Avenue, which has a similar setback to the proposed project.

Response ARB-3c: Section 2.5.2 Building Design, p.31 and Section 3.4 Cultural, Paleontological, and Tribal Cultural Resources, p.93, were modified to include an additional description of the benefits of the new, wider sidewalks, consistent with this comment.

Furthermore, Section 2.5.1 Building Characteristics, p.29, includes a description of the additional space to accommodate child carriers in the bike parking area.

A description of the landscaping, which is included as part of the proposed project, was also added to Section 2.5.6 Landscaping, on pp.32-33. The description includes reference to the new landscaping and other improvements along the frontages and alleyway, including the wider sidewalk, built-in benches, new raised planters, and new trees. These improvements are designed to create an inviting streetscape and a convenient pedestrian alleyway between the existing surrounding buildings and the proposed project.

CHAPTER 4 - REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

The following section includes all revisions to the Draft EIR made in response to comments received during the Draft EIR comment period. Furthermore, it also includes revisions to Section 2.5.2 Building Design, that were not made pursuant to a comment but due to a design modification of the building. Those revisions to the draft EIR were done to be consistent with the final design of the building. The changes to the building design are minor and were done to improve the overall architectural design of the proposed project. Thereby, they do not change any conclusions of the draft EIR.

None of the criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 (Recirculation of an EIR Prior to Certification) indicating the need for recirculation of the May 2018 Draft EIR has been met because of the revisions, in particular:

- No new significant environmental impact due to the project or due to a new mitigation measure has been identified;
- No substantial increase in the severity of a significant environmental impact has been identified; and;
- No additional feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others analyzed in the Draft EIR has been identified that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project.

All text revisions are indicated by strike-through and underlining in red plus a solid vertical line in the left margin next to the revised line(s). All of the revised pages supersede the corresponding pages in the May 2018 Draft EIR.

CITY OF PALO ALTO

Parking Structure at 375 Hamilton Avenue

(Downtown Parking Garage)

~~Draft~~ Final Environmental Impact Report



State Clearinghouse No. 2017052040

City of Palo Alto

Prepared by

May 2018, Amended August 2018

City of Palo Alto

Parking Structure at 375 Hamilton Avenue (Downtown Parking Garage)

~~Draft~~ Final Environmental Impact Report

State Clearinghouse No. 2017052040

Prepared For

CITY OF PALO ALTO
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301
United States
Contact: Holly Boyd
(650) 329-2612

Prepared By:

WSP USA
425 Market Street, 17th Floor
San Francisco, California 94105
United States
(415) 243-4600

May 2018, Amended August 2018

Demand for Parking:

- Additional information is needed to show that there is additional demand for parking in the commercial core of the City of Palo Alto and the neighboring residential areas. Considerations should be given to the recommendations of the Downtown Parking Management Study that is being conducted by the City, and actions taken by the Transportation Management Association (TMA) to reduce the demand for parking.

Context Sensitive Solutions:

- Compatibility of the parking garage with the existing adjacent buildings regarding architectural contexts and the number of the proposed stories of the structure.
- Compatibility with adjacent historic buildings, especially the historic two-story U.S. Post Office across Hamilton Avenue and the church across Waverley Street.
- Loss of natural air and light due to shadows from the new parking structure located south and west of the building on Lot 85.
- Preserve or replace existing protected California Oak trees. Preserve and/or replace other existing trees.

Other Design Elements:

- Consideration of new technologies that help reduce the need for large parking structures, delays and idling time during entering and exiting the structure.
- Maintaining vehicular access to Lot 84 and Lot 85 which faces Waverley Street, this proposes to consider allowing space and structural accommodations in the basement of the downtown parking garage and the potential need to expand the building in the future.
- Maintain access by providing a delivery zone on Waverley Street.
- Maintain or improve the existing pedestrian walkways between the parking structure and Lot 85.

Construction Impacts:

- Effect of the loss of the existing parking spaces while the proposed project is being constructed.

1.1.2 Draft EIR

The Draft EIR provides a description of the proposed project, the environmental setting, evaluation of the project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts determined to be significant, including direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR addresses environmental resources that were determined to have potential impacts according to the prepared IS Checklist consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (see Appendix B for a copy of the Initial Study Checklist). Resources that were determined to have "No Impacts" from the project will not be further evaluated in this report. The following is a list and description of the resources with a determination of "No Impact":

2.4 Project Objectives

The following are the project objectives:

1. To increase the number of parking spaces within the downtown to maximize the accessibility and convenience to downtown visitors and workers
2. To provide a parking structure that includes neighborhood-serving retail and street frontage to contribute to the economic vitality of the downtown and the City
3. To provide a parking structure that incorporates a pedestrian- and bike-friendly layout
4. To provide a parking structure that is visually appealing and compatible with the downtown character and nearby historic buildings

2.5 Project Description

2.5.1 Building Characteristics

The proposed project consists of:

- A four-story public parking garage consisting of five above ground parking levels and one basement level. The uppermost level would provide parking spaces on the roof. The structure would reach a height of 49 feet-10 inches to the top of the rail of the fifth deck, continuing to a height of 63 feet at the top of the elevator penthouse.
- The public parking garage footprint would cover 23,490 square feet and the overall square footage would be 114,048 square feet (of above-grade floor area).
- A 585-square-foot bicycle parking area would provide approximately 50 bicycle parking spaces with additional space for child carriers and would be located near the entrance to the structure along Hamilton Avenue.
- A total of 325 parking stalls would be available within the structure. Approximately eight stalls will be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible, 82 are planned to be designated for electric vehicles (with 17 being installed with charging stations), and nine stalls designated specifically for the retail area use[6].
- 25 percent of the parking spaces would be designed with infrastructure to allow the future installation of charging stations for electric vehicles, per the City of Palo Alto Green Building Code[7]. Initially, 5 percent, or approximately 19 stalls, of the parking spaces would be equipped with a charging station.
- The building would be designed to accommodate the future installation of photovoltaic panels and their associated structure above the building's uppermost deck. The top level of the photovoltaic

[6] Building Code require 1 space per 250 square feet of non-residential use within the Downtown Assessment District.
[7] City of Palo Alto, Ordinance No. 5263, Amendment to the California Green Building Standards Code, August 4, 2014, https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/43818, accessed on November 6, 2017.

structure installation, at 56 feet above grade, would be below the top of the elevator penthouse, at 63 feet above grade.

- The building would be designed with a 3-foot setback from the property line on the south side of the building along Hamilton Avenue. A continuous 12-foot sidewalk wraps both frontages.
- The building would include an approximately 2,000-square-foot single- or dual-tenant commercial shell-space building fronting Waverley Street, to be used as commercial retail space for new or existing businesses.
- The trash enclosure would include area for trash and recycling from two adjacent properties on Waverley Street (Lots 84 and 85), and for the retail area in the proposed project.

Table 3 below presents a comparison of the proposed project.

Table 3: Summary of the Characteristics of the Proposed Project

Use/Characteristics	*Amount/Description*	*Proposed Project*
Parking	325 stalls	127,612 sf
Commercial		1,955 sf
Circulation	Elevator lobbies, ramp, stairs	4,644 sf
Utilities		1,679 sf
Bike Parking	50 spaces, plus child trailer storage	585 sf
Trash		441 sf
Total area		**136,595 sf**
Height to rail		49'-10"
Height to solar		56'-0"
Height to penthouse		63'-0"

Note: sf = square feet

Source: Watry Design, May 2018.

Figure 6, p.35 to Figure 8, p.37, show the floor plans of the proposed project. Figure 10, p.39 and Figure 12, p.41 shows the elevations and sections of the proposed building.

2.5.2 Building Design

The proposed building would extend 4 feet into the existing setback along Hamilton Avenue (providing a 3-foot setback from the property line) and Waverley Street edge as well as the interior side lot line shared with the adjacent AT&T building. At the property line shared with the southeastern side of Lot 85 (or 560 Waverley Street), the edge of the garage would be set back ten feet from the property line, allowing openings for natural ventilation into the parking garage, as well as light to reach the existing windows of the property at 560 Waverley Street. This necessary setback would also create an opportunity for a pedestrian walkway, which would be ADA-accessible, leading to the secondary stairway. At the property line shared with Lot 84 and the southwestern side of Lot 85, the garage would be set back 16 feet to maintain access for utilities, service, and a secondary means of egress for the existing buildings fronting Waverley Street. Vehicle access would be restricted in this alley to those needed to service the adjacent

properties. Additionally, the alley would be enhanced with architectural paving, new plantings, benches, and lighting so that it can be a usable space. The sidewalks on Hamilton and Waverley are replaced and widened to 12 foot to provide more room for circulation.

The project's façade design is intended to be compatible with the surrounding architectural context, and to reflect the character of Palo Alto's Downtown. Potential locations for the integration of public art have also been identified on the building. These locations are the shear wall element that would face Hamilton Avenue and the perforation pattern of the stair cladding proposed at the corner of Hamilton Avenue and Waverley Street.

The primary construction material would be poured in place concrete columns, slabs and walls. Along the street edges, the ~~two-story~~building base ~~would be sandblasted~~columns and shear wall would be board-formed concrete in a natural color, similar to ~~the~~ All Saints ~~Episcopal~~ Church ~~to the north (across Waverley Street), with subtle details used to define the corners and architrave of the building. Metal flat~~. Flat metal bars painted a dark bronze color ~~would be used to~~ infill the first~~-~~ floor openings to create pedestrian screening ~~for pedestrians.~~. The metalwork ~~would continue along~~continues on the runs and landings of the stair, celebrating the metalwork found in the ~~Post Office to the east (across Hamilton Street)~~post office and other Spanish ~~Revival~~revival buildings. ~~Lighted from the inside, a~~An illuminated perforated metal scrim ~~would wrap~~wraps on the main corner stair creating a lantern element ~~to serve~~that serves as a wayfinding device. This element ~~could~~is also ~~be~~ the focus of the public art program for the building. ~~Metal fins would wrap the upper~~Vertical metal louvers would fill the space between columns at the second, third and fourth stories ~~in panels outlined by metal channels that would define the cornice of the building as the channels rise to the upper story.~~. The ~~fins would~~vertical louvers serve to create a body to the building while allowing for the required garage ventilation. ~~The fin~~Their color is ~~intended to be~~ reminiscent of the terracotta colors found in the ~~Downtown~~downtown area. ~~Above the roof parking level, a dark bronze metal 'cap' and metal railing create a cornice for the building. This design is enhanced by, but not dependent on, future columns and beams supporting photovoltaic panels.~~

Figure 13, p.42 shows the rendering of the proposed design for the parking structure.

2.5.3 Access Points

The proposed parking garage can be accessed by vehicles via an entrance and exit on Hamilton Avenue and another one on Lane 21. Lane 21 would continue to be one-way circulation, with the entrance on Waverley Street and the exit on Bryant Street. A pedestrian pathway through the structure leads from the bike parking entry near Gilman Street to Lane 21 near the CVS. City Council has not yet decided whether the facility would be a paid parking lot and thus, there is space reserved to accommodate the provisional gates at the entrance and exit. Gates and access points are shown on the ground floor plan (**Figure 6, p.35**).

2.5.4 Utilities

The construction of the parking garage would require the relocation of the existing fiber optic and high voltage electric lines. Existing utility transformers will be housed below ground in the alleyway adjacent to

the trash enclosure. The new parking structure does not include replacing the public restroom due to safety and maintenance concerns.

2.5.5 Transportation

Improvements for the safety of the pedestrians at the intersection of Waverley Street and Hamilton Avenue would be part of the proposed project. The project would include the construction of new bulb-outs adjacent to the parking structure along both Hamilton Avenue and Waverley Street. It would also include new signal priority for pedestrians.

2.5.6 Landscaping

The landscape of the proposed parking structure is designed to enhance the pedestrian environment of downtown Palo Alto and to encourage social interaction through providing an inviting streetscape and creating a unique and convenient pedestrian alleyway between the existing surrounding buildings and the proposed structure.

Due to the planned footprint of the parking structure, the seven existing trees would need to be removed from the project site to accommodate the construction of the structure. One of the existing trees, of the species Coast Live Oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), is protected under the City of Palo Alto's Tree Technical Manual. Although this tree is protected, the arborist's report indicates that previous, imprecise pruning has resulted in the poor condition of the tree and a potential for breakage. One street tree will be removed and replaced with four gingko trees and three oak trees along Hamilton and two gingko trees along Waverley in enlarged, 4-foot by 7-foot tree wells to help ensure healthy growth of these new ginkgo trees, which reflect the existing species of the street trees to be retained on Waverley Street.

All tree removals on this project require replacement. The replacement standards outlined in the Tree Technical Manual (as described in the Draft EIR) will be utilized to achieve no net loss of canopy per Policy 1.G of the Urban Forest Master Plan[8]. Site preparation and soil volume requirements apply so that newly planted trees have the potential to mature to desired size and thrive.

The corner of the parking structure will feature a small plaza area featuring decorative pavers, which are also used in the pedestrian access alleyways. In the pedestrian walkway, decorative pervious pavement, generous benches, landscaped storm water treatment planters, and pedestrian-scaled lighting will be used to invite pedestrian use. The storm water planters will be at grade level even with the walkway, and will feature a combination of low-growing, knee-high foliage and flowering plants that provide year-round interest and function; to cleanse storm water directed from the parking structure deck. As width allows, columnar gingko trees similar to the surrounding street trees are introduced to further enhance the pedestrian environment and create a pleasant atmosphere for what may become a well-used passageway.

[8] City of Palo Alto, Urban Forest Master Plan Policy 1.G, "Strive for no net loss in canopy cover.", p.142, May 2015, https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/36187 (accessed on April 16, 2018)

The streetscape walkways are replaced and widened to provide more room for circulation along the proposed retail space on Waverley Street and to enjoy the built-in benches and landscaped raised planters on Hamilton Avenue. New street trees are proposed along Hamilton in enlarged, 4 feet by 7 feet tree wells and a suspended pavement system to help ensure healthy growth of the new Ginkgo trees which reflect the existing species of the preserved street trees on Waverley Street. Three native Oak trees have been added on Hamilton to compensate for the removal of the one protected oak tree.

2.5.7 Foundation and Excavation

Existing slabs, foundations, fills, and pavement would be removed before the excavation of the basement. Existing surface pavement consist of generally 2 to 3 inches of asphalt concrete over 3 to 4 inches of an aggregate base. Most of this existing pavement will be removed, and the underlying sands and clays will be excavated and removed from the site.

Approximately 13,500 cubic yards of soil would be excavated for the basement and will be transported off-site by the excavation subcontractor using two 10-yard dump trucks. Minor cuts and fills into the subgrade at a depth range of 13 to 16 feet are anticipated for setting the foundation. Design of the foundation is expected to be a one-basement level structure. At the time this report was written, specific structural loads are not yet known, but are anticipated to be typical of this type of structure.

A site survey determined that the site elevation ranges between 49 and 51 feet below sea level. No ground improvement or piling is expected. There is a potential for hydrostatic pressures on the basement slab, even though it does not appear that the one-level below grade basement would extend below the design ground water depth. There is a potential for short duration perched water events, which could result in uplift pressures on the basement slab. It is recommended to design the slab for 2 to 4 feet of hydrostatic uplift pressure over the full width of the below-grade portion of the building[9].

2.5.8 Construction

2.5.8.1 Schedule

Construction of the parking structure is expected to last 15 months, excluding possible delays due to weather, underground issues, etc. Construction is scheduled to begin in Spring 2019 and be complete by Summer 2020.

Construction would be separated in the following phases:

- Utility relocations are expected to last three to four months, with the collaboration of the utility service providers such as the City of Palo Alto Utilities (CPAU) for electric and wastewater, AT&T for data, and others to be determined further in the design

[9] Gordon Knowles, Senior Project Manager, Watry Design, email correspondence with Lyne-Marie Bouvet, Environmental Planner, WSP, April 12, 2018.

The parking structure would be 49 feet-10 inches to the top of rail on the fifth deck with an elevator penthouse continuing to 63 feet. The height of the structure would be lower than the adjacent 75-foot tall AT&T building to the west. The structure would include infrastructure to support the future installation of photovoltaic panels, which would be mounted above the top (fifth) level parking deck. The structure would maximize the amount of parking while allowing for retail storefronts, with the primary intent of consistency with the context of the downtown area. The parking structure would have a zero setback, extending to the property line, at the Hamilton Avenue and Waverley Street edges, as well as the interior side lot line shared with the AT&T building. The ground-floor retail space would open to the Waverley Street frontage. Along the northern property line, the parking structure would be set back 10 feet from the property line to allow natural ventilation into the structure and light to the existing windows at 560 Waverley Street. The 10-foot setback would also provide for a pedestrian walkway leading to a secondary stair, as well as a visual connection to the All Saints Episcopal Church. The main stair and elevator for the structure would be located at the corner of Waverley Street and Hamilton Avenue and would include a pedestrian court with access to the ground floor retail. Construction of the parking structure would require removal of the existing onsite trees and one street tree which would be replaced with four gingko trees and three oak trees along Hamilton and two gingko trees along Waverley. There would be no net loss of canopy per Policy 1.G of the Urban Forest Master Plan[12].

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Map L-4 of the adopted Comprehensive Plan identifies scenic vistas, including major view corridors, scenic routes, and gateways within the City of Palo Alto[13]. There are no scenic vistas within the project area; therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would have ***no impact*** on scenic vistas.

NO IMPACT

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

There are no state scenic highways within the project area; therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not damage any resources within a state scenic highway. There would be ***no impact*** and no mitigation is required.

NO IMPACT

[12] City of Palo Alto, Urban Forest Master Plan Policy 1.G, "Strive for no net loss in canopy cover.", p.142, May 2015, https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/36187 (accessed on April 16, 2018)

[13] City of Palo Alto, Comprehensive Plan, Map L-4, https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/62915 accessed on April 16, 2018.

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

Construction

During construction, the site would be fenced primarily for safety purposes. The fence limits visibility of the site and construction activities. Large-scale equipment used to hoist and/or excavate materials would be visible to surrounding areas and passersby. Signage for safety and informational purposes would also be visible. Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as good housekeeping activities (street sweeping, material organization, etc.), stockpile management, and careful placement of construction staging areas would be implemented to prevent injuries, minimize vandalism, and reduce visibility of equipment and materials. Use of BMPs would help minimize the visual clutter associated with construction.

Operations

The proposed structure would be constructed primarily of poured-in-place concrete. ~~The two story~~Along the street edges, the building base ~~would be sandblasted~~columns and shear wall are board-formed concrete in a natural color, similar to ~~the~~ All Saints ~~Episcopal~~ Church~~, with subtle details used to define the corners and architecture of the building.~~. Metal flat bars painted a dark bronze color ~~would be~~are used to infill the first~~-~~ floor openings ~~and~~to create screening for pedestrians. The metalwork ~~would continue~~is continued on the ~~rails~~runs and landings of the stair ~~to mimic~~celebrating the metalwork found in the ~~Post Office~~post office and other Spanish ~~Revival~~revival buildings. ~~The structure would have substantially open sides to provide natural ventilation and~~An illuminated perforated metal scrim wraps the main corner stair creating a ~~façade scaled to~~lantern element that serves as a wayfinding device. This element is also the ~~local streets. Metal fins wrapping~~focus of the public art program for the building. Vertical metal louvers, capped by a horizontal metal channels, wrap the upper stories and define the cornice of the building. The vertical louvers serve to create a body to the building while allowing for the required garage ventilation. ~~The~~Their color ~~of the fins would mimic~~is reminiscent of the terracotta colors found in the downtown ~~area~~. The proposed architectural design of the structure is intended to reflect elements and materials of the Post Office and surrounding buildings and to be consistent with the character of the downtown area. In addition, two elements of the structure have the potential for integration of public art. The two locations are the shear wall element facing Hamilton Avenue and the perforation pattern to the stair cladding at the corner of Hamilton Avenue and Waverley Street. The corner of the parking structure would feature a small plaza area with decorative pavers similar to what would also be used in the pedestrian access alleyway. The alleyway would also be visually enhanced with decorative paving, plantings, benches and decorative lighting to encourage pedestrian use of these spaces. To invite people to explore and use the alley, decorative pervious pavement, generous benches, landscaped storm water treatment planters, and pedestrian-scaled lighting would be used. The storm water treatment planters would be at-grade and even with the walkway. The planters would feature a combination of low growing knee-high foliage and flowering plants to provide year-round interest, as well as functionality for cleansing storm water directed from the parking structure roof.

3.2.3.1 Criteria of Significance

The following significance criteria are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) and are used by the City to determine the significance of impacts. Impacts ~~to~~ would be significant if the proposed project would:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (such as the Bay Area Clean Air Plan)?
b. Violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

3.2.3.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

The applicable air quality plan is the Bay Area 2017 CAP. The Plan focuses on two closely-related goals: protecting public health and protecting the climate. Consistent with the GHG reduction targets adopted by the State of California, the plan lays the groundwork for a long-term effort to reduce Bay Area GHG emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. A project that would not result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts may be considered consistent with the Bay Area 2017 CAP. The BAAQMD proposed thresholds are included in **Table 8**, p.64, for comparison purposes. As seen in the modeled data in **Table 12,** p. 70, construction emissions would not exceed the proposed thresholds for the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Bay Area 2017 CAP. Impacts would then considered be ***less than significant***. No mitigation is required.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

The proposed project would result in a significant impact if the estimated construction or operational emissions exceed the BAAQMD thresholds shown in **Table 8,** p.64. The estimated daily project emissions generated during construction and operation of the proposed project are summarized in **Table 12,** p.70, and **Table 13**, p.70. As shown in these tables, emission estimates from the proposed project would not exceed BAAQMD thresholds and impacts will be ***less than significant***. The project would not violate any air

3.3.3 Impact Analysis

3.3.3.1 Significance Criteria

The following significance criteria are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) and are used by the City to determine the significance of impacts. Impacts ~~to~~ would be significant if the proposed project would:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Service?
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved, local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?

According to the City's CEQA thresholds, a significant impact would occur if the project would conflict with the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance.

3.3.3.2 Impacts and Measures

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

The project site is located in an urbanized area of Palo Alto and is currently developed with a surface parking lot and landscaping. The project site does not include riparian habitat, wetlands or streams or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

A search of the California Natural Diversity Database, maintained by the CDFW, as well as the official species list from the USFWS yielded a list of threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, and critical

3.4.3 Impact Analysis

3.4.3.1 Significance Criteria

The following significance criteria are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) and are used by the City to determine the significance of impacts. Impacts ~~to~~ would be significant if the proposed project would:

a. Adversely affect a historic resource listed or eligible for listing on the National and/or California Register, or listed on the City's Historic Inventory.
b. Eliminate important examples of major period of California history or prehistory.
c. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to 15064.5.
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.
e. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a local cultural resource that is recognized by City Council resolution.
g. Cause a substantive adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:
    i a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, or on a local register or historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) or
    ii a resource determined by a lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in Public Resources Code section 5024.1 (c), and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

3.4.3.2 Impacts

a. Would the project adversely affect a historic resource listed or eligible for listing on the National and/or California Register, or listed on the City's Historic Inventory?

b. Directly or indirectly destroy a local cultural resource that is recognized by City Council resolution?

There is no historic building listed or eligible for listing on the National and/or California Register, or listed on the City's Historic Inventory on the proposed project site. The City of Palo Alto inventory of the downtown area shows several historic buildings within proximity to the project area. The most prominent building is the U.S. Post Office located across the street from the project site, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The adjacent building located at 526 Waverley Street is listed on the City's Historic Inventory as a Category 3 historic resource and is currently used as the Palo Alto Sport Shop. It is

not anticipated that the project would affect the U.S. ~~p~~Post O~~o~~ffice building, the Sport Shop or any other historic building.

The design of the proposed garage incorporates several architectural elements ~~intended~~ to make it an appropriate and compatible addition to the Palo Alto downtown area. This includes consideration of the ~~total~~ building height, the character of the ground floor façades, and building setbacks. The garage will include a sub-grade level that will allow for additional parking ~~while limiting the overall building height~~. ~~The proposed parking structure will be 49 feet 10 inches to the top of rail on the fifth deck, below the city-wide 50-foot height limits.~~ The parking structure would be 49 feet-10 inches to the top of rail on the fifth deck with future photovoltaic panels at 56 feet and an elevator penthouse continuing to 63 feet. Although this is taller than the existing zoning height limit for this site, t~~T~~he proposed building will ~~also~~ have a lower height than the existing building to the west, which is 75 feet tall, therefore it is consistent with the development pattern of adjacent buildings.

~~While the~~The proposed garage design ~~attempts to~~ maximizes parking capacity~~, it also~~ while also incorporat~~inges~~ ground floor storefront facades in keeping with the character of the surrounding retail and entertainment neighborhood. In addition, the visual impact of the proposed garage will be softened by the widen 12 foot sidewalks on Waverley Street and Hamilton Avenue, sympathetic to the two-story, 25 foot tall U.S. Post Office which is setback from the Hamilton Avenue sidewalk~~by a 10-foot setback along Waverley Street and a 7-foot setback from Hamilton Avenue~~. The selection of exterior materials also reflects an attempt to include design element from surrounding structures, with a neutral sandblasted concrete and bronze painted metal panels. The exterior treatments employ a color palette that echoes the natural adobe-colored walls and terracotta roof tiles of the city's Spanish Revival buildings (including the adjacent U.S. Post Office). There is also a commitment to preserve or replace existing street trees and to incorporate additional appropriate landscaping.

The proposed project would not directly demolish, destroy, relocate, touch, or alter any historic resources listed or eligible for listing on the National and/or California Register, or listed on the City's Historic Inventory. Furthermore, ~~given the restrained height and compatible design,~~ the garage design avoids or minimizes potential adverse impacts on the historic resources in the project area. The proposed project would not indirectly destroy a local cultural resource that is recognized by City Council resolution. Therefore, impacts would be ***less than significant***. No mitigation is required.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK