

3.10 Land Use and Recreation

This section characterizes potential project impacts on existing land use and recreation. For the purposes of this section, the analysis generally considers land uses within 0.25 miles of the project corridor from San Francisco to San Jose (2 miles south of Tamien Station). However, the focus of the impact analysis is on existing land uses and recreational facilities directly adjacent to the Caltrain right-of-way (ROW) or that cross the Caltrain ROW, such as bike paths.

The project corridor traverses the counties of San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara, extending from downtown San Francisco to south of downtown San Jose. This corridor encompasses portions of the following cities: San Francisco, Brisbane, South San Francisco, San Bruno, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, Redwood City, Atherton, Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and San Jose. Land uses in the corridor comprise the full range of urban development, with a diverse mix of uses adjacent to the Caltrain corridor in some locations, and more homogeneous industrial and commercial uses in others. The corridor includes numerous areas of single- or multi-family residential uses, as well as a variety of recreational land uses, that are directly adjacent to the Caltrain ROW.

As described in Section 2.5, *Required Permits and Approvals*, pursuant to SamTrans' enabling legislation (Public Utilities Code Section 103200 et seq.) and the 1991 Interstate Commerce Commission's approval of the JPB acquisition of the Caltrain line, JPB activities within the Caltrain ROW are exempt from local building and zoning codes and other land use ordinances. Thus, within the Caltrain ROW, no impacts on land use or recreation are expected. Consequently, the focus of analysis in this section is locations where project activities would occur outside the current Caltrain ROW.

The project areas with permanent facilities outside the Caltrain ROW are as follows:

- The two traction power substations (TPSs) in South San Francisco and San Jose could be outside of the ROW along with underground duct banks connecting them to the Caltrain ROW and overhead or underground duct banks connecting the TPS to the nearest PG&E substation. Each of the TPSs would have three options. ~~All~~ Three of the four options in South San Francisco would be outside of the ROW while two of the three options in San Jose would be outside of the ROW.
- The poles for the overhead contact system (OCS) alignment would be installed slightly (perhaps several feet) outside of the current ROW in an estimated ~~27~~ 29 locations for a total length of approximately ~~10,200~~ 9,300 feet. These areas would be acquired in fee (if on private land) or an easement would be acquired (if on public land) for the OCS.
- The electrical safety zone of 10 feet around the OCS alignment would extend outside of the current ROW ~~in an estimated 108 locations~~.
 - The Draft EIR presumed a worst-case electrical safety zone up to 24 feet from the outer track centerline.
 - The Final EIR describes that the electrical safety zone is more likely to be 21 feet in most two-track areas and 18 feet in most multi-track areas. Using a range between the Draft EIR and Final EIR safety zone assumptions, it is estimated that approximately 5 to 8 acres of new easement would be required on adjacent public road and rail ROW, 2 to 10 acres on private

1 residential, commercial, or industrial property, and 0.1 to 0.3 acres on parklands for a total
2 of approximately 7 to 18 acres.

- 3 ○ The JPB would acquire electrical safety easements from private landowners and public
4 agencies to allow vegetation safety maintenance and to maintain minimum clearances from
5 buildings to the OCS.

6 Analysis of potential cumulative land use impacts on future projects proposed along the Caltrain
7 ROW or within the ROW are discussed in Chapter 4, *Other CEQA-Related Analysis*.

8 **3.10.1 Existing Conditions**

9 **3.10.1.1 Regulatory Setting**

10 **Land Use**

11 This section presents relevant applicable land use and transportation plans. Please refer to
12 Appendix H, *Land Use Information*, for a list and discussion of all applicable plans for lands adjacent
13 to the project corridor.

14 **MTC Transportation 2035 Plan**

15 The MTC's *Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area (2035 Plan)* specifies how
16 anticipated federal, state, and local transportation funds will be spent in the nine-county Bay Area
17 during the next 25 years. The vision for Transportation 2035 is to support a prosperous and globally
18 competitive Bay Area economy, provide for a healthy and safe environment, and promote equitable
19 mobility opportunities to all residents. Among the cornerstones of the new plan are a joint regional
20 planning initiative known as FOCUS, which provides incentives for cities and counties to promote
21 future growth near transit in already urbanized portions of the Bay Area. Caltrain transit operating
22 and capital improvements are included in the 2035 Plan. Improvements to San Mateo County and
23 Santa Clara County stations, such as upgrades/relocation of platforms, pedestrian tunnels, and
24 parking improvements, are also included (Metropolitan Transportation Commission 2009).

25 **General Plans**

26 California Government Code Section 65301 requires every city and county to adopt a general plan.
27 General plans lay out the pattern of future residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, open
28 space, public, and recreational land uses within a community. Local jurisdictions implement their
29 general plans by adopting zoning, subdivision, grading, and other ordinances. Zoning identifies the
30 specific types of land uses or forms of development that may be allowed on a given site and
31 establishes the standards that are to be imposed on new development. Zoning regulations vary from
32 jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Typical zoning standards address the density and size of structures, the
33 siting of structures relative to parcel boundaries, architectural design, and the percentage of
34 building coverage allowed relative to the overall square footage of a parcel.

35 As noted above, the permanent facilities outside the ROW would be in various cities along the
36 project corridor. Appendix H includes a description of all the applicable general plans for these
37 cities.

1 **Specific, Area, and Precise Plans**

2 A specific plan is a tool for the systematic implementation of a city or county general plan. A specific
3 plan effectively establishes a link between implementing policies of the general plan and the
4 individual development proposals in a defined area. Precise plans are flexible documents adopted by
5 some California cities to facilitate the use of innovative or unconventional urban planning
6 techniques. Area plans are plans that cover specific subareas of a community. Within these plans,
7 general policies contained in the general plan elements are made more precise as the policies relate
8 to specific parts of the city.

9 The area of analysis overlaps with, or runs adjacent to, several adopted specific, area, or precise
10 plans that address land development in defined geographic areas within a jurisdiction. The plans
11 adjacent to the project corridor are listed in Appendix H. In addition, several plans that are adjacent
12 to the ROW are currently under review but not adopted, including the *South San Francisco*
13 *Downtown Specific Plan*, the *San Antonio Precise Plan* (Mountain View), the *Lawrence Station Area*
14 *Plan* (Sunnyvale), and the *Peery Park Specific Plan* (Sunnyvale). The *Millbrae Station Area Specific*
15 *Plan*, which includes the project corridor, was originally adopted in 1998 and is in the process of
16 being updated.

17 All options of TPS1 would be located in the South San Francisco *East of 101 Area Plan*, which covers
18 approximately 1,700 acres bounded by San Francisco Bay to the east, U.S. Highway 101 and the
19 Caltrain corridor to the west, the City of Brisbane to the north, and San Francisco International
20 Airport to the south (South San Francisco 1994). The overall goal is to recognize the unique
21 character of the East of 101 Area and to guide and relate development in a manner that protects and
22 enhances the area's physical, economic, and natural resources, while also encouraging appropriate
23 development in the area. TPS1 Options 1 and 3, would be within areas with Planned Commercial
24 land use designations in the area plan. TPS1 Option 2 would be within an area designated as
25 Planned Industrial.

26 None of the options for TPS2 in the City of San Jose would be within an area covered by a specific,
27 area, or precise plan. There are no proposed specific, area, or precise plans adjacent to or
28 encompassing the options for TPS1 or TPS2.

29 **Habitat Conservation Plans**

30 Habitat conservation plans (HCPs) are voluntarily developed for ecologically sensitive areas in order
31 to fulfill the requirements of the Endangered Species Act and the California Natural Community
32 Conservation Planning (NCCP) Act. These plans address impact mitigation and contribute to the
33 recovery of endangered species while enhancing and restoring habitats and natural systems.

34 The Caltrain corridor runs adjacent to the *San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan* in San
35 Mateo County, as described in Appendix H. In addition, the corridor bisects the northern portion of
36 the *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan*. The *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan* provides a framework for
37 promoting the protection and recovery of natural resources, including endangered species, while
38 streamlining the permitting process for development, infrastructure, and maintenance activities.
39 The *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan* allows Santa Clara County, the Santa Clara Valley Water District,
40 the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the cities of Gilroy, Morgan Hill, and San
41 José (collectively, the local partners or permittees) to receive endangered species "take" permits for
42 activities and projects they conduct and under their jurisdiction (ICF International 2012). The TPS2

1 options, Paralleling Station (PS) 7, and the Caltrain ROW from Santa Clara to south of Tamien Station
2 are within the *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan* area.

3 **3.10.1.2 Environmental Setting**

4 **Existing Land Uses in the Vicinity of the Caltrain Corridor**

5 The primary land use in the Proposed Project area is the rail ROW itself, portions of which have
6 existed since the 1860s. Surrounding land uses include commercial, industrial, open space, mixed
7 use, and residential uses. Land uses in the vicinity of the proposed paralleling and switching stations
8 and traction power substations are primarily industrial and commercial; however, at a few
9 locations, residential properties are adjacent to the existing ROW.

10 Land uses in the downtown San Francisco area of the Caltrain corridor are primarily urban and
11 industrial, with some retail, live/work loft, residential, and commercial uses. Between the 22nd
12 Street and Bayshore Station areas, land uses are primarily light industrial and warehouse with some
13 residential north of Paul Avenue. South of Paul Avenue to the Bayshore Station, there is a shift to a
14 more even distribution of light industrial and residential through Visitacion Valley, south of which
15 the primary use is light industrial.

16 There is primarily vacant land through the Brisbane lagoon area, with mainly light industrial and
17 warehouse uses and some residential and commercial uses through South San Francisco. San Bruno
18 presents a mixture of park/open space and low-density residential housing with some commercial
19 and light industrial uses. In Millbrae, the area to the west of the corridor is primarily commercial
20 and contains low-density businesses and residential uses. Industrial uses lie east of the ROW in
21 Millbrae. Transit-oriented development (TOD) uses surround the multi-modal Millbrae
22 Caltrain/BART station.

23 Land uses in the Burlingame segment of the corridor include commercial, residential, and industrial.
24 The tracks pass directly adjacent to Burlingame High School and Washington Park. Land use
25 adjacent to the Caltrain corridor within the City of San Mateo (from north to south) are commercial,
26 multi-family residential, neighborhood commercial, central business, office, service commercial,
27 manufacturing, and commercial. South of State Route (SR) 92 is the San Mateo County Event Center
28 and the under-construction Bay Meadows TOD project. Located on the other side of the tracks and
29 to the west of El Camino Real is Hillsdale Shopping Center.

30 The primary adjacent land uses within the City of Belmont are single-family residential and
31 commercial along the El Camino Real corridor. East and west¹ of the San Carlos segment are single-
32 family residential, local retail, and service/convenience commercial uses. Further to the east is U.S.
33 Highway 101 and predominantly industrial uses. The Redwood City segment provides a relatively
34 equal mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

35 The land uses in the Town of Atherton along the corridor are low-density, single-family residential
36 and one park. Holbrook-Palmer Park is adjacent to the corridor, to the east. The land uses in Menlo
37 Park are general commercial and varying types of residential from medium-density apartment to
38 single-family suburban. Burgess Park is adjacent to the corridor in the vicinity of downtown Menlo

¹ Note that the Caltrain corridor generally runs in a north-south direction. Although some segments are oriented in a northwest-southeast direction, for sake of consistency, this section assumes that the corridor is north-south in all segments.

1 Park. El Palo Alto Park and El Camino Park are located adjacent to the Caltrain ROW as it enters Palo
2 Alto, beyond which is the Stanford Shopping Center and Stanford University to the west. Palo Alto
3 High School is located adjacent to the railroad corridor. The majority of the area within 0.25 miles of
4 the corridor in Palo Alto contains single-family residential units.

5 The City of Mountain View has general industrial, residential, public facility, office, and arterial
6 commercial uses adjacent to the project corridor. Rengstorff Park is located adjacent to ROW. The
7 eastern section of the corridor within the City of Sunnyvale is primarily industrial with low- to
8 medium-density residential interspersed. Neighborhood shopping, general business, high-density
9 residential, and industrial residential uses are located to the west. Through the City of Santa Clara,
10 the adjacent uses consist of mixed use, moderate-density residential, and office/research and
11 development. Heavy industrial uses are located east of the railroad tracks, with light industrial,
12 research and development, and office uses located to the west. The San Jose International Airport is
13 located northeast of Santa Clara Station.

14 The College Park Station in San Jose is located near Bellarmine College Preparatory High School. The
15 SAP Center is adjacent to the Caltrain alignment just north of the San Jose Diridon Station. The
16 primary adjacent land uses in the City of San Jose are combined industrial/commercial, public park,
17 medium-low density to medium-density residential, light industrial, private recreation, campus
18 industrial, and the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve. Near Tamien Station is the Tamien Planned
19 Community, and farther to the south between the Capitol and Blossom Hill Stations is the
20 Communications Hill Planned Community. The main land uses in this planned community are single-
21 family detached and attached residential, parks/play fields, heavy industrial, and combined
22 industrial/commercial.

23 Table 3.10-1, below summarizes the predominant land uses adjacent to the Caltrain corridor.

24 **Existing Land Uses Adjacent to Paralleling Stations, Switching Station, and Traction** 25 **Power Substations**

26 The Proposed Project would involve constructing seven PSs, one switching station (SWS), and two
27 TPSs. The existing land uses in the vicinity of these project features are summarized below.

- 28 • **PS1** would be within the Caltrain corridor on the northeast corner of Mariposa Street and
29 Pennsylvania Street in San Francisco. The site is surrounded by industrial land uses. Although
30 this empty parcel of land is not included as part of an area plan, it is adjacent to areas included
31 within the *Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan* to the south and west and areas included in
32 the *Central Waterfront Area Plan* to the southeast.
- 33 • **PS2** would be within the Caltrain corridor to the southwest of the Tunnel Avenue/Blanken
34 Avenue intersection in San Francisco. The site is surrounded by industrial land uses. The empty
35 parcel of land is not within an existing specific, area, or precise plan.

1 **Table 3.10-1. Predominant Land Uses within 0.25 Miles of the Caltrain Corridor**

City/Segment	East/West of Corridor	Predominant Land Uses ^{a,b}
San Francisco		
San Francisco 4th and King Station to 22nd Street Station	East	Mixed use, residential, commercial, parks/open space, education/public/semi-public, industrial, commercial
22nd Street Station to Bayshore Station	West	Mixed use, industrial, residential
	East	Industrial, residential, education/public/semi-public
	West	Industrial, residential
Brisbane	East	Commercial, parks/open space
	West	Commercial, parks/open space, residential
South San Francisco	East	Commercial/industrial
	West	Residential, commercial, industrial, mixed use
San Bruno	East	Industrial, residential, commercial
	West	Residential, commercial
Millbrae	East	Parks/open space, industrial, residential, mixed use
	West	Residential, commercial, mixed-use
Burlingame		
North Burlingame border to Broadway Station	East	Mixed use (commercial/industrial)
	West	Commercial, residential, parks/open space, education
Broadway Station to south Burlingame border	East	Commercial, residential, mixed use
	West	Commercial, residential
San Mateo		
North San Mateo border to San Mateo Station	East	Residential, education
	West	Residential, commercial, mixed use
San Mateo Station to Hayward Park Station	East	Commercial, residential, industrial, education
	West	Commercial, residential, mixed use, parks/open space
Hayward Park Station to Hillsdale Station	East	Mixed use, commercial, residential, public space
	West	Commercial, residential, mixed use
Hillsdale Station to South San Mateo border	East	Residential, commercial, education
	West	Commercial, mixed use, residential
Belmont	East	Residential, commercial, education
	West	Residential, commercial, mixed use, education
San Carlos	East	Industrial, residential, commercial
	West	Residential, commercial

City/Segment	East/West of Corridor	Predominant Land Uses ^{a,b}
Redwood City	East	Residential, education/public/semi-public, mixed use, industrial, commercial
	West	Residential, education, commercial
North Fair Oaks (unincorporated)	East	Industrial, residential, commercial
	West	Residential, commercial
Atherton	East	Residential, parks/open space
	West	Residential, public/semi-public space
Menlo Park	East	Residential, commercial, public/semi-public space, parks/open space
	West	Commercial, residential
Palo Alto	East	Residential, mixed use, commercial
	West	Residential, education/public/semi-public spaces, commercial
Mountain View		
San Antonio Station to Mountain View Station	East	Residential, office , industrial , mixed use
	West	Residential, office , commercial , parks/open space, industrial
Mountain View Station to South Mountain View border	East	Residential, industrial/ office
	West	Residential , Commercial , industrial / office , residential - commercial
Sunnyvale		
North Sunnyvale border to Sunnyvale Station	East	Residential, industrial
	West	Residential, education/public/semi-public space, commercial, industrial
Sunnyvale Station to Lawrence Station	East	Mixed use (residential/industrial), residential, industrial
	West	Commercial, residential, mixed use (residential/ industrial)
Santa Clara	East	Industrial
	West	Residential, education/public/semi-public spaces, commercial
San Jose		
North San Jose border to College Park Station	East	Commercial/industrial, industrial
	West	Residential, industrial, education/public/semi-public spaces
College Park Station to Diridon Station	East	Commercial/industrial, industrial, commercial, mixed use, parks/open space
	West	Residential, mixed use, commercial, industrial
Diridon Station to Tamien Station	East	Residential, mixed use, commercial/industrial, commercial, parks/open space
	West	Residential, mixed use, mixed use, parks/open space
Tamien Station to Project terminus	East	Residential, industrial, parks/open space
	West	Residential, industrial, parks/open space

Source: Metropolitan Transportation Commission 2012.

^a Includes prominent, large-scale land uses. Most segments include small parks/open spaces, commercial blocks, and small educational facilities.

^b Unless otherwise specified, “mixed use” refers to residential/commercial mixed use.

- 1 ● **TPS1** is proposed in South San Francisco. Three potential sites are being considered that are
2 outside the Caltrain ROW. Option 1 is located south of Grand Avenue along the west side of
3 Gateway Boulevard in a parking lot (under lease from PG&E) adjacent to industrial/
4 commercial/office uses, including a PG&E facility. Option 2 consists of vacant land south of
5 Grand Avenue and west of Harbor Way adjacent to R&D/office uses. Option 3 is located to the
6 south along Gateway Boulevard on vacant land west of West Harris Avenue adjacent to
7 hotel/R&D/office uses (but for which there is a pending application with the City of South San
8 Francisco for a 128-room hotel expansion). One potential site is being considered inside the
9 Caltrain ROW. Option 4 is located adjacent to the Caltrain tracks next to the South San Francisco
10 Caltrain Station. The potential sites for TPS1 are surrounded by industrial and commercial and
11 office uses and are within the *East of 101 Area Plan*. Specific land uses in the area include rental
12 car parking lots, storage facilities, distribution centers, truck storage areas, and an electrical
13 substation. Some smaller office buildings are located within the area.
- 14 ● **PS3** is proposed to be located north of Broadway in Burlingame, adjacent to areas covered by
15 the *North Burlingame/Rollins Road Specific Plan*. PS3 Option 1 would be within an existing
16 storage area in the Caltrain corridor, just north of the Broadway Station parking lot. The site is
17 separated from residential development to the west by a major arterial route, California Drive,
18 which fronts along the Caltrain ROW. PS3 Option 2 would be within the Caltrain ROW at the end
19 of Star Way. This site would be adjacent to existing parking associated with commercial and
20 commercial/industrial uses ~~are~~ adjacent to the corridor.
- 21 ● **PS4** has ~~two~~ three potential sites, ~~both~~ all of which are within the Hillsdale Station parking lot in
22 San Mateo. Surrounding areas include commercial uses along El Camino Real. ~~Both~~ All potential
23 sites for PS4 are located adjacent to areas covered by the *Rail Corridor Transit-Oriented*
24 *Development Plan*, the *Bay Meadows Phase II Specific Plan*, and the *El Camino Real Master Plan*.
25 All potential sites are located within the area covered by the Hillsdale Station Area Plan.
- 26 ● **SWS1 Option 1** is proposed to be located on land owned by SamTrans adjacent to the Caltrain
27 ROW. This site is separated from residences on the west side by both the Caltrain ROW and
28 Westmoreland Avenue, a local arterial route. This location is within a triangular area bound by
29 railroad tracks on all three sides and is within an industrial area. SWS1 Option 1 would be
30 located adjacent to areas covered by the *North Fair Oaks Community Plan*. Although SWS1
31 Option 1 would not be located within the Caltrain ROW, since the land is owned by SamTrans
32 and is vacant, no additional land would need to be acquired and no existing land use would be
33 displaced. SWS1 Option 2 would be located within the Caltrain ROW in an existing storage yard
34 adjacent to the Caltrain tracks. This site is adjacent to the Orchard Supply Hardware and Costco
35 on Middlefield Road in Redwood City and would not be immediately adjacent to the area
36 covered by the North Fair Oaks Community Plan.
- 37 ● **PS5** has ~~two~~ three potential sites, ~~both~~ all of which would be within the Caltrain corridor in Palo
38 Alto. Option 1 is located east of the tracks and west of Alma Street at the intersection of Alma
39 and Greenmeadow Way which is across the street from the Greenmeadow residential
40 neighborhood.² Option 1B is located east of the tracks and west of Alma Street just south of the
41 intersection of Alma Street and Ferne Avenue and across the street from residences on Ferne
42 Avenue backing onto Alma Street and a Jehovah's Witness Kingdom Hall. Option 2 is south of

² As described in Section 3.4, Cultural Resources, the historic portion of the Greenmeadow neighborhood is not adjacent to Alma St. and is separated from Alma St. by approximately 250 feet of other non-historic development.

1 Page Mill Road west of the tracks and is immediately adjacent to a mixed residential/
 2 commercial development (195 Page Mill Road) under construction and near other commercial
 3 areas surrounded by industrial uses. The closest residential uses relative to Option 2 are located
 4 approximately 0.05 mile to the east, across the Caltrain tracks and Alma Street.

- 5 • **PS6** has two potential sites, both of which would be within the Caltrain corridor in Sunnyvale.
 6 Option 1 is located to the east of the tracks and west of East Hendy Avenue, which separates the
 7 area from the residential neighborhoods to east. Option 2 is located to the southwest of Mathilda
 8 Avenue and West Evelyn Avenue within the northern portion of the Sunnyvale Station parking
 9 lot. This area consists of commercial uses and a City park (Plaza del Sol) across West Evelyn
 10 Avenue from the Caltrain parking lot. Option 2 is ~~directly adjacent to~~ within the areas covered by
 11 the Downtown Specific Plan to the east.
- 12 • **TPS2** is proposed in San Jose. Two out of the three potential sites outside of the Caltrain
 13 corridor are being considered. Option 1 is located on VTA property on Newhall Street. A PG&E
 14 substation is located directly across Newhall Street, north of Interstate 880 (I-880). Surrounding
 15 uses at this location are mostly industrial, with residential uses to the east. Option 2 is located
 16 west of Stockton Avenue and south of I-880. This site and its surroundings have industrial uses.
 17 Option 3 is on JPB property near the Caltrain Centralized Equipment Maintenance and
 18 Operations Facility (CEMOF) and is surrounded by industrial uses. All TPS2 options are located
 19 within the *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan* area.
- 20 • **PS7** is proposed to be constructed near Communications Hill in South San Jose. This site is
 21 located in the Caltrain ROW, south of Communications Hill Boulevard. The land use adjacent to
 22 the proposed location is parks (Kurte Park)/open space with new residential development
 23 located on Communications Hill. The site is adjacent to areas covered by the *Communications*
 24 *Hill Specific Plan*, as summarized in Appendix H, *Land Use Information*. Under Project Variant 1,
 25 PS7 would be located on vacant land south of the Tamien Station along Alma Avenue between
 26 the Caltrain tracks and State Route 87. Variant A is on land owned by Caltrans. Variant B is
 27 partially within the JPB ROW and partially on land owned by Caltrans. Both sites would be
 28 across the railroad tracks from an apartment high-rise apartment building north of Alma
 29 Avenue and a townhouse development located south of Alma Avenue.

30 **Existing Land Uses Where OCS Alignment or OCS Electrical Safety Zone Would Be** 31 **Outside Caltrain ROW**

32 The OCS alignment would be installed slightly (perhaps several feet) outside of the current ROW in
 33 an estimated ~~27-20~~ locations for a total length of approximately ~~10,200-9,300~~ feet. Approximately
 34 ~~8,700-7,100~~ feet of the OCS alignment would be installed several feet outside of the current ROW in
 35 ~~9~~ locations in adjacent road or rail rights of way in San Francisco, South San Francisco, Millbrae,
 36 Burlingame, Belmont, Redwood City, Mountain View, ~~Santa Clara~~ and San Jose. In addition,
 37 approximately ~~1,400-2,200~~ feet of OCS alignment in ~~8-11~~ locations would be installed several feet
 38 outside of the current ROW on adjacent commercial property ~~in nine~~ locations in South San
 39 Francisco, ~~Brisbane~~, Sunnyvale and San Jose.

40 The exact amount of electrical safety zone encroachment of private land would depend on the width
 41 of the zone, the width of the ROW, and the proximity of private land to the ROW. In the Draft EIR, a
 42 worst-case assumption for the width of the safety zone of 24 feet was used. In the Final EIR, as
 43 described in Chapter 2, Project Description, the more likely width of the safety zone from the outer

1 track centerline would be 21 feet (in two-track areas) and 18 feet (in multi-track areas). Thus, this
2 EIR discloses a range of potentially effects.

3 • Worst-case estimates (using a 24-foot electrical safety zone):

4 ○ The electrical safety zone of 10 feet around the OCS alignment would extend outside of the
5 current ROW in adjacent road or rail rights of way in ~~46 locations~~ in San Francisco, South
6 San Francisco, San Bruno, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, Redwood
7 City, San Mateo County (North Fair Oaks area), Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Santa
8 Clara, and San Jose.

9 ○ The electrical safety zone of 10 feet around the OCS alignment would extend outside of the
10 current ROW in adjacent residential property (~~11 locations~~ approximately 98 parcels³ in
11 San Francisco, Belmont, San Mateo County (North Fair Oaks area) ~~Redwood City~~, Atherton,
12 Menlo Park, Palo Alto, ~~Mountain View~~, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and San Jose); commercial
13 property (~~47 locations~~ approximately 84 parcels in San Francisco, Brisbane, South San
14 Francisco, San Bruno, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont, Redwood City, San Mateo
15 County (North Fair Oaks area), Menlo Park, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and San Jose) and park
16 areas (four locations in Redwood City, Atherton, Palo Alto, and Santa Clara). The four park
17 locations are: Broadway-Arguello Park (Redwood City); Holbrook-Palmer Park (Atherton);
18 Peers Park (Palo Alto); and Reed Street Dog Park (Santa Clara).

19 • Likely estimates (using 21 foot electrical safety zone in two-track areas and 18-foot zone in
20 multi-track areas):

21 ○ The electrical safety zone of 10 feet around the OCS alignment would extend outside of the
22 current ROW in adjacent road or rail rights of way in San Francisco, South San Francisco,
23 San Bruno, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, Redwood City, San Mateo
24 County (North Fair Oaks area), Atherton, Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale,
25 Santa Clara, and San Jose.⁴

26 ○ The electrical safety zone of 10 feet around the OCS alignment would extend outside of the
27 current ROW in adjacent residential property (approximately 34 parcels in San Francisco,
28 Belmont, San Mateo County (North Fair Oaks area), Atherton, Menlo Park, and Sunnyvale);
29 commercial property (approximately 47 parcels in Brisbane, San Mateo, Belmont, Redwood
30 City, Menlo Park, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and San Jose) and park areas (four locations in
31 Redwood City, Atherton, Palo Alto, and Santa Clara). The four park locations are: Broadway-
32 Arguello Park (Redwood City); Holbrook-Palmer Park (Atherton); Peers Park (Palo Alto);
33 and Reed Street Dog Park (Santa Clara).

34 Recreation Facilities

35 Parks, recreation, and open space facilities are generally overseen by the parks and recreation
36 departments of the cities through which the Caltrain corridor passes. These municipalities generally
37 use planning documents, such as park master plans, to oversee the acquisition, preservation,
38 improvement, maintenance, and expansion of local parklands and trail networks. Additionally, as

³ Note that the DEIR used “locations” in terms of areas of encroachment which could include multiple parcels. This was updated in the FEIR to use actual property parcels.

⁴ Some of the differences with the revised estimates for the Final EIR have to do with updates to the preliminary engineering, not the change in the electrical safety zone widths and thus there are some additional estimate areas of encroachment in road or rail ROWs.

1 described above, general plans of each jurisdiction include goals and policies addressing parks and
 2 recreational facilities. Other organizations, such as the San Francisco Bay Conservation and
 3 Development Commission and the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District, oversee parks, recreation and
 4 open space lands on a regional level and provide guidance on issues that transcend the authority of
 5 local jurisdictions.

6 Table 3.10-2 summarizes the park and open space facilities adjacent to the corridor with no
 7 separation by existing streets or freeways and Appendix H include a comprehensive list of all parks
 8 within 0.25 mile of the ROW. In addition to the existing parks, several parks are proposed adjacent
 9 to the ROW in the cities of San Mateo, Redwood City, Santa Clara, and San Jose.

10 **Table 3.10-2. Publicly Owned Parks and Recreational Resources Directly Adjacent to the Caltrain**
 11 **Corridor**

Facility Name	Location
Lions Park	1st Avenue, San Bruno
Lomita Park	San Anselmo Avenue/San Juan Avenue, San Bruno
Trinta Park	150 19th Avenue, San Mateo
John S Roselli Memorial Park	1044 Middlefield Road, Redwood City
Main Street Park	Main Street/Beech Street, Redwood City
Broadway Arguello Park	Broadway Avenue, Redwood City
Holbrook-Palmer Park	150 Watkins Avenue, Atherton
El Camino Park	100 El Camino Real, Palo Alto
El Palo Alto Park	117 Palo Alto Avenue, Palo Alto
Embarcadero Bike Path	Parallel to Caltrain corridor, Palo Alto
Peers Park	1899 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto
Rengstorff Park and Pool	201 South Rengstorff Avenue, Mountain View
Resident Park	North of Chiquita Avenue/Villa Street, Mountain View
Bracher Park	2700 Chromite Drive, Santa Clara
Reed Street Dog Park	888 Reed Street, Santa Clara
Fuller Park	Fuller Avenue, San Jose
Kurte Park ^a	Communication Hills Boulevard, San Jose

Source: ICF International 2013.

^a PS7 facility would be adjacent to Kurte Park. With Project Variant 1, PS7 would not be located adjacent to Kurte Park.

12

13 **3.10.2 Impact Analysis**

14 **3.10.2.1 Methods for Analysis**

15 **Land Use**

16 This analysis considers existing uses and the existing general plans, specific plans, area plans, and
 17 precise plans along the Caltrain ROW, as well as applicable regional plans. In addition, GIS maps
 18 documenting existing land uses were created and site reconnaissance has been conducted.

1 **Recreation**

2 In determining whether the Proposed Project would have a significant impact on parks and open
3 spaces, this analysis considers recreational facilities within 0.25 mile of the Caltrain corridor. This
4 assessment considers potential Project impacts on park design and physical conditions, existing
5 vegetation, and how a park would be used while the Proposed Project is under construction and in
6 operation.

7 **3.10.2.2 Thresholds of Significance**

8 In accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Proposed Project would be
9 considered to have a significant effect if it would result in any of the conditions listed below.

- 10 • Physically divide an established community.
- 11 • Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction
12 over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal
13 program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an
14 environmental effect.
- 15 • Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.
- 16 • Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such
17 that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.
- 18 • Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities
19 that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

20 As noted above, local land use plans are not applicable within the Caltrain ROW. Consequently,
21 project activities that remain within the Caltrain ROW would not conflict with local land use plans,
22 policies, or regulations.

23 **3.10.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

24 Project Variant 1 is addressed wherever applicable in the analysis below.

Impact LUR-1	Physically divide an established community
Level of Impact	Less than significant

25 **Construction**

26 Community cohesion addresses the degree to which residents have a sense of belonging to their
27 neighborhood or experience attachment to community groups and institutions as a result of
28 continued association over time. Possible community cohesion impacts of a project include effects
29 on interactions among persons and groups, whether certain people would be isolated from others,
30 and the perceived impact on community quality of life.

31 The construction of OCS poles and wires within the existing ROW could involve short-term,
32 temporary detours or street closures, which could separate an established community. However,
33 these detours and closures would be temporary and would not significantly impact access to or from
34 surrounding areas. In addition, the paralleling and switching stations and the traction power
35 substations would be located either within or adjacent to the corridor, which would not divide an

1 established community during construction. Consequently, construction impacts would be less than
2 significant.

3 **Operation**

4 The Proposed Project would primarily place new OCS poles and wires within the Caltrain ROW, with
5 some portions of the OCS alignment located outside the Caltrain ROW. These facilities would be
6 included within or adjacent to an existing, active commuter and freight rail corridor. Therefore, their
7 operation would not constitute any new physical or psychological barriers that would divide,
8 disrupt, or isolate neighborhoods, individuals, or community focal points in the corridor. Access
9 across the ROW at existing roads and bike paths would be maintained under the Proposed Project.
10 Although there would be some temporary delays to crossing the ROW during peak hours due to
11 increased gate-down time at select at-grade crossings, which may result in a potential traffic impact
12 (see Section 3.14, *Transportation and Traffic*), the increase in gate-down time during peak hours
13 would not create an actual barrier between communities on either side of the Caltrain ROW.

14 The Proposed Project would place up to 10 traction power facilities (TPFs), consisting of two
15 traction power substations, one switching station, and seven paralleling stations, along the corridor
16 from San Francisco to San Jose. With the exception of the three of the four TPS options in South San
17 Francisco and two of the three TPS options in San Jose, these facilities would be within the Caltrain
18 ROW. The two traction power substations would be located in areas of existing commercial and
19 industrial development. Due to their relatively small size, and location within similar land uses, none
20 of these facilities would have the potential to divide or disrupt an existing residential neighborhood
21 or community. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Project would not divide an established
22 community beyond existing conditions. The impact would be less than significant.

23 Under Project Variant 1, described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, PS7 would be located between
24 the Caltrain tracks and State Route 87 adjacent to Alma Avenue and the proposed use would not
25 divide or disrupt an existing neighborhood or community. Therefore, Project Variant 1 would not
26 change the significance determination of this impact.

Impact LUR-2 Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Proposed Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and compatibility with existing surrounding land uses

Level of Impact Less than significant

27 **Construction and Operation**

28 The Proposed Project would involve construction of OCS poles and wires primarily within the
29 Caltrain ROW (with some OCS poles and wires outside the Caltrain ROW), 10 TPFs along the
30 corridor, and new or improved bridge barriers.

31 The proposed TPFs would be constructed primarily within the Caltrain corridor and would be
32 placed adjacent to areas zoned for industrial or commercial/office use, except for a few locations
33 near residential areas. All Three out of the four proposed TPSs in South San Francisco and two out of
34 the three proposed TPSs in San Jose would be constructed outside of the ROW. However, in general,
35 these facilities would be consistent with land use designations for each local jurisdiction and would
36 not substantially impact surrounding land uses, as discussed in more detail below.

1 The OCS facilities would be primarily constructed within the existing, active commuter and freight
2 rail corridor. However, in some cases, the OCS alignment would be located just outside the Caltrain
3 ROW on commercial property or in existing road and rail rights-of-way. While the OCS facilities
4 would slightly encroach on adjacent property in a number of locations, as discussed below, the
5 placement of OCS facilities in these areas would not require a change in existing land uses, nor
6 substantially hinder future site development.

7 Most of the electrical safety zone needed around the OCS facilities would be within the Caltrain
8 ROW. However, in a number of areas, the electrical safety zone would be located in part or in whole
9 outside the Caltrain ROW on residential or commercial property or in existing road and rail rights-
10 of-way. The primary effect of placement of the electrical safety zone in these areas outside the
11 Caltrain ROW would be the removal of existing vegetation and maintenance of an area clear of
12 vegetation within 10 feet of the OCS alignment. In addition, establishment of the electrical safety
13 would prevent future structural improvements within 6 feet of the OCS alignment. As discussed
14 further below, the removal of vegetation would, in some cases, be a significant biological and
15 aesthetic impact and mitigation is recommended to address these biological and aesthetics impacts.
16 However, due to the limited area of effect on any particular parcel, the placement of the electrical
17 safety zone and the land use constraints required for the zone would not be considered a significant
18 land use impact because they would not result in displacement of current land use or substantial
19 restrictions on future land uses.

20 **Compatibility with Existing Land Uses**

21 As shown in Table 3.10-3, construction and operation of the TPFs would be consistent with existing
22 site and surrounding land uses.

23 For the placement of OCS poles and establishment of an electrical safety zone, the current analysis
24 has not identified any locations where the Proposed Project would displace existing structures or
25 facilities. Vegetation clearance would be necessary on certain residential, commercial/industrial,
26 and road/rail ROW parcels but would not actually displace existing residential, commercial,
27 industrial, road or rail uses. Impacts on parks due to vegetation clearance are discussed separately
28 under Impact LUR-3 below.

29 **Consistency with Local General Plans, Specific Plans, Area Plans, and Precise Plans**

30 The Proposed Project would generally be consistent with the local plans and policies, including land
31 use designations and zoning, except for the TPS sites and PS4 discussed below. The majority of the
32 Proposed Project, including OCS poles and wires, the paralleling stations, and the switching station,
33 would be located within the existing Caltrain ROW and would, therefore, not impact the adjacent
34 land use plans (PS7 Variant A and B would be located partially or entirely on vacant land owned by
35 Caltrans). Bridge barriers would be constructed or enhanced on existing roadway bridges across the
36 Caltrain alignment. Overbridge protection barriers would be 6.5 feet high above sidewalk or
37 pavement level and placed along the parapet of the bridge at least 10 feet from the closest energized
38 conductors crossing underneath. Although these barriers could result in visual impacts (as
39 discussed in Section 3.1, *Aesthetics*), they would be within existing transportation infrastructure and
40 would not conflict with local plans.

41

Table 3.10-3. Traction Power Facility Compatibility with Existing Land Uses

Traction Power Facility	City/Jurisdiction	Location and Existing Land Uses	Land Use Compatibility
Paralleling Station 1	San Francisco	Within Caltrain corridor to the west of the tracks. Vacant lot that is surrounded by industrial land uses.	Compatible. PS1 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.
Paralleling Station 2	San Francisco	Within Caltrain corridor to the west of the tracks. Vacant lot that is surrounded by industrial land uses.	Compatible. PS2 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.
Traction Power Substation 1, Option 1	South San Francisco	Outside of the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks, and to the west of Gateway Boulevard. Parking lot that is surrounded by commercial/industrial land uses. The ductbank from the ROW to this site would be placed on an existing rail spur. The connection to the PG&E substation would be directly to the north where there an existing PG&E substation.	Compatible. TPS1 would be approximately 150 feet by 200 feet. Although it would be outside of the existing ROW, TPS1 would be consistent with the height and bulk of the surrounding warehouse and light industrial buildings and consistent with the adjacent PG&E substation.
Traction Power Substation 1, Option 2	South San Francisco	Outside of the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks, and to the east of Gateway Boulevard. Vacant parcel that is surrounded by commercial/ industrial/ <u>office</u> land uses. The ductbank from the ROW to this site would be placed on an existing rail spur. The connection to the PG&E substation would be to the northwest where there an existing PG&E substation and require an underground or overhead crossing on Gateway Boulevard.	Compatible. TPS1 would be approximately 150 feet by 200 feet. Although it would be outside of the existing ROW, TPS1 would be consistent with the height, bulk and characteristics of the surrounding <u>office, R&D,</u> warehouse and light industrial buildings and the PG&E substation located across Gateway Boulevard. The addition of overhead connection to the PG&E substation (if underground ductbanks are not used) would be consistent with existing overhead transmission lines in the area.
Traction Power Substation 1, Option 3	South San Francisco	Outside of the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks, and to the south of Gateway Boulevard. Vacant parcel that is surrounded by commercial/ industrial land uses. The ductbank from the ROW to this site would be placed under Gateway Boulevard and an existing parking lot, and along an existing rail spur. The connection to the PG&E substation would be to the north where there an existing PG&E substation and would require either an underground ductbank or overhead transmission line along Gateway Boulevard.	Compatible. TPS1 would be approximately 150 feet by 200 feet. Although it would be outside of the existing ROW, TPS1 would be consistent with the height and bulk of the surrounding warehouse and light industrial buildings. The addition of overhead connection to the PG&E substation along Gateway Boulevard (if underground ductbanks are not used) would be consistent with existing overhead transmission lines in the area.

Traction Power Facility	City/Jurisdiction	Location and Existing Land Uses	Land Use Compatibility
<u>Traction Power Substation 1, Option 4</u>	<u>South San Francisco</u>	<u>Within Caltrain corridor to the west of the tracks. Existing parking lot for South San Francisco Caltrain Station. Adjacent to commercial uses and associated parking.</u>	<p><u>There is a pending application for a 128-room hotel on the Option 3 site with the City of South San Francisco. If this hotel were built on the site, a substation would not be a compatible use.</u></p> <p><u>Compatible. TPS1 would be approximately 150 feet by 200 feet. Would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.</u></p>
<u>Paralleling Station 3, Option 1</u>	<u>Burlingame</u>	<p><u>The ductbank or overhead transmission line would cross the Caltrain ROW, a parking lot in commercial areas east of the ROW, and Grand Avenue.</u></p> <p>Within the Caltrain corridor to the west of the tracks. Adjacent to the Broadway parking lot within a storage area. Surrounded by residential land uses to the north and west and commercial land uses to the south.</p>	<p><u>The buried duct bank or overhead transmission line would be compatible with and would not substantially hinder railway, commercial parking, and roadway uses.</u></p> <p>Compatible. PS3 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within 100 feet of residences to the west, but would be buffered by California Drive. PS3 would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.</p>
<u>Paralleling Station 3, Option 2</u>	<u>Burlingame</u>	<u>Within the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks. Adjacent to a parking lot for commercial/industrial uses.</u>	<p><u>Compatible. PS3 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. PS3 would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.</u></p>
<u>Paralleling Station 4, Option 1</u>	<u>San Mateo</u>	Within the northern portion of the Hillsdale Station parking lot to the west of the corridor. Surrounded by commercial land uses.	<p>Compatible <u>with existing uses</u>. PS4 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses. <u>See discussion of cumulative impacts with planned future uses in the Hillsdale Station Area Plan.</u></p>
<u>Paralleling Station 4, Option 2</u>	<u>San Mateo</u>	Within the southern portion of the Hillsdale Station parking lot to the west of the corridor. Surrounded by commercial land uses.	<p>Compatible <u>with existing uses</u>. PS4 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses. <u>See discussion of cumulative impacts with planned future uses in the Hillsdale Station Area Plan.</u></p>

Traction Power Facility	City/Jurisdiction	Location and Existing Land Uses	Land Use Compatibility
<u>Paralleling Station 4, Option 3</u>	<u>San Mateo</u>	<u>Within the southern portion of the Hillsdale Station parking lot to the west of the corridor, to the south of Hillsdale Boulevard. Surrounded by commercial land uses.</u>	<u>Compatible. PS4 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.</u>
<u>Switching Station 1, Option 1</u>	<u>San Mateo County (North Fair Oaks)</u>	<u>Within the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks. Parcel used as a storage facility. Surrounded by industrial land uses.</u>	<u>Compatible. SWS1 would be approximately 80 feet by 120 feet. Would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.</u>
<u>Switching Station 1, Option 2</u>	<u>Redwood City</u>	<u>Within the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks. Parcel used as a storage facility. Surrounded by industrial land uses.</u>	<u>Compatible. SWS1 would be approximately 80 feet by 120 feet. Would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.</u>
<u>Paralleling Station 5, Option 1</u>	<u>Palo Alto</u>	<u>Within the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks. Vacant parcel. Railroad ROW to the west. Alma Street to the east. Surrounded by Residential land uses <u>across Alma Street.</u></u>	<u>Compatible. PS5 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within 100 feet of residences to the east, but would be buffered by Alma Street. PS5 would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.</u>
<u>Paralleling Station 5, Option 1B</u>	<u>Palo Alto</u>	<u>Within the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks. Vacant parcel. Railroad ROW to the west. Alma Street to the east. Residential land uses and Jehovah's Witness Kingdom Hall across Alma Street.</u>	<u>Compatible. PS5 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within 100 feet of residences to the east, but would be buffered by Alma Street. PS5 would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.</u>
<u>Paralleling Station 5, Option 2</u>	<u>Palo Alto</u>	<u>Within the Caltrain corridor to the west of the tracks. Vacant parcel adjacent to existing communications building. Adjacent to industrial and mixed residential/commercial development under construction. Commercial uses in vicinity. land uses. Residential uses are separated from site by the Caltrain ROW and Alma Street.</u>	<u>Compatible. PS5 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within 150 feet of residences to the east, but would be buffered by the ROW and Alma Street. PS5 would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses. <u>New development is oriented inward to courtyard and not eastward toward the ROW. Mitigation Measure AES-2b would help to buffer new development to the west in terms of visual aesthetics.</u></u>

Traction Power Facility	City/Jurisdiction	Location and Existing Land Uses	Land Use Compatibility
Paralleling Station 6, Option 1	Sunnyvale	Within the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks. Vacant parcel. Residential land uses to the east.	Compatible. PS6 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within 100 feet of residences to the east, but would be buffered by East Hendy Avenue. PS6 would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.
Paralleling Station 6, Option 2	Sunnyvale	Within the northern portion of the Sunnyvale Station parking lot to the west of the Caltrain corridor. Adjacent to commercial land uses.	Compatible. PS6 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within 120 feet of residences to the east, but would be buffered by the Caltrain ROW. PS6 would be within the Caltrain station parking lot and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.
Traction Power Substation 2, Option 1	San Jose	Outside of the Caltrain corridor to the east. Within an empty large industrial parcel. Surrounded by industrial and industrial/commercial land uses with PG&E substation (the PG&E substation is between Newhall Street and I-880). Route of ductbank to the Caltrain ROW would cross industrial/vacant land. Route of transmission line from PG&E substation would be directly across Newhall Street as site is adjacent to PG&E substation.	Compatible. TPS2 would be approximately 150 feet by 200 feet. Although it would be outside of the existing ROW, TPS2 would be consistent with the height and bulk of the surrounding warehouse buildings and existing land uses, including the PG&E substation. The addition of overhead connection to the PG&E station (if underground ductbanks are not used) would be consistent with existing overhead transmission lines in the area.
Traction Power Substation 2, Option 2	San Jose	Outside of the Caltrain corridor to the east. Within an industrial parcel in current use. Surrounded by industrial land uses. Route of ductbank to the Caltrain ROW would cross industrial land. Route of transmission line from PG&E substation would be across I-880.	Compatible. TPS2 would be approximately 150 feet by 200 feet. Although it would be outside of the existing ROW, TPS2 would be consistent with the height and bulk of the surrounding warehouse buildings and existing land uses, including the nearby PG&E substation. Site is located on south side of an industrial parcel and is used for parking at present. Addition of TPS2 may displace existing industrial use on parcel.
Traction Power Substation 2, Option 3	San Jose	Outside of the Caltrain corridor to the east. Within parking lot and vacant lot used by Caltrain as part of CEMOF. Surrounded by industrial land uses and railway lines.	Compatible. TPS2 would be approximately 150 feet by 200 feet. Would be within land owned by Caltrain. The building would be consistent with the height and bulk of the surrounding buildings. May displace some existing parking and use of the empty lot for temporary staging, but parking and staging can be accommodated on other parts of the facility.

Traction Power Facility	City/Jurisdiction	Location and Existing Land Uses	Land Use Compatibility
Paralleling Station 7	San Jose	Within the Caltrain corridor to the east of the tracks. Vacant parcel adjacent to Kurte Park. Surrounded by parks/open space land uses.	Compatible. PS7 would be approximately 80 feet by 40 feet. Would be within the ROW and consistent with the existing Caltrain operations and surrounding land uses.
<u>Variant 1 Paralleling Station 7 (Variants A and B)</u>	<u>San Jose</u>	<u>On a vacant lot along Alma Avenue between Caltrain tracks and State Route 87, near Tamien Station owned by Caltrans (Variant A) or Caltrans/IPB (Variant B). Residential areas are located across the railroad tracks from the PS7 variant locations.</u>	<u>Compatible. The variants would be adjacent to the existing train tracks, SR87, and the VTA light rail tracks and consistent with existing Caltrain and freeway transportation uses. Although located across the tracks from several residential areas, given the limited size of the facility and the separation and context, the new facility would not result in any fundamental incompatibility with adjacent uses.</u>

Source for adjacent land use identification: Metropolitan Transportation Commission 2012.

1 It is important to note that while CEQA requires an EIR to disclose potential inconsistencies with
2 local plans, an inconsistency on its own is not considered a significant impact under CEQA unless it
3 were to result in a significant physical impact on the environment. Thus, the analysis below focuses
4 on two things: 1) is the Proposed Project consistent with local land use plans; and 2) if there is an
5 inconsistency, would it result in a significant physical impact on the environment, if for example, it
6 were to displace planned development to an alternative location that might result in secondary
7 significant impacts.

8 The TPS facilities would be constructed outside of the ROW in locations addressed by the *South San*
9 *Francisco General Plan*, the *East of 101 Area Plan*, and the *Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan*. No
10 plans that are currently being developed, but which are not yet adopted, would apply to the TPS
11 facilities.

12 ***TPS1***

13 ~~The Three of the four~~ TPS1 options (Options 1, 2, and 3) in South San Francisco would be located
14 outside of the ROW in areas with land use designations under the *South San Francisco General Plan*
15 of Business Commercial (Options 1 and 3) and Business and Technology Park (Option 2) (City of
16 South San Francisco 1999). ~~These Options 1, 2 and 3 areas~~ are zoned Business Commercial (BC),
17 Business Technology Park (BTP), and Freeway Commercial (FC), respectively (City of South San
18 Francisco 2011). Permitted uses in the Business Commercial land use designation include
19 administrative, financial, business, professional, medical and public offices, research and
20 development facilities, and visitor-oriented and regional commercial activities. This designation
21 accommodates campus-like environments for corporate headquarters, research and development
22 facilities, and offices. Permitted uses within the Business and Technology Park designation include
23 incubator-research facilities, testing, repairing, packaging, publishing and printing, marinas,
24 shoreline-oriented recreation, offices, and research and development facilities. Warehousing and
25 distribution facilities and retail are permitted as ancillary uses only. Although the proposed TPS
26 would not be compatible with the Business and Technology Park designation, the existing land uses
27 to the south and west are more feature parcels that are light-industrial and warehouse in nature.
28 These uses include rental car parking lots, storage facilities, distribution centers, truck storage areas,
29 and an electrical substation. ~~Some smaller-~~ However, immediately adjacent, to the north, and across
30 Harbor Way to the east and northeast, is a large Research and Development (R&D)/Office campus.
31 office buildings are located within the area.

32 The TPS1 ~~facility~~ Options 1, 2, and 3 are in areas addressed by the *East of 101 Area Plan*. Options 1
33 and 3 would be within areas designated as Planned Commercial and Option 2 would be in an area
34 designated as Light Industrial. Planned Commercial is intended to accommodate retail
35 developments, office parks, hotels, restaurants, and high-end offices. New development is controlled
36 through development standards and design guidelines to ensure compatibility between the allowed
37 uses and the adjacent industrial areas. The Light Industrial land use category is intended to
38 accommodate existing industrial land uses and allow for a wide range of light industrial uses (City of
39 South San Francisco 1994).

40 BC and BTP zoning districts in South San Francisco conditionally permit major utilities; however, FC
41 (Option ~~23~~) does not allow such uses. Under all TPS 1 options, the TPS would be constructed on
42 either vacant parcels or on existing surface parking lots within areas that are surrounded by
43 industrial or commercial uses. With the exception of TPS1 Option ~~23~~, all sites are zoned to allow
44 utilities and power generation facilities with conditional use permits. For TPS1 Option ~~23~~, JPB would

1 need to seek a zoning amendment for a traction power substation. While the proposed use would be
2 in conflict with existing zoning restrictions, the traction power substation would not be
3 incompatible with the surrounding uses and would not displace any existing land use. Placement of
4 a traction power substation at this location would preclude designated FC uses; however, regionally,
5 the minimal loss of developable commercial land (30,000 square feet) is not considered substantial
6 enough to place additional commercial development pressure on areas outside of urban areas that
7 would otherwise result in secondary environmental impacts.

8 **PS 4**

9 All three of the proposed sites for PS4 would be located within the Caltrain ROW, and also within
10 San Mateo's Hillsdale Station Area Plan (HSAP). The HSAP calls for future relocation of the Hillsdale
11 Caltrain Station approximately 1,000 feet to the north, between 28th and 31st Avenues and the
12 development of a new expanded multi-modal Station and parking garage, as well as modifications to
13 the Station's surrounding land uses including transit oriented residential and commercial
14 development in the areas between the rail ROW and El Camino Ave.

15 All three PS4 Options are on Caltrain-owned land which is currently designated in the HSAP land use
16 map for "Transportation Corridor" use which is defined as follows:

17 "This designation is intended for freeways and fixed transit lines which provide mass transportation.
18 Portions of the railroad corridor not required for transportation purposes may be considered for
19 other uses."

20 A paralleling station to support electrified commuter rail for mass transportation is consistent with
21 the current designation. Furthermore, as described in Chapter 2, Caltrain is not legally subject to
22 local land use regulations within its ROW.

23 The HSAP recommends this relative to the Caltrain-owned property, outside the rail ROW and the
24 relocated station area:

25 "The existing Caltrain Station is located on a parcel that is designated Transportation Corridor and
26 owned by Caltrain. Located north of Hillsdale Boulevard and bounded by El Camino Real and the
27 railway tracks, this parcel is designated Transportation Corridor, which prohibits residential uses.
28 However, only the portion immediately adjacent to the train tracks is necessary to support the tracks
29 and associated right-of-way. Once the Caltrain Station relocates north, the parcel's designation as
30 Transportation Corridor would make it difficult to construct housing or mixed-use consistent with
31 this Plan's vision for the area. For this reason, this Plan recommends that Caltrain or a future
32 property owner consider applying to the City to redesignate the portion of this parcel not needed for
33 Caltrain tracks and right-of-way to TOD. This would allow development on the parcel that would
34 incorporate it into the greater network of transit-oriented uses."

35 Caltrain has not applied for such a redesignation to date and thus the currently applicable land use
36 designation of "Transportation Corridor" in the plan is the appropriate basis to be considered for
37 consistency analysis. The paralleling station options are all consistent with the current plan and no
38 significant physical impact is identified relative to consistency with the HSAP.

39 The discussion below addresses the potential inconsistency in the event that Caltrain requests
40 redesignation in the future. This is an analysis of cumulative conditions, as Caltrain has not made
41 such a request, and the Proposed Project does not require making of such a request.

42 While PS4, Options 1 and 2 would each require approximately 3,200 SF of space, the placement of a
43 paralleling station at either of these locations would not hinder the ability to develop most of the

1 HSAP area for TOD and would not hinder the ability to relocate the Caltrain station or install
2 supporting infrastructure, as discussed below:

- 3 • PS4, Option 1 would be located in an area envisioned in the HSAP for a landscaped area along
4 the railroad tracks in an area adjacent to the Transit Center associated with the relocated
5 station. Option 1 would result in a loss of some plaza space, but this would not displace land use
6 to an area outside the HSAP. Furthermore, a Transit Center, which includes areas for bus and
7 shuttle loading and unloading, passenger drop, and parking at surface or in a structure is not a
8 particularly sensitive land use that would somehow create a substantial conflict to use of a 3,200
9 SF area for a paralleling station next to an active railroad. Thus, although it may be desirable to
10 have the paralleling station outside of the HSAP, PS4, Option 1 would not displace any planned
11 land use outside of the HSAP without the need for major additional structures or
12 reconfiguration. Thus, PS4 Option 1 would not result in a significant land use impact under
13 CEQA in relation to the HSAP.
- 14 • PS4, Option 2 would be in a location envisioned for landscaping adjacent to a future residential
15 building at the corner of El Camino Real and Hillsdale Blvd. with a larger area designated for
16 parking immediately to the north of the proposed residential building location. Given the
17 relative size of the residential building, it could easily be relocated to the north of its proposed
18 location in the area of surface parking and the landscaping at the corner of El Camino Real and
19 Hillsdale Blvd. would be relocated to between the residential area and the Option 2 paralleling
20 station. Parking could be placed around the paralleling station. As noted in the DEIR, the
21 paralleling station at the Option 2 location would displace perhaps 10 parking spaces, which is a
22 minor loss of parking. As a result, with a minor reconfiguration, the intended residential use and
23 landscaping could be readily accommodated nearly in the same location as the current plan,
24 without any displacement of residential use outside of the HSAP area. Thus, while it may be
25 desirable to have the paralleling station outside the HSAP, PS4, Option 2 would not result in a
26 significant land use impact under CEQA in relation to the HSAP.
- 27 • PS4, Option 3 would be to the south of Option 2 and Hillsdale Boulevard. This option would still
28 be within the HSAP area, but there are no plans for substantial development in this area due to
29 its size and irregular shape. Thus, PS4, Option 3 would not result in a significant land use impact
30 under CEQA in relation to the HSAP.

31 ***TPS2***

32 The locations for all three TPS2 options in San Jose are currently zoned Heavy Industrial (HI) with
33 land use designations of Combined Industrial Commercial (Option 1) and Transit Employment
34 Center (Options 2 and 3)(City of San Jose 2013a and 2013b). The *Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan*
35 designates the TPS2 sites as Combined Industrial Commercial (Option 1) and Transit Employment
36 Center (Options 2 and 3) (City of San Jose 2013b). Combined Industrial Commercial allows flexibility
37 for the development of a varied mixture of compatible commercial and industrial uses. The Transit
38 Employment Center designation is applied to areas planned for intensive job growth because of
39 their importance as employment districts and high degree of access to transit and other facilities
40 and services. Uses allowed in the Industrial Park designation are appropriate in the Transit
41 Employment Center designation, but with a focus on public transportation (City of San Jose 2011).
42 Power generation facilities are permitted with a conditional use permit in areas zoned as Heavy
43 Industrial (City of San Jose 2010).

1 Under all TPS2 options, the TPS would be constructed on either vacant parcels or on existing surface
2 parking lots within areas that are surrounded by industrial or commercial uses. All sites are zoned
3 to allow utilities and power generation facilities with conditional use permits.

4 ***OCS Poles and Electrical Safety Zone***

5 The land use designations for the areas of OCS pole alignment and/or electrical safety zone outside
6 the ROW were reviewed and are presented in Appendix H, *Land Use Information*. As described
7 therein, the placement of these project facilities outside the ROW would be inconsistent in some
8 cases with designated land uses in local plans and policies.

9 The use of existing rail and road rights-of-way for OCS poles or the electrical safety zone would not
10 result in any inconsistency with land use policies and plans because these areas are designated to
11 support transportation purposes. The use of small portions of residential, commercial, and
12 industrial parcels for the OCS pole alignment or the electrical safety zone would be inconsistent in
13 areas designated for residential use, and possibly in some commercial and industrial areas. Thus,
14 OCS pole alignment or electrical safety zone encroachment would conflict in certain locations with
15 local land use plans and policies where rail or utility uses are prohibited.

16 Because OCS pole alignment would encroach only an estimated 2 to 4 feet outside the Caltrain ROW
17 in most locations, OCS poles would not result in displacing current land uses. While these poles
18 would preclude the ability to build out some commercial and industrial parcels to the Caltrain ROW
19 property line, given the limited encroachment and the ability to use land under the wires for
20 parking, walkways, low-lying landscaping and other ancillary uses, the limitations on land use due to
21 the OCS pole alignment would not be expected to displace commercial/industrial uses at all. Thus,
22 although the OCS pole alignment may be inconsistent with current land use plans or policies at
23 certain locations, OCS poles would not be expected to result in secondary environmental impacts
24 related to plan or policy inconsistency.

25 As noted above, the electrical safety zone encroachment outside the Caltrain ROW (usually less than
26 10 feet but in some cases up to 14 feet), would not result in displacement of current land uses. In
27 residential, commercial and industrial parcels, the electrical safety zone requirements would
28 preclude the ability to build out to the Caltrain ROW property line. The land within the electrical
29 safety zone will still be useable for parking, walkways, access, low-lying landscaping and other
30 ancillary uses. The limitations on land use within the safety zone would result in a limited loss of
31 land available for residential, commercial, or industrial structures and associated landscaping. As
32 evidenced by the Proposed Project's effect on existing uses (i.e., no loss of structures or facilities),
33 development on affected parcels would remain largely feasible. Residential, commercial, or
34 industrial structures and facilities could be built with minor constraints on site development
35 directly adjacent to the Caltrain ROW. Given that the electrical safety zone encroachment is not
36 expected to substantially change the ability to use parcels for their designated residential,
37 commercial, or industrial uses in local plans and policies, the Proposed Project is not expected to
38 result in secondary environmental impacts related to the plan or policy inconsistency.

39 Impacts on parks due to vegetation clearance are discussed separately under Impact LUR-4 below.

1 **Consistency with the MTC Transportation 2035 Plan**

2 The Proposed Project is a key element in the MTC Transportation 2035 Plan by providing efficient
3 transit options to existing developed areas along the Peninsula. Caltrain has been supportive of TOD
4 development near its stations, such as the proposed San Carlos Transit Village.

5 Because OCS poles and the electrical safety zone would require very limited areas of land and would
6 not disrupt planned residential or mixed use developments, the Proposed Project would not hinder
7 future development of areas adjacent to Caltrain stations. Rather, by reducing noise and improving
8 air quality, the Proposed Project would create a more conducive environment for development of
9 land at or near Caltrain stations. As called for in Caltrain’s Strategic Plan, Caltrain plans to work
10 closely with adjoining communities as part of a partnership to improve coordination of land use and
11 transportation planning to increase Caltrain ridership. The Proposed Project is not expected to
12 increase development on the Peninsula and in the South Bay; however, reducing noise and
13 enhancing the transit experience may help to encourage planned transit-oriented development
14 around station locations.

15 **Overall Consistency with Applicable Local Plans and Policies**

16 CEQA requires that an EIR consider whether a proposed project may conflict with any applicable
17 land use plan, policy, or regulation that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an
18 environmental impact. This environmental determination under CEQA differs from the policy
19 determination of whether a proposed project is consistent with a jurisdiction’s general plan, specific
20 plan, area plan, or precise plan.

21 Conflicts of a project with land use policies do not, in and of themselves, constitute significant
22 environmental impacts. Policy conflicts are considered environmental impacts only when they
23 would result in direct environmental effects. As discussed above, the Proposed Project would result
24 in several inconsistencies with local plans and policies, specifically, at the location of TPS1 Option 2,
25 and at certain locations of the OCS alignment and electrical safety zone outside rail or road ROW.
26 However, as evaluated above, the Proposed Project is not expected to displace existing or potential
27 future development and, thus, would not result in significant secondary environmental impacts as a
28 result of the inconsistencies with local land use plans and policies. Consequently, the Proposed
29 Project would have less-than-significant impacts related to consistency with local land use plans and
30 policies.

Impact LUR-3 Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural
community conservation plan

Level of Impact Less than significant

31 **Construction**

32 The Caltrain ROW is adjacent to the east of the *San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan* (San
33 Bruno Mountain HCP). This plan promotes preservation of the existing diverse ecological values of
34 the mountain and limits habitat manipulation. Under the Proposed Project, OCS poles and wires
35 would be constructed adjacent to but not in the San Bruno Mountain HCP area. Construction would
36 occur within the Caltrain corridor and would not encroach on areas included in the San Bruno
37 Mountain HCP. Therefore, the construction of the Proposed Project features would not conflict with
38 the San Bruno Mountain HCP.

1 Proposed Project features within the City of San Jose would be located within the *Santa Clara Valley*
 2 *Habitat Plan*. As explained above, this plan provides a framework for promoting the protection and
 3 recovery of natural resources, including endangered species, while streamlining the permitting
 4 process for planned development, infrastructure, and maintenance activities. OCS poles and wires,
 5 TPS2, and PS7 would be constructed in areas covered by the *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan*.
 6 Construction activities would occur within the Caltrain corridor, with the exception of TPS2
 7 construction. However, the three proposed locations for TPS2 are located in urbanized, industrial
 8 areas with limited habitat and no natural communities. None of the project area in Santa Clara
 9 County is designated as preservation area in the *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan*. Consequently, the
 10 construction of the Proposed Project features would not conflict with the *Santa Clara Valley Habitat*
 11 *Plan*, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

12 **Operation**

13 The Proposed Project would operate within the existing Caltrain corridor, which is highly developed
 14 with little to no existing habitat. As described in Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*, the Proposed
 15 Project would actually be a benefit to rare butterfly habitats protected by the San Bruno Mountain
 16 HCP and the *Santa Clara Habitat Plan* because the Proposed Project would reduce nitrogen pollution
 17 that has been having a deleterious effect on native plant habitats that support rare butterflies. As
 18 discussed in Section 3.2, *Air Quality*, the use of electrified trains and the Proposed Project’s increased
 19 ridership would reduce nitrogen emissions associated with existing diesel trains and passenger
 20 vehicles compared with both existing conditions and with future No Project conditions.

21 Consequently, operation of the Proposed Project would have a beneficial impact on the San Bruno
 22 Mountain HCP and the *Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan*.

Impact LUR-4	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated
Level of Impact	Potentially significant
Mitigation Measures	AES-2b: Apply aesthetic surface treatments to new infrastructure to and provide screening vegetation at TPFs in sensitive visual locations <u>Aesthetic treatments for OCS poles, TPFs in sensitive visual locations, and Overbridge Protection Barriers</u> BIO-5: Implement Tree Avoidance, Minimization, and Replacement Plan
Level of Impact with Mitigation	Less than significant

23 **Construction**

24 As shown in Table 3.10-2, a number of parks and open spaces are adjacent to the Caltrain ROW.
 25 The proposed locations of the TPFs have been selected because they are mainly in industrial and
 26 commercial areas, and generally away from parks and open spaces. No park or recreational facility
 27 properties would need to be acquired for the placement of TPFs. Construction of TPFs and ancillary
 28 facilities would not affect the accessibility of existing public parks or recreation facilities. The only
 29 TPF directly adjacent to a park would be PS7, which would be located next to Kurte Park in San Jose.
 30 However, the paralleling station would be within the project corridor and construction would not
 31 affect users of the park or accessibility.

1 Several of these parks have existing trees and vegetation that may encroach onto the Caltrain ROW.
2 Currently, the JPB maintenance practice is to comply with California Public Utility Commission
3 requirements by pruning trees and other mature vegetation in adjacent parks that lean or hang over
4 into the Caltrain ROW and pose a potential safety hazard to train operations. Under the Proposed
5 Project, additional vegetation clearance may be necessary at four park locations where the electrical
6 safety zone would extend outside the current Caltrain ROW and one location where the park is
7 partially on the Caltrain ROW. This vegetation removal could have an effect on park uses, park lands
8 and park aesthetics.

- 9 • **Broadway-Arguello Park (Redwood City):** This is a small parklet between Broadway Avenue
10 and the Redwood City Station. The only facilities in this park are two park benches and a limited
11 grassy area. There are several small trees on the edge of the park that do not presently block the
12 views of the Caltrain station and ROW. These trees that may need to be removed to
13 accommodate the Proposed Project's electrical safety zone. As required by Mitigation Measure
14 BIO-5, JPB will provide on-site tree replacement (where feasible) for removed trees. Given the
15 limited facilities and use of this park, it should be feasible to plant additional trees slightly
16 farther away from the Caltrain station while allowing for park use. The area adjacent to the park
17 within the electrical safety zone could still be used for turf and park benches.
- 18 • **Holbrook-Palmer Park (Atherton):** This park contains a variety of facilities and uses. A
19 baseball field, tennis courts, a paved walkway and vegetation are located near the Caltrain ROW.
20 Based on the current Proposed Project's design, there would be a need to remove vegetation
21 outside the ROW, perhaps up to approximately 10 feet in the park itself. The vegetation removal
22 would not require any change in the adjacent trail, baseball field or tennis court facilities. If
23 during final design, tree removal is determined to be unavoidable, Caltrain will work with the
24 Town of Atherton on tree replacement options. It appears feasible to plant additional trees
25 outside the electrical safety zone between the edge of the baseball field (on both sides of the
26 walkway) and the zone and between the tennis courts and the zone. Planting in this area would
27 replace visual screening that is provided by existing trees today without limiting park uses.
- 28 • **Peers Park (Palo Alto):** This park contains a variety of facilities including tennis courts, a
29 children's playground, picnic tables, and a basketball court along with a grassy open field. There
30 are trees along the perimeter of the park, including along the rail line. The park also includes the
31 "Challenger Grove," which is a small grove of trees grown from seeds carried into space and
32 planted in the park as a commemoration honoring the crew of the Challenger Space Shuttle
33 disaster. Based on the current project design, there would be a need to remove vegetation
34 outside the ROW, perhaps up to approximately 10 feet in the park itself. The vegetation removal
35 would not require any change in any park facilities and the Challenger Grove would not be
36 affected. If during final project design tree removal is determined to be unavoidable, Caltrain
37 will work with the City of Palo Alto on tree replacement options. It appears feasible to plant
38 additional trees outside the electrical safety zone between the edge of the tennis court and the
39 rail line and outside the grassy area. Planting in this area would replace visual screening that is
40 provided by existing trees today without limiting park uses.
- 41 • **Reed Street Dog Park (Sunnyvale):** This park is the only off-leash dog park in Sunnyvale and
42 provides several fenced areas for dogs. The electrical safety zone would be along the southern
43 edge of this park, which is barren and does not contain any facilities. The dog run areas are well
44 north of the Caltrain ROW and would be unaffected. No trees would need to be removed at this
45 park. If the southern part of the park within the electrical safety zone were proposed for park

1 use in the future, it could be used for a grassy area or walkways for human or canine use as long
2 as no elevated structures or vegetation were proposed.

- 3 • **Fuller Park (San Jose):** This is a small park between the Caltrain Tracks and Fuller Avenue. The
4 facilities in this park include game tables, bocce ball court, a horseshoe pit and a limited grassy
5 area. The portion of the park between a row of trees and the railroad berm is owned by the JPB
6 which has leased it for park purposes. Tree removal should not necessary in the park but some
7 pruning may be necessary for the electrical safety zone.

8 While Rengstorff Park in Mountain View is near the ROW, it is actually separated from the ROW by a
9 frontage road and thus no removal of trees in this park would occur due to the project.

10 Loss of vegetation at several of the parks noted above, if unmitigated, could result in loss of park use
11 areas, which could result in increased use of other park areas. However, as described above,
12 Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would require replacement of any removed trees, and it is feasible to
13 replace the visual screening function of trees that exists today in a way that is compatible with
14 Proposed Project design. Thus, with mitigation, the loss of vegetation would be a less-than-
15 significant impact.

16 Operation

17 Operationally, the Proposed Project would only affect adjacent parks in relation to aesthetics, air
18 quality, noise, and vegetation maintenance.

19 PS7 would be adjacent to Kurte Park in San Jose. At this location, the prevailing views northward
20 from the park are of the grasslands on Communications Hill, a few scattered trees and the railroad
21 ROW. Although the PS7 facility would be small (40 by 80 feet), it would be an anomalous industrial
22 facility in a view largely dominated by grassland features (see Figure 3.1-17). As discussed in
23 Section 3.1, *Aesthetics*, this is considered a significant aesthetic impact. Mitigation Measure AES-2b
24 would require planting of trees between the park and PS7 to visually screen the lower portions of
25 the new paralleling station and require aesthetic treatment to help the facility blend in with
26 surroundings. With this mitigation, aesthetic impacts at this location would be less than significant.
27 With Project Variant 1, PS7 would be located farther north than its current proposed location and
28 would not be visible from Kurte Park and there are no other parks in the close vicinity to the PS7
29 variant locations. The new overhead OCS facilities would be visible from parks adjacent to the
30 Caltrain ROW unless intervening vegetation is particularly dense. In urbanized areas, the addition of
31 overhead wires similar to existing telephone and power lines would not change the visual character
32 of areas adjacent to urban parks. Further, the OCS system would be installed along the existing ROW,
33 which already has a transportation and industrial character.

34 As discussed in Section 3.2, *Air Quality*, the Proposed Project would lower overall air pollutant
35 emissions as well as diesel particulate matter emissions along the Caltrain ROW. This would
36 improve the ambient health conditions at adjacent parks for all park users.

37 As discussed in Section 3.11, *Noise and Vibration*, at most locations, the Proposed Project would have
38 less-than-significant noise impacts when taking into account the net effect of quieter train engines
39 combined with a slight increase in train horn noise with increased train service. At several areas
40 with existing high noise levels and nearby at-grade crossings (where horn noise would increase)
41 there would be moderate noise impacts. At some of the locations farther away from at-grade
42 crossings, overall noise levels should slightly decrease. Given that the existing conditions for parks
43 located along the Caltrain ROW include train noise, a minor increase in noise where it occurs would

1 not substantially change park use such that users would be diverted to other park areas and result
2 in degradation of those other park facilities due to higher use.

3 As discussed above, vegetation maintenance inside the Caltrain ROW is an existing activity. While
4 the area of vegetation maintenance would move outward to the edge of the ROW, after initial
5 vegetation removal for construction, the maintenance activity should be roughly similar to existing
6 vegetation maintenance. Thus, temporary noise of vegetation maintenance inside the Caltrain ROW
7 would have less-than-significant impacts on adjacent or nearby parks. Where vegetation
8 maintenance is required within the electrical safety zone in the four parks described above, it would
9 be more intrusive than vegetation maintenance than on the Caltrain ROW itself. Because the areas of
10 maintenance would be outside the areas of active park use and maintenance would occur for a
11 limited period of time in any one year, vegetation maintenance would have a less-than-significant
12 impact on park lands and park uses.

13 Thus, Proposed Project operations would not have a significant impact on parks and recreational
14 facilities related to physical deterioration of parklands.

Impact LUR-5	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment
Level of Impact	No Impact

15 **Construction and Operation**

16 The Proposed Project would not involve the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. As
17 discussed above, the Proposed Project would not result in the physical degradation of park or
18 recreational facilities that would displace recreational use that might result in the demand for new
19 recreational facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no impact on the physical
20 environment as a result of new recreational facilities.