

**PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT**

**INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE  
DECLARATION**

**BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN PROJECT  
BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA**



**LSA**

September 2018

**This page intentionally left blank**

**PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT**

**INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE  
DECLARATION**

**BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN PROJECT  
BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA**

Submitted to:

Teresa Rom  
Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning  
211 Linden Avenue  
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Prepared by:

LSA  
157 Park Place  
Pt. Richmond, California 94801  
510.236.6810

Project No. GRP1802



September 2018

**This page intentionally left blank**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES AND TABLES .....	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....	iii
<b>1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 PROJECT SITE .....	2-1
2.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES .....	2-7
2.3 PROPOSED PROJECT .....	2-7
2.4 PROJECT APPROVALS .....	2-11
<b>3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Determination .....	3-1
<b>4.0 CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST .....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1 Aesthetics .....	4-1
4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	4-3
4.3 Air Quality .....	4-5
4.4 Biological Resources.....	4-15
4.5 Cultural Resources .....	4-18
4.6 Geology and Soils .....	4-21
4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	4-24
4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	4-29
4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality .....	4-33
4.10 Land Use and Planning .....	4-38
4.11 Mineral Resources.....	4-40
4.12 Noise.....	4-41
4.13 Population and Housing .....	4-49
4.14 Public Services.....	4-50
4.15 Recreation .....	4-52
4.16 Transportation/Traffic.....	4-53
4.17 Tribal Cultural Resources .....	4-71
4.18 Utilities and Service Systems.....	4-73
4.19 Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	4-77
<b>5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS .....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>6.0 REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>6-1</b>

## APPENDICES

- A: CALEEMOD Output Sheets
- B: Transportation Impact Analysis

## FIGURES AND TABLES

### FIGURES

Figure 2-1: Project Location and Regional Vicinity Map .....	2-2
Figure 2-2: Aerial Photograph of the Project Site and Surrounding Land Uses .....	2-3
Figure 2-3: Photos of Existing Site Conditions .....	2-4
Figure 2-4: Photos of Existing Site Conditions .....	2-5
Figure 2-5: Photos of Existing Site Conditions .....	2-6
Figure 2-6: Conceptual Site Plan .....	2-9
Figure 4-1: Project Trip Distribution .....	4-59
Figure 4-2: Existing Traffic Volumes .....	4-60
Figure 4-3: Existing Plus Project Traffic Volumes .....	4-61
Figure 4-4: Background Plus Project Traffic Volumes .....	4-62
Figure 4-5: Cumulative Plus Project Traffic Volumes .....	4-65

### TABLES

Table 2.A: Potential Permits and Approvals .....	2-11
Table 4.A: Project Construction Emissions in Pounds Per Day .....	4-10
Table 4.B: Project Operational Emissions .....	4-12
Table 4.C: GHG Emissions (Metric Tons Per Year) .....	4-26
Table 4.D: Maximum Allowable Noise Levels from Construction Equipment .....	4-42
Table 4.E: Planning Criteria – Maximum Outdoor Noise Levels (dBA) .....	4-43
Table 4.F: Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels .....	4-44
Table 4.G: Unsignalized Intersection Level of Service Definitions Based on Delay .....	4-56
Table 4.H: Project Trip Generation Estimates .....	4-57
Table 4.I: Existing Plus Project Level of Service Summary .....	4-58
Table 4.J: Background Plus Project Level of Service Summary .....	4-63
Table 4.K: Cumulative Level of Service Summary .....	4-64

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AB 52	California Assembly Bill 52
ACM	Asbestos Containing Material
ADA	American with Disabilities Act
ADWF	average dry weather flow
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
AWSC	All-Way Stop Control
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan
BAWSCA	Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency
Bay	San Francisco Bay
BMP	Best Management Practices
BPD	Burlingame Police Department
C/CAG	City/County Association of Governments
Cal/OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CalEEMod	California Emission Estimator Model
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	City of Burlingame's Climate Action Plan
CCFD	Central County Fire Department
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act

---

CH <sub>4</sub>	Methane
Clean Air Plan	BAAQMD 2017 Clean Air Plan
CMP	San Mateo County Congestion Management Program
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO	Carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
CO <sub>2</sub> e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
Construction General Permit	General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activity
CTP	San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan
CY	cubic yards
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DHS	California Department of Health Services
DOT	Department of Transportation
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
FTE	full-time equivalent
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HFCs	Hydrofluorocarbons
I-280	Interstate 280
IS/MND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
L <sub>dn</sub>	Day-night equivalent noise level
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design

---



L <sub>eq</sub>	Continuous equivalent noise level
LID	Low Impact Development
L <sub>max</sub>	Maximum instantaneous noise level
L <sub>min</sub>	Minimum instantaneous noise level
LOS	Levels of Service
LUST	Leaking underground storage tank
mgd	million gallons per day
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MRP	Water Board Municipal Regional Permit
N <sub>2</sub> O	Nitrous oxide
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen dioxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
O <sub>3</sub>	Ozone
OSHA	United States Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Pb	Lead
PCEP	Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project
PFCs	Perfluorocarbons
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric Company
PM <sub>10</sub>	Respirable Particulate Matter
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Fine Particulate Matter
POTW	publicly owned treatment work
PRC	Public Resources Code
proposed project	Burlingame Community Center Master Plan Project
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976

---

Recology	Recology San Mateo
ROG	Reactive organic gases
SamTrans	San Mateo County Transit District
SCP	Stormwater Control Plan
SDSs	Safety Data Sheets
sec	seconds
SF <sub>6</sub>	Sulfur Hexafluoride
SFO	San Francisco International Airport
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide
SQG	small-quantity generator
SSSC	Side-Street Stop Control
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	Toxic air contaminant
TDM	Travel Demand Management
TIA	Transportation Impact Analysis
UCMP	University of California Museum of Paleontology, Berkeley
US 101	US Highway 101
US EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VOC	Volatile organic compound
Water Board	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
WWTP	Burlingame Wastewater Treatment Plant
µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Micrograms per cubic meter

---

## 1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

**1. Project Title:**

Burlingame Community Center Master Plan Project

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

City of Burlingame  
Parks and Recreation Department  
850 Burlingame Avenue  
Burlingame, CA 94010

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Margaret Glomstad, (650)558-7307

**4. Project Location:**

850 Burlingame Avenue, Burlingame, CA 94010

**5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

City of Burlingame  
Parks and Recreation Department  
850 Burlingame Avenue  
Burlingame, CA 94010

**6. General Plan Designation:** Parks - Community

**7. Zoning:** Unclassified

**8. Description of Project:** The proposed project would include three components: 1) redevelopment of the Burlingame Community Center; 2) improvements to the playground, outdoor basketball court, picnic area, and site; and 3) improvements to allow for more parking area. The existing Burlingame Community Center would be demolished and the new, approximately 35,700-square-foot Burlingame Community Center would be constructed in approximately the same location with a different footprint. The existing playground adjacent to the existing Community Center would be moved north to accommodate the proposed location for the new Community Center and address the City's request for the playground to be further away from the street. A surface parking lot and a below-ground level parking garage would be constructed in the eastern corner of the project site.

See Section 2.0, Project Description of this Initial Study, for a full project description.

**9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is located in a developed area of the City of Burlingame and is surrounded primarily by residential and public uses.

- 10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (i.e., permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):** Pacific Gas & Electric
- 11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resource Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?** California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project site and area have been notified of the proposed project. No tribes have requested consultation.

## 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following describes the Burlingame Community Center Master Plan Project<sup>1</sup> (proposed project) that is the subject of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) prepared per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The proposed project is the redevelopment of the existing Burlingame Community Center to create the new Burlingame Community Center on Burlingame Avenue in Burlingame, San Mateo County.

### 2.1 PROJECT SITE

The following section describes the project location, existing conditions, surrounding land uses, and the regulatory setting.

#### 2.1.1 Project Location

The project site is located in the southeastern portion of Washington Park in the City of Burlingame (City), within San Mateo County. The approximately 2.41-acre project site (a portion of Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 029-141-030) is located at 850 Burlingame Avenue and is bound by Washington Park and the former Gunst Estate grounds to the north, residential uses to the east and Burlingame Avenue to the south, and the Burlingame Lions Club and Washington Park to the west. The project's location and regional vicinity is shown in Figure 2-1; and an aerial of the project site and surrounding land uses are shown in Figure 2-2.

#### 2.1.2 Existing Conditions

The project site is currently developed with the existing Burlingame Community Center; which includes the offices of the Burlingame Parks and Recreation Department, an auditorium, social hall, art room, ceramics room, conference room, and various other community-oriented uses; and the Washington Park Playground, which includes a playground and picnic areas. The existing Burlingame Community Center is approximately 25,000 square feet in total. While originally constructed in the late 1940s, the existing building has been renovated many times over the years to address the needs of the community and the City has determined that the building has no historic merit or significance. Additionally a building survey has determined that the building would need seismic improvements to meet the current California Building Code.<sup>2</sup> Existing conditions are depicted in Photos 1 through 6 in Figure 2-3, Figure 2-4, and Figure 2-5. The project site is generally level and contains 158 trees.

<sup>1</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2014. *Burlingame Community Center Master Plan*. July 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cecil H. Wells, Jr & Associates. 2009. Partial Seismic Evaluation for City of Burlingame Recreation Center. June.

**Figure 2-1: Project Location and Regional Vicinity Map**

8.5x11, bw

**Figure 2-2: Aerial Photograph of the Project Site and Surrounding Land Uses**

8.5x11, color

**Figure 2-3: Photos of Existing Site Conditions**

8.5x11, color



## Figure 2-4: Photos of Existing Site Conditions

8.5x11, color

**Figure 2-5: Photos of Existing Site Conditions**

8.5x11, color

### 2.1.3 Surrounding Land Uses

As shown in Figure 2-2, a variety of land uses are located within the vicinity of the project site. A portion of Washington Park and the lands of the former Gunst Estate are immediately north of the project site. Further north of the project site are single-family residential units and US Highway 101 (US 101). The project site is bounded to the east by single-family residential uses, which also make up the land uses further east. Burlingame Avenue bounds the project site to the south, with single- and multi-family residential uses, as well as institutional uses, including Washington Elementary School. The Burlingame Lions Club and Washington Park bound the project site to the west. Further west is Burlingame High School, the Burlingame Aquatic Club, and the Burlingame Caltrain Station and tracks.

### 2.1.4 Parking, Circulation, and Access

A surface parking lot on the eastern border of the project site provides approximately 22 parking spaces for staff members at the Burlingame Community Center. Another surface parking lot along Burlingame Avenue provides two parking spaces compliant with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) as well as a drop-off and pickup loop. Automobiles access both of these parking lots via three driveways along Burlingame Avenue, one of which provides ingress and egress to the staff parking lot, one of which provides only ingress to the drop-off and pickup loop, and the last of which only provides egress from the loop. Regional access to the project site is provided by the Broadway on- and off-ramp of US 101. Local access to the project site is provided by Rollins Road to the north, Bloomfield Road to the south, and Carolan Avenue/East Lane to the west. The Burlingame Caltrain station is located approximately 0.2 miles west of the project site. Pedestrian access to and throughout the project site is provided by sidewalks and concrete pathways.

### 2.1.5 Regulatory Setting

The project site is designated as Parks – Community on the City’s General Plan Land Use Map<sup>3</sup> and is within the Unclassified zoning district on the City’s Zoning Map.<sup>4</sup>

## 2.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

On March 19, 2018, the Burlingame City Council approved the current scope of the proposed project. The proposed project would implement the portion of the Master Plan east of the Lion’s Club Hall through redevelopment of the existing Burlingame Community Center and associated site work as well as additional parking to meet the needs of the community and to have the flexibility to meet the ever-changing needs of future patrons.

## 2.3 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would include three components: 1) redevelopment of the Burlingame Community Center; 2) improvements to the playground, outdoor basketball court, picnic area, and site; and 3) improvements to and additional parking. Each of these components is described below.

<sup>3</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2000. City of Burlingame General Plan Land Use Map. April.

<sup>4</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2016. *Burlingame General Plan: Zoning – Southeast Areas*. Available online: [www.burlingame.org/document\\_center/Zoning/ZoningMap-Burlingame-SE.pdf](http://www.burlingame.org/document_center/Zoning/ZoningMap-Burlingame-SE.pdf) (accessed June 8, 2018).

### 2.3.1 Community Center Redevelopment

The existing Burlingame Community Center would be demolished and the new Burlingame Community Center would be constructed in approximately the same location with a different footprint, as shown in Figure 2-6. The new Community Center building would be two stories in height and approximately 35,700 square feet in size. The first floor of the new Community Center building would include space for a community hall with a raised platform and associated storage space, a kitchen, a large lobby, lounge, meeting room, staff offices, a maker room, kids and teen spaces, and a creative arts and ceramics space. Additionally, the first floor would include restrooms for the Community Center and the adjacent park and various storage spaces. The second floor of the new Community Center would include a large meeting room, active lounge, fine arts space, musical arts space, an enrichment classroom, and a dance and fitness studio as well as two outdoor decks and storage spaces.

The new Community Center would allow the City to provide approximately 420 hours of programming on a weekly basis in the fall, winter, and spring, and 600 hours of weekly programming in the summer.

### 2.3.2 Playground, Basketball Court, Picnic Area, and Site Improvements

The existing playground adjacent to the existing Community Center would be moved north to accommodate the proposed location for the new Community Center and address the City's request for the playground to be further away from the street. Additional site improvements would include a relocated basketball court in the western corner of the project site, relocated picnic tables and a sculpture planter in the center of the project site, outdoor seating around the new Community Center, and event lawn seating in the northern corner of the project site. The existing entrance pillars in the southern corner of the project site along Burlingame Avenue would be retained.

### 2.3.3 Parking Improvements

A surface parking lot and a below-ground level parking garage would be constructed in the eastern corner of the project site. The surface parking lot would include a drop-off area adjacent to the new Community Center building. In total, 84 parking spaces would be provided, with approximately 40 parking spaces in the below-ground level and 44 spaces in the surface parking lot. The parking lot would also include a vegetated sound wall along its northeastern border.

### 2.3.4 Construction Schedule

Construction of the proposed project would take 24 months. Construction staging areas would be determined by the construction manager, but would be contained on the project site. Approximately 41 trees are expected to be removed from the project site, and 36 trees would be replanted.

**Figure 2-6: Conceptual Site Plan**

8.5x11, color

**This page intentionally left blank**

## 2.4 PROJECT APPROVALS

A number of permits and approvals would be required for the proposed project. While the City is the Lead Agency for the project, other agencies also have discretionary authority related to the project and approvals. A list of these agencies and potential permits and approvals that may be required is provided in Table 2.A.

**Table 2.A: Potential Permits and Approvals**

Lead Agency	Potential Permits/Approvals
City of Burlingame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project approval</li><li>• IS/MND adoption</li><li>• Provision of grading, demolition, construction, tree removal, parking, traffic, erosion, and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan permits and approvals</li><li>• Approval of water lines, water hookups, wastewater lines, wastewater hookups</li></ul>
<b>Other Agencies</b>	
Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Connection/Reconnection of utilities</li></ul>

Source: LSA (2018).

**This page intentionally left blank**



### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist in Chapter 4.0.

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

### 3.1 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

  
Margaret Glomstad  
Director, Parks & Recreation

September 12, 2018  
Date

**This page intentionally left blank**

## 4.0 CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

### 4.1 AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4.1.1 Impact Analysis

##### a. *Would the project have a substantial effect on a scenic vista? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

A scenic vista is generally defined as a public vantage point with an expansive view of a significant landscape feature. Scenic vistas within the City include the hillside leading to Skyline Ridge as seen from the San Francisco Bay (Bay), and the Bay as seen from the hillside.<sup>5</sup>

The project site is located in an urban area, is surrounded by urban uses, and is currently developed with the existing community center and Washington Park Playground. The proposed project would include demolition of the existing community center and Washington Park Playground and the construction of a new community center and playground, as well as associated site improvements. The proposed project would not be readily visible from any scenic vista, nor would the project block existing public views of a scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on publicly-accessible scenic vistas.

##### b. *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Interstate 280 (I-280) is the closest officially designated State scenic highway to the project site. At its closest, I-280 is located approximately 2.6 miles west of the project site.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would not be visible from any State designated scenic highway, and this impact would be less than significant.

<sup>5</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2015. *General Plan of the City of Burlingame*. As amended.

<sup>6</sup> California Department of Transportation, 2011. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. Website: [www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16\\_livability/scenic\\_highways/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm) (accessed July 6, 2018). September 7.

*c. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The proposed project would include the demolition of the existing community center and Washington Park Playground and the construction of a new community center and playground, as well as associated site improvements. While the proposed project would be visually different than the existing structures on the project site, it would not create a degradation of the existing visual character of the site. The change would be consistent with the existing community uses and park setting. The proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to visual character.

*d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Lighting is currently installed around the existing buildings, parking lots, and in the uses surrounding the project site. The proposed project would include exterior security lighting for the new community center, playground, and parking areas. Lighting installed as a part of the proposed project would result in lighting levels similar to current conditions on the project site and would not result in a significant increase in light and glare over current conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to day or nighttime views in the project area, and this impact would be less than significant.

## 4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 4.2.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (No Impact)*

The project site is currently developed with the existing community center and Washington Park Playground, and is surrounded by residential and other community uses. There are no agricultural resources located on or near the project site. The project site is classified as "Urban and Built-Up Land" by the State Department of Conservation.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would not result

<sup>7</sup> California Department of Conservation, 2016. Division of Land Use Resource Protection. California Important Farmland Finder. Website: [maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF](https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF) (accessed July 6, 2018).

in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, and would have no impact.

*b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (No Impact)*

The project site is designated as Parks – Community on the City’s General Plan Land Use Map.<sup>8</sup> The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

*c. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? (No Impact)*

The project site is currently developed with the existing community center and Washington Park Playground, and is surrounded by residential and other community uses, and is designated Parks – Community. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

*d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forestland to non-forest use? (No Impact)*

Refer to Section 4.2.1.c. The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

*e. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (No Impact)*

Refer to Section 4.2.1.a and 4.2.1.c. The proposed project would not involve any other changes to the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use, or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

---

<sup>8</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2000. *City of Burlingame General Plan*, Land Use Map. April.

<sup>9</sup> California Department of Conservation, 2012. San Mateo County Williamson Act FY 2006/2007 (map). Available online at: [ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/SanMateo\\_06\\_07\\_WA.pdf](http://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/SanMateo_06_07_WA.pdf) (accessed July 6, 2018).

### 4.3 AIR QUALITY

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4.3.1 Impact Analysis

The proposed project is located in the City of Burlingame, and is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which regulates air quality in the San Francisco Bay Area. Air quality conditions in the San Francisco Bay Area have improved significantly since the BAAQMD was created in 1955. Ambient concentrations of air pollutants and the number of days during which the region exceeds air quality standards have fallen substantially. In Burlingame, and the rest of the air basin, exceedances of air quality standards occur primarily during meteorological conditions conducive to high pollution levels, such as cold, windless winter nights or hot, sunny summer afternoons.

Within the BAAQMD, ambient air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and lead (Pb) have been set by both the State of California and the federal government. The State has also set standards for sulfate and visibility. The BAAQMD is under State non-attainment status for ozone and particulate matter standards. The BAAQMD is classified as non-attainment for the federal ozone 8-hour standard and non-attainment for the federal PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-hour standard.

#### a. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The applicable air quality plan is the BAAQMD 2017 Clean Air Plan (Clean Air Plan),<sup>10</sup> which was adopted on April 19, 2017. The Clean Air Plan is a comprehensive plan to improve Bay Area air quality and protect public health. The Clean Air Plan defines control strategies to reduce emissions

<sup>10</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2017. *Clean Air Plan*. April 19.

and ambient concentrations of air pollutants; safeguard public health by reducing exposure to air pollutants that pose the greatest health risk, with an emphasis on protecting the communities most heavily affected by air pollution; and reduce greenhouse gas emissions to protect the climate. Consistency with the Clean Air Plan can be determined if the project: 1) supports the goals of the Clean Air Plan; 2) includes applicable control measures from the Clean Air Plan; and 3) would not disrupt or hinder implementation of any control measures from the Clean Air Plan.

**Clean Air Plan Goals.** The primary goals of the Bay Area Clean Air Plan are to: attain air quality standards; reduce population exposure and protect public health in the Bay Area; and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect climate.

The BAAQMD has established significance thresholds for project construction and operational impacts at a level at which the cumulative impact of exceeding these thresholds would have an adverse impact on the region's attainment of air quality standards. The health and hazards thresholds were established to help protect public health. As discussed in Section 3.3.1b, implementation of the proposed project would result in less-than-significant operation-period emissions and, with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1, the project would result in less-than-significant construction-period emissions. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Clean Air Plan goals.

**Clean Air Plan Control Measures.** The control strategies of the Clean Air Plan include measures in the following categories: Stationary Source Measures, Transportation Measures, Energy Measures, Building Measures, Agriculture Measures, Natural and Working Lands Measures, Waste Management Measures, Water Measures, and Super-Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Pollutants Measures.

***Stationary Source Control Measures.*** The stationary source measures, which are designed to reduce emissions from stationary sources such as metal melting facilities, cement kilns, refineries, and glass furnaces, are incorporated into rules adopted by the BAAQMD and then enforced by the BAAQMD's Permit and Inspection programs. Since the project would not include any stationary sources, the Stationary Source Measures of the Clean Air Plan are not applicable to the project.

***Transportation Control Measures.*** The BAAQMD identifies Transportation Measures as part of the Clean Air Plan to decrease emissions of criteria pollutants, toxic air contaminants (TACs), and GHGs by reducing demand for motor vehicle travel, promoting efficient vehicles and transit service, decarbonizing transportation fuels, and electrifying motor vehicles and equipment. The proposed project would redevelop the Burlingame Community Center which would include playground and site improvements and parking improvements. The Burlingame Community Center would be located near Washington Park, Burlingame Lions Club, Burlingame High School, and single-family residential land uses, and therefore would provide community, meeting, fitness, art, and educational uses near existing residential and recreational uses in addition to public transportation. The overall network of sidewalks and crosswalks in the study area has adequate connectivity and provides pedestrians with safe routes to school, transit services, and other points of interest in the vicinity of the project site. In addition, although few of the local streets within the project study area are designated as bike routes, due to their low speed limits and traffic volumes, many streets in the vicinity of the project site are conducive to bicycle



travel. In addition, existing transit service to the study area is provided by the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), the City of Burlingame, and Caltrain. The project area is served directly by a limited bus route, an express bus route, and a shuttle route. The nearest bus stop is located at the Myrtle Road/Burlingame Avenue intersection, which is about 500 feet walking distance west of the project site. The proposed project is also located within approximately 650 feet to the Burlingame Caltrain station. Additionally, the availability of LimeBikes, a shared bicycle service, within the City promotes further bicycle use. Therefore, the project would promote the BAAQMD's initiatives to reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled and would increase the use of alternate means of transportation.

**Energy Control Measures.** The Clean Air Plan also includes Energy and Climate Control Measures, which are designed to reduce ambient concentrations of criteria pollutants and reduce emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. Implementation of these measures is intended to promote energy conservation and efficiency in buildings throughout the community, promote renewable forms of energy production, reduce the "urban heat island" effect by increasing reflectivity of roofs and parking lots, and promote the planting of (low-volatile organic compound [VOC]-emitting) trees to reduce biogenic emissions, lower air temperatures, provide shade, and absorb air pollutants. The measures include voluntary approaches to reduce the heat island effect by increasing shading in urban and suburban areas through the planting of trees. Implementation of the proposed project would include paved areas that could result in a heating effect. The proposed project would include 36 new trees throughout the project site. In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with the latest California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) standard building measures and Title 24 standards. Therefore the proposed project would not conflict with the Energy and Climate Control Measures.

**Building Control Measures.** The BAAQMD has authority to regulate emissions from certain sources in buildings such as boilers and water heaters, but has limited authority to regulate buildings themselves. Therefore, the strategies in the control measures for this sector focus on working with local governments that do have authority over local building codes, to facilitate adoption of best GHG control practices and policies. As identified above, the proposed project would be required to comply with the latest CALGreen standard building measures and Title 24 standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with these measures.

**Agriculture Control Measures.** The Agriculture Control Measures are designed to primarily reduce emissions of methane. Since the project does not include any agricultural activities, the Agriculture Control Measures of the Clean Air Plan are not applicable to the project.

**Natural and Working Lands Control Measures.** The Natural and Working Lands Control Measures focus on increasing carbon sequestration on rangelands and wetlands, as well as encouraging local governments to ordinances that promote urban-tree plantings. Since the project does not include the disturbance of any rangelands or wetlands, the Natural and Working Lands Control Measures of the Clean Air Plan are not applicable to the project.

**Waste Management Control Measures.** The Waste Management Measures focus on reducing or capturing methane emissions from landfills and composting facilities, diverting organic materials away from landfills, and increasing waste diversion rates through efforts to reduce, reuse, and recycle. The project would comply with local requirements for waste management (e.g., recycling and composting services). Therefore, the project would be consistent with the Waste Management Control Measures of the Clean Air Plan.

**Water Control Measures.** The Water Control Measures focus on reducing emissions of criteria pollutants, TACs, and GHGs by encouraging water conservation, limiting GHG emissions from publicly owned treatment works (POTWs), and promoting the use of biogas recovery systems. Since these measures apply to POTWs and local government agencies (and not individual projects), the Water Control Measures are not applicable to the project.

**Super GHG Control Measures.** The Super-GHG Control Measures are designed to facilitate the adoption of best GHG control practices and policies through the BAAQMD and local government agencies. Since these measures do not apply to individual projects, the Super-GHG Control Measures are not applicable to the project.

**Clean Air Plan Implementation.** As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would generally implement the applicable measures outlined in the Clean Air Plan, including Transportation Control Measures. Therefore, the project would not disrupt or hinder implementation of a control measure from the Clean Air Plan and this impact would be less than significant.

*b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

Both State and federal governments have established health-based Ambient Air Quality Standards for six criteria air pollutants: CO, ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, Pb, and suspended particulate matter (PM). These standards are designed to protect the health and welfare of the populace with a reasonable margin of safety. As identified above, the BAAQMD is under State non-attainment status for ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards. The Air Basin is also classified as non-attainment for both the federal ozone 8-hour standard and the federal PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-hour standard.

Air quality standards for the proposed project are regulated by the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. According to the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, to meet air quality standards for operational-related criteria air pollutant and air precursor impacts, the project must not:

- Contribute to CO concentrations exceeding the State ambient air quality standards;
- Generate average daily construction emissions of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), NO<sub>x</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> greater than 54 pounds per day or PM<sub>10</sub> exhaust emissions greater than 82 pounds per day; or
- Generate average operational emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> of greater than 10 tons per year or 54 pounds per day or PM<sub>10</sub> emissions greater than 15 tons per year or 82 pounds per day.

The following sections describe the proposed project's construction- and operation-related air quality impacts and CO impacts.

**Construction Emissions.** During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions generated by demolition, excavation, grading, hauling, and other activities. Emissions from construction equipment are also anticipated and would include CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, directly-emitted particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>), and TACs such as diesel exhaust particulate matter.

Site preparation and project construction would involve demolition, grading, paving, and building activities. Construction-related effects on air quality from the proposed project would be greatest during the site preparation phase due to the disturbance of soils. If not properly controlled, these activities would temporarily generate particulate emissions. Sources of fugitive dust would include disturbed soils at the construction site. Unless properly controlled, vehicles leaving the site would deposit dirt and mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity and local weather conditions. PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would depend on soil moisture, silt content of soil, wind speed, and the amount of operating equipment. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would be dispersed over greater distances from the construction site.

Water or other soil stabilizers can be used to control dust, resulting in emission reductions of 50 percent or more. The BAAQMD has established standard measures for reducing fugitive dust emissions (PM<sub>10</sub>). With the implementation of these Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, fugitive dust emissions from construction activities would not result in adverse air quality impacts.

In addition to dust-related PM<sub>10</sub> emissions, heavy trucks and construction equipment powered by gasoline and diesel engines would generate CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, VOCs, and some soot particulate (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>) in exhaust emissions. If construction activities were to increase traffic congestion in the area, CO and other emissions from traffic would increase slightly while those vehicles idle in traffic. These emissions would be temporary in nature and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site.

Construction emissions were estimated for the project using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2, consistent with BAAQMD recommendations. The project would include the demolition of approximately 25,000 square feet of building area, which was included as an input to the CalEEMod analysis. Other construction details are not yet known; therefore, default assumptions (e.g., construction fleet activities and excavation depths associated with the below-ground level parking) from CalEEMod were used. The entire construction duration is expected to occur for approximately 24 months, commencing in fall 2020. Construction-related emissions are presented in Table 4.A. CalEEMod output sheets are included in Appendix A.

**Table 4.A: Project Construction Emissions in Pounds Per Day**

Project Construction	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	Exhaust PM <sub>10</sub>	Exhaust PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Average Daily Emissions	1.9	11.7	0.6	0.5
BAAQMD Thresholds	54.0	54.0	82.0	54.0
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Source: LSA (July 2018).

As shown in Table 4.A, construction emissions associated with the project would be less than significant for ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> exhaust emissions. The BAAQMD requires the implementation of the BAAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures to reduce construction fugitive dust impacts to a less-than-significant level as follows:

**Mitigation Measure AIR-1:** Consistent with the Basic Construction Mitigation Measures required by the BAAQMD, the following actions shall be incorporated into construction contracts and specifications for the project:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt tracked-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible.
- Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the City of Burlingame regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

**Operational Air Quality Emissions.** Long-term air pollutant emission impacts are those associated with area sources and mobile sources related to the proposed project. In addition to the short-term construction emissions, the project would also generate long-term air pollutant emissions, such as those associated with changes in permanent use of the project site. These long-term emissions are primarily mobile source emissions that would result from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. Area sources, such as natural gas heaters, landscape equipment, and use of consumer products, would also result in pollutant emissions.

PM<sub>10</sub> emissions result from running exhaust, tire and brake wear, and the entrainment of dust into the atmosphere from vehicles traveling on paved roadways. Entrainment of PM<sub>10</sub> occurs when vehicle tires pulverize small rocks and pavement and the vehicle wakes generate airborne dust. The contribution of tire and brake wear is small compared to the other PM emission processes. Gasoline-powered engines have small rates of particulate matter emissions compared with diesel-powered vehicles.

Energy source emissions result from activities in buildings for which electricity and natural gas are used. The quantity of emissions is the product of usage intensity (i.e., the amount of electricity or natural gas) and the emission factor of the fuel source. Major sources of energy demand include building mechanical systems, such as heating and air conditioning, lighting, and plug-in electronics, such as refrigerators or computers. Greater building or appliance efficiency reduces the amount of energy for a given activity and thus lowers the resultant emissions. The emission factor is determined by the fuel source, with cleaner energy sources, like renewable energy, producing fewer emissions than conventional sources. Area source emissions associated with the project would include emissions from water heating and the use of landscaping equipment.

Emission estimates for operation of the project were calculated using CalEEMod. Model results are shown in Table 4.B. Trip generation rates for the project were based on the project's trip generation estimates, as identified in the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA),<sup>11</sup> which estimates that the proposed project would generate approximately 308 net new average daily trips, with 19 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 25 trips occurring during the PM peak hour.

---

<sup>11</sup> Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., 2018. *Burlingame Community Center Draft Transportation Impact Analysis*. June 27.

The primary emissions associated with the project are regional in nature, meaning that air pollutants are rapidly dispersed on release or, in the case of vehicle emissions associated with the project; emissions are released in other areas of the Air Basin. The daily emissions associated with project operational trip generation, energy and area sources are identified in Table 4.B for ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The results shown in Table 4.B indicate the project would not exceed the significance criteria for daily ROG, NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions; therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant effect on regional air quality and mitigation would not be required. This impact would be less than significant.

**Table 4.B: Project Operational Emissions**

	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Pounds Per Day</b>				
Area Source Emissions	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy Source Emissions	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
Mobile Source Emissions	0.4	1.5	1.1	0.3
<b>Total Emissions</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>
BAAQMD Thresholds	54.0	54.0	82.0	54.0
<b>Exceed Threshold?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Tons Per Year</b>				
Area Source Emissions	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy Source Emissions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile Source Emissions	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1
<b>Total Emissions</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>
BAAQMD Thresholds	10.0	10.0	15.0	10.0
<b>Exceed Threshold?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

Source: LSA (July 2018).

**Localized CO Impacts.** The BAAQMD has established a screening methodology that provides a conservative indication of whether the implementation of a proposed project would result in significant CO emissions. According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, a proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to localized CO concentrations if the following screening criteria are met:

- The project is consistent with an applicable congestion management program established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, and the regional transportation plan and local congestion management agency plans;
- Project traffic would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour; and
- The project would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited (e.g., tunnel, parking garage, bridge underpass, natural or urban street canyon, or below-grade roadway).

Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) for designated roads and highways, a regional transportation plan, or other agency plans. The project site is not located in an area where vertical or horizontal mixing of air is substantially limited. As identified in the TIA, the project's trip generation would be approximately 308 net new average daily trips, with 19 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 25 trips occurring during the PM peak hour; therefore, the project's contribution to peak hour traffic volumes at intersections in the vicinity of the project site would be well below 44,000 vehicles per hour. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in localized CO concentrations that exceed State or federal standards and this impact would be less than significant.

*c. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

CEQA defines a cumulative impact as two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. According to the BAAQMD, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. No single project is sufficient in size to, by itself; result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. Therefore, if daily average or annual emissions of operational-related criteria air pollutants exceed any applicable threshold established by the BAAQMD, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively significant impact.

As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would generate less-than-significant operational emissions. As shown in the project-specific air quality impacts discussion above, the proposed project would not result in individually significant impacts and therefore would also not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional air quality impacts. This impact would be considered less than significant.

*d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Sensitive receptors are defined as residential uses, schools, daycare centers, nursing homes, and medical centers. Individuals particularly vulnerable to diesel particulate matter are children, whose lung tissue is still developing, and the elderly, who may have serious health problems that can be aggravated by exposure to diesel particulate matter. Exposure from diesel exhaust associated with construction activity contributes to both cancer and chronic non-cancer health risks.

According to the BAAQMD, a project would result in a significant impact if it would: individually expose sensitive receptors to TACs resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 10.0 in one million, increased non-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), or an annual average ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m<sup>3</sup>). A significant cumulative impact would occur if the project in combination with other projects located within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site would expose sensitive receptors to TACs resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 100.0 in one million, an increased non-cancer risk of greater



than 10.0 on the hazard index (chronic), or an ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> increase greater than 0.8 µg/m<sup>3</sup> on an annual average basis. Impacts from substantial pollutant concentrations are discussed below.

As described above, construction of the proposed project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (i.e., usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, construction contractors would be required to implement Mitigation Measure AIR-1 described above. With implementation of this mitigation measure, project construction pollutant emissions would be below the BAAQMD significance thresholds. Once the project is constructed, the project would not be a source of substantial pollutant emissions. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during project construction or operation, and potential impacts would be considered less than significant.

*e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

During project construction, some odors may be present due to diesel exhaust. However, these odors would be temporary and limited to the construction period. The proposed project would not include any activities or operations that would generate objectionable odors and once operational, the project would not be a source of odors. Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This impact would be less than significant.



## 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 4.4.1 Impact Analysis

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

The topography of the City of Burlingame varies from mudflat adjacent to the San Francisco Bay to hills in the west. However, most of the City, including the project site, is developed and contains very little suitable habitat available for plant and animal species to exist. Some special-status species that have known occurrences in Burlingame include Ridgway's rail, in coastal salt and brackish marsh areas, and California red-legged frog, in riparian corridors.<sup>12</sup> The project site does not include any coastal salt, brackish marsh, or riparian areas. Due to the developed nature of the project site and the presence of buildings and associated hardscape, it is unlikely that the project site would

<sup>12</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2015. *Existing Conditions Report*. November.

support any special-status species. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to special-status species.

- b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (No Impact)*

The project site is within a developed area and does not support any riparian or other sensitive natural communities.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

- c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (No Impact)*

The project site is within a developed area and is not located in an area that supports wetlands, drainages, or water bodies as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.<sup>14</sup> The proposed project would not result in the direct removal, filling, or hydrological interruption of such wetlands. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on federally protected wetlands.

- d. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

The project site is a developed, landscaped area that supports wildlife species typically associated with urban and suburban areas. Because the project site is within a developed area, there are not major wildlife movement corridors that pass through or are adjacent to the site. Existing trees are located throughout and around the project site. Trees and other landscape vegetation generally have the potential to support nests of common native bird species. All native birds, regardless of their regulatory status, are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Wildlife Code. The proposed project would result in the removal of 41 trees. If conducted during the breeding season (February through August), vegetation removal and construction activities could directly impact nesting birds by removing trees or vegetation that support active nests. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to a less-than-significant level.

<sup>13</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2018. National Wetlands Inventory (Map). Website: [www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html](http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html) (accessed July 26, 2018). June 25.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1:**

If feasible, all vegetation removal shall be conducted during the non-breeding season (i.e., September 1 to January 31) to avoid direct impacts to nesting birds. If such work is scheduled during the breeding season, a qualified biologist or ornithologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine if any birds are nesting within the project sites. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May (since there is a higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through July. If active nests are found during the survey, the biologist or ornithologist shall determine an appropriately sized buffer around the nest in which no work will be allowed until the young have successfully fledged. The size of the buffer shall be determined by the biologist or ornithologist in consultation with the California department of Fish and Wildlife, and would be based on the nesting species, its sensitivity to disturbance, and the expected types of disturbance.

*e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The City of Burlingame requires a permit for tree removals with the following characteristics:

- Street trees, which are defined as any woody perennial plant having a single main axis or stem more than 10 feet in height; or
- Any tree with a circumference of 48 inches or more when measured 54 inches above natural grade; or
- A tree or stand of trees so designated by the City Council based upon findings that it is unique and of importance to the public due to its unusual appearance, location, historical or other factor; or
- A stand of trees in which the director has determined each tree is dependent upon the others for survival.<sup>15</sup>

As noted above, 41 of the 158 trees on the project site would be removed as a part of the proposed project. The City would obtain a tree removal permit prior to the removal of any protected trees. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and this impact would be less than significant.

---

<sup>15</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2018. *Burlingame Municipal Code*, as amended. May.

*f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (No Impact)*

The project site is not within any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

#### 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

##### 4.5.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

For a cultural resource to be considered a historical resource (i.e., eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources [CRHR]), it generally must be 50 years or older. Under CEQA, historical resources can include pre-contact (i.e., Native American) archaeological deposits, historic-period archaeological deposits, historic buildings, and historic districts. The project site includes the existing Community Center, a portion of which was constructed in the late 1940s, and which has been significantly modified over time.<sup>16</sup> However, the existing Community Center is not listed on the State Office of Historic Preservation Historic Property Directory, which includes listings of the CRHR, California State Historical Landmarks, California State Points of Historical Interest, and the National Register of Historic Places. Additionally, there are no known or recorded archaeological resources at the project site.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5, and this impact would be less-than-significant.

<sup>16</sup> Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning, Inc., 2018. *Burlingame's New Community Center Conceptual Design Executive Report*. March.

<sup>17</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2015. *Existing Conditions Report*. November.

*b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

The project site is currently developed with the existing community center and Washington Park Playground, and is surrounded by residential and public uses. As noted above, there are no known or recorded archaeological resources at the project site.<sup>18</sup> However, it is possible that a currently unknown cultural resource, as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, could be encountered during construction activities. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would ensure that potential impact to archaeological resources that may be encountered during project activities would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure CULT-1:** Should an archaeological resource be encountered during project construction activities, the construction contractor shall halt construction within 25 feet of the find and immediately notify the City. Construction activities shall be redirected and a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the City, shall: 1) evaluate the archaeological deposit to determine if it meets the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological resource and 2) make recommendations about the treatment of the deposit, as warranted. If the deposit does meet the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological resource then it shall be avoided to the extent feasible by project construction activities. If avoidance is not feasible, then adverse effects to the deposit shall be mitigated as specified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b) (for historic resources) or CEQA Section 21083.2 (for unique archaeological resources). This mitigation may include, but is not limited to, a thorough recording of the resource on Department of Parks and Recreation Form 523 records, or archaeological data recovery excavation. If data recovery excavation is warranted, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), which requires a data recovery plan prior to data recovery excavation, shall be followed. If the significant identified resources are unique archaeological resources, mitigation of these resources shall be subject to the limitations on mitigation measures for archaeological resources identified in CEQA Sections 21083.2(c) through 21083.2(f).

<sup>18</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2015. *Existing Conditions Report*. November.

*c. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

Although there is no documentation that suggests paleontological resources are present within the project site, there is a possibility that construction activities could uncover paleontological resources beneath the surface. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would ensure that potential impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure CULT-2:** If paleontological resources are encountered during site preparation or grading activities, all work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected until a qualified paleontologist has assessed the discoveries and made recommendations. Paleontological resources include fossil plants and animals, and evidence of past life such as trace fossils and tracks.

If the paleontological resources are found to be significant, adverse effects to such resources shall be avoided by project activities to the extent feasible. If project activities cannot avoid the resources, the adverse effects shall be mitigated in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3). Mitigation may include data recovery and analysis, preparation of a final report, and the formal transmission or delivery of any fossil material recovered to a paleontological repository, such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP). Upon completion of project activities, the final report shall document methods and findings of the mitigation and be submitted to the City's Community Development Department and a suitable paleontological repository.

*d. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

The potential to uncover Native American human remains exists in locations throughout California. Although not anticipated, human remains could be identified during site-preparation and grading activities and could result in a significant impact to Native American cultural resources.

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure CULT-3:** If human remains are encountered during construction activities, work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the San Mateo County Coroner shall be notified immediately. At the same time, a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the situation and consult with the appropriate agencies. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods.

Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results, and provide recommendations for the treatment of human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The City shall follow the recommendations outlined in the report and the report shall be submitted to the City's Community Development Department and the Northwest Information Center.

## 4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4.6.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*
  - i. *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*
  - ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking?*
  - iii. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*
  - iv. *Landslides?*

**Fault Rupture.** Fault rupture is generally expected to occur along active fault traces that have exhibited signs of recent geological movement (i.e., 11,000 years). Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones delineate areas around active faults with potential surface fault rupture hazards that would require specific geological investigations prior to approval of certain kinds of development within the delineated area. The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to fault rupture.

**Seismic Ground Shaking.** The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area, a region of intense seismic activity, as noted above. Ground shaking is likely to occur within the life of the proposed project as a result of future earthquakes. The closest known active fault to the project site is the San Andreas Fault, which is located approximately 3 miles west of the project site. Other active faults within 15 miles of the project site include the San Gregorio Fault and the Pilarcitos Fault. Due to the proposed project's location in a seismically active area, strong seismic ground shaking at the project site is highly probable during the life of the proposed project. The intensity of the ground shaking would depend on the characteristic of the fault, distance from the fault, the earthquake magnitude and duration, and site-specific geologic conditions. Conformance with the California Building Code would ensure potential impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

**Seismic Ground Failure.** The potential for different types of ground failure to occur during a seismic event is discussed below.

**Liquefaction.** Soil liquefaction is a phenomenon primarily associated with saturated soil layers located close to the ground surface. During ground shaking, these soils lose strength and acquire "mobility" sufficient to permit both horizontal and vertical movements. Soils that are most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, uniformly graded, saturated, fine-grained sands that lie relatively close to the ground surface. However, loose sands that contain a significant amount of fines (silt and clay) may also liquefy. The project site is located in an area of low liquefaction

---

<sup>19</sup> California, State of, 1974. Department of Conservation. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation – San Mateo Quadrangle. July 1.



risk.<sup>20</sup> Additionally, compliance with the California Building Code would ensure potential impacts associated with liquefaction would be less-than-significant.

**Lateral Spreading.** Lateral spreading is a phenomenon in which surficial soil displaces along a shear zone that has formed within an underlying liquefied layer. Upon reaching mobilization, the surface soils are transported downslope or in the direction of a free face by earthquake and gravitational forces. The project site is relatively flat and development of the proposed project would not exacerbate lateral spreading. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to lateral spreading.

**Landslides.** A landslide generally occurs on relatively steep slopes and/or on slopes underlain by weak materials. The project site is located on a relatively flat area and is not located next to any hills. The project site is considered Flatland, and therefore would not be susceptible to landslides.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, the potential for the proposed project to expose people or structures to risk as a result of landslides would be less than significant.

*b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Topsoil is defined as the upper part of the soil profile that is relatively rich in humus and is technically known as the A-horizon of the soil profile.<sup>22</sup> Grading and earthmoving during project construction has the potential to result in erosion and loss of topsoil. Exposed soils could be entrained in stormwater runoff and transported off the project sites. However, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with water quality control measures, which include preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) (refer to Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality). Although designed primarily to protect stormwater quality, the SWPPP would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize erosion. Additional details regarding the SWPPP are provided in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality of this Initial Study.

*c. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

As described in Section 4.6.1.a, soils on the project site would not be subject to liquefaction, lateral spreading, or landslides. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to conform with the California Building Code, which would reduce risks related to unstable soils. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to unstable soils.

<sup>20</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2015. Existing Conditions Report. November.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> California State Mining and Geology Board, 2014. Surface Mining Reclamation Act Regulations. California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 2, Chapter 8, Subchapter 1.

- d. *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Expansive soils are characterized by the potential for shrinking and swelling as the moisture content of the soil decreases and increases, respectively. Shrink-swell potential is influenced by the amount and type of clay minerals present and can be measured by the percent change of the soil volume.<sup>23</sup> Soils within the Alluvial zone, where the project site is located, contain clay, and therefore have shrinking and swelling potential.<sup>24</sup> However, compliance with California Building Code requirements would ensure that geotechnical design of the proposed project would reduce potential impacts related to expansive soils to a less-than-significant level. As such, the risk of expansive soil affecting the proposed project is considered low and would represent a less-than-significant impact.

- e. *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? (No Impact)*

The proposed project would connect to the City's wastewater conveyance system. On-site treatment and disposal of wastewater is not proposed for the project; therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts associated with soils incapable of supporting alternative wastewater disposal systems.

## 4.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 4.7.1 Impact Analysis

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are present in the atmosphere naturally, are released by natural sources, or are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. The gases that are widely seen as the principal contributors to human-induced global climate change are:

<sup>23</sup> Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2017. *Web Soil Survey*. Website: [websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx](http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx) (accessed September 4).

<sup>24</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2015. Existing Conditions Report. November.

- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>);
- Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>);
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O);
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs);
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and
- Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>).

Over the last 200 years, humans have caused substantial quantities of GHGs to be released into the atmosphere. These extra emissions are increasing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and enhancing the natural greenhouse effect, believed to be causing global warming. While manmade GHGs include naturally-occurring GHGs such as CO<sub>2</sub>, methane, and N<sub>2</sub>O, some gases, like HFCs, PFCs, and SF<sub>6</sub> are completely new to the atmosphere.

Certain gases, such as water vapor, are short-lived in the atmosphere. Others remain in the atmosphere for significant periods of time, contributing to climate change in the long term. Water vapor is excluded from the list of GHGs above because it is short-lived in the atmosphere and its atmospheric concentrations are largely determined by natural processes, such as oceanic evaporation.

These gases vary considerably in terms of Global Warming Potential (GWP), a concept developed to compare the ability of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. The GWP is based on several factors, including the relative effectiveness of a gas to absorb infrared radiation and length of time that the gas remains in the atmosphere ("atmospheric lifetime"). The GWP of each gas is measured relative to CO<sub>2</sub>, the most abundant GHG. The definition of GWP for a particular GHG is the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of the GHG to the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of CO<sub>2</sub> over a specified time period. GHG emissions are typically measured in terms of pounds or tons of "CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents" (CO<sub>2</sub>e).

*a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

This section describes the proposed project's construction- and operational-related GHG emissions and contribution to global climate change. The BAAQMD has not addressed emission thresholds for construction in their CEQA Guidelines; however, the BAAQMD encourages quantification and disclosure. Thus, construction emissions are discussed in this section.

**Construction Activities.** Construction activities associated with the proposed project would produce combustion emissions from various sources. During construction, GHGs would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and builder supply vendor vehicles, each of which typically use fossil-based fuels to operate. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs such as CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O. Furthermore, CH<sub>4</sub> is emitted during the fueling of heavy

equipment. Exhaust emissions from on-site construction activities would vary daily as construction activity levels change.

The BAAQMD does not have an adopted threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions. However, lead agencies are encouraged to quantify and disclose GHG emissions that would occur during construction. Using CalEEMod, it is estimated that construction of the proposed project would generate approximately 621.8 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would reduce GHG emissions by reducing the amount of construction vehicle idling and by requiring the use of properly maintained equipment. Therefore, project construction impacts associated with GHG emissions would be considered less than significant.

**Operational Emissions.** Long-term operation of the proposed project would generate GHG emissions from area and mobile sources as well as indirect emissions from sources associated with energy consumption. Mobile-source GHG emissions would include project-generated vehicle trips associated with trips to the proposed project. Area-source emissions would be associated with activities such as landscaping and maintenance on the project site, and other sources.

Following guidance from the BAAQMD, GHG emissions were estimated using CalEEMod. Table 4.C shows the calculated GHG emissions for the proposed project. Motor vehicle emissions are the largest source of GHG emissions for the project at approximately 64 percent of the total. Energy use is the next largest category at 30 percent. Solid waste and water are about 5 percent and 1 percent of the total emissions respectively. Additional calculation details are included in Appendix A.

**Table 4.C: GHG Emissions (Metric Tons Per Year)**

Emissions Source	Operational Emissions				
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub> e	Percent of Total
Area Source Emissions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Energy Source Emissions	93.0	0.0	0.0	93.6	30
Mobile Source Emissions	198.3	0.0	0.0	198.5	64
Waste Source Emissions	6.7	0.4	0.0	16.5	5
Water Source Emissions	2.2	0.0	0.0	3.3	1
<b>Total Annual Emissions</b>				<b>311.9</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>BAAQMD Threshold</b>				<b>1,100</b>	-
<b>Exceed?</b>				<b>No</b>	-

Source: LSA (July 2018).

According to the BAAQMD, a project would result in a less-than-significant GHG impact if it would:

- Result in operational-related greenhouse gas emissions of less than 1,100 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e a year; or
- Result in operational-related greenhouse gas emissions of less than 4.6 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population (residents plus employees).

Based on the results of the construction and operation analysis, the project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment. The proposed project would generate 311.9 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e which would be well below the BAAQMD numeric threshold of 1,100 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e. Operation of the proposed project would not generate significant GHG emissions and would have a less-than-significant impact related to operational GHG emissions.

*b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The City of Burlingame's Climate Action Plan (CAP),<sup>25</sup> adopted in June 2009, serves as a guiding document to identify methods that the City and community can implement to significantly reduce GHG emissions toward meeting the requirements mandated by Assembly Bill 32, California's Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which requires emissions to be reduced 15 percent below current levels (as measured in 2005) by the year 2020 and to be reduced by 80 percent by the year 2050. The CAP also provides a baseline of emissions, sets achievable targets as stipulated by AB 32, and recommends steps to be taken to reduce emissions, increase sustainability, and improve quality of life. The CAP provides strategies related to energy efficiency and green building, transportation and land use, waste reduction and recycling, education and promotion, and municipal operations. The following strategies are applicable to the proposed project:

- Research methods to expand and enhance shuttles and public transportation services to increase shuttle ridership and public transportation alternatives;
- Encourage development that is mixed use, infill, and higher density;
- Require recycling at major public events in Burlingame (of cardboard, paper, containers and food/organics);
- Adopt a Recycling Policy to achieve a citywide diversion rate of 75 percent measured diversion by 2015; and
- Adopt a Civic Green Building Policy that requires "Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design" (LEED) a green building standard for new municipal construction and major remodels.

The proposed project would redevelop the Burlingame Community Center which would include playground and site improvements and parking improvements. In 2016, the City adopted Chapter 18.30 Green Buildings Standards Code as part of the Municipal Code, which encourages projects to comply with the 2016 CALGreen standard building measures and Title 24 standards. As discussed in the Project Description, the proposed Burlingame Community Center would be designed to meet seismic standards and meet the current California Building Code. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with Chapter 18.30 of the Municipal Code. The City has not adopted a Civic Green Building Policy, however, compliance with the latest CALGreen and Title 24 building standards, as required by Chapter 9.35 of the Municipal Code, would result in enhanced energy efficiency over the current building.

<sup>25</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2009. *City of Burlingame Climate Action Plan*. June.

In addition, the Burlingame Community Center would be located near Washington Park, Burlingame Lions Club, Burlingame High School, and single-family residential land uses, and therefore would provide community, meeting, fitness, art, and educational uses near existing residential and recreational uses in addition to public transportation. The overall network of sidewalks and crosswalks in the study area has adequate connectivity and provides pedestrians with safe routes to school, transit services, and other points of interest in the vicinity of the project site. In addition, although few of the local streets within the project study area are designated as bike routes, due to their low speed limits and traffic volumes, many streets in the vicinity of the project site are conducive to bicycle travel. In addition, existing transit service to the study area is provided by SamTrans, the City of Burlingame, and Caltrain. The project area is served directly by a limited bus route, an express bus route, and a shuttle route. The nearest bus stop is located at the Myrtle Road/Burlingame Avenue intersection, which is about 500 feet walking distance west of the project site. The proposed project is also located approximately 650 feet to the Burlingame Caltrain station. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with CAP strategies related to energy efficiency and green building and transportation and land use.

In addition, as discussed above, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions and, therefore, is consistent with the CAP and would not generate emissions that would exceed the project-level significance criteria established by the BAAQMD. The project would also be consistent with the strategies and policies included in the CAP. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. This impact would be less than significant.

## 4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 4.8.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Small quantities of commercially-available hazardous materials (e.g., paint, cleaning supplies) would be routinely used at the project site and in the new community center during operation. However, the City would be required to comply with existing government regulations<sup>26</sup> in its use and disposal of these materials, and such materials would not be used in sufficient strength or quantity to create a substantial risk to human or environmental health. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

<sup>26</sup> The United States Environmental Protection Agency regulates "small-quantity generators" (SQGs) of hazardous wastes, which are defined as facilities that generate more than 100 kg (approximately 220 lbs), but less than 1,000 kg (2,200 lbs), of hazardous waste per month.

*b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

As described above, small quantities of common hazardous materials would be used at the project site during construction and operation of the proposed project. Improper use, storage, or handling could result in a release of hazardous materials into the environment which could pose a risk to construction workers and the public. However, the City would be required to comply with existing government regulations in its use and disposal of these materials, and such materials would not be used in sufficient strength or quantity to create a substantial risk to human or environmental health.

In July 2017, RestCon Environmental prepared an Asbestos Investigation at the existing Community Center.<sup>27</sup> The investigation found that there were Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs) present in building materials and paints throughout the existing Community Center.

The proposed project would be required to conform to all applicable local, State, and federal regulations and standards pertaining to treatment and disposal of ACMs. These requirements would include compliance with regulations set forth by the California State License Board, the Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), and the California Department of Health Services (DHS) for removal of ACMS during construction. Compliance with all applicable regulations would reduce any significant hazards to the public or the environment.

Construction of the proposed project would involve the transport, use, and disposal of chemical agents, solvents, paints, fuel and oil for construction equipment, and other hazardous materials that are commonly associated with construction activities. The routine handling and use of hazardous materials by construction workers would be performed in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations, which include training requirements for construction workers and a requirement that hazardous materials are accompanied by manufacturer's Safety Data Sheets (SDSs). Cal/OSHA regulations include requirements for protective clothing, training, and limits on exposure to hazardous materials. Compliance with these existing regulations would ensure that construction workers are protected from exposure to hazardous materials that may be used on site.

Because the proposed project would result in soil disturbance greater than 1 acre, management of hazardous materials during construction activities would be subject to the requirements of the Stormwater Construction General Permit, which requires preparation and implementation of an SWPPP that includes hazardous materials storage requirements. For example, construction site operators must store chemicals in watertight containers (with appropriate secondary containment to prevent any spillage or leakage) or in a storage shed (completely enclosed).

In 1990 and 1994, the federal Hazardous Material Transportation Act was amended to improve the protection of life, property, and the environment from the inherent risks of transporting hazardous

---

<sup>27</sup> RestCon Environmental, 2017. *Asbestos Investigation for 850 Burlingame Avenue, Burlingame, CA 94010*. July 3.



material in all major modes of commerce. The Department of Transportation (DOT) developed hazardous materials regulations, which govern the classification, packaging, communication, transportation, and handling of hazardous materials, as well as employee training and incident reporting. The transportation of hazardous materials is subject to both federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and DOT regulations. The California Highway Patrol, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) are responsible for enforcing federal and State regulations pertaining to the transportation of hazardous materials.

The proposed project would comply with existing government regulations (federal, State, regional, and local) regarding the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to the potential release of hazardous materials commonly associated with construction activities into the environment.

*c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Refer to Section 4.8.1.a and 4.8.1.b. The City would be required to comply with all applicable local, State, and federal regulations and standards related to hazardous emissions and materials. As noted above, compliance with all applicable regulations would reduce any significant hazards to the public or the environment related to hazardous materials, and the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

*d. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (No Impact)*

The project site does not include any active storage sites listed on the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) Leaking Underground Storage (LUST) database or the Water Board's site cleanup program,<sup>28</sup> two of the component databases that comprise of the State Cortese List of known hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Active sites are not listed for the project on other components of the Cortese List, including the DTSC hazardous waste and substance list.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, no impacts associated with locating a project on a site included on a list of hazardous materials is expected to occur.

<sup>28</sup> San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2018. GeoTracker. Website: [geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map) (accessed July 24, 2018).

<sup>29</sup> California, State of, 2018. Department of Toxic Substances Control. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. Website: [www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public](http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public) (accessed July 24, 2018).

- e. Would the project be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The San Francisco International Airport (SFO) is the closest airport to the project site, located approximately 2.5 miles to the north. The project site is within the boundary of the SFO Airport Influence Area B, which requires new projects to demonstrate consistency with the goals and policies of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The proposed project would be two stories in height, and would be consistent with existing building heights in the adjacent areas. The proposed project would not increase the proposed residential density, would not be an incompatible land use, would not increase the height such that it would create a hazard or obstruction, and would not result in the addition of a characteristic that would create a hazard to air navigation. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to airport safety hazards.

- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (No Impact)*

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project due to the proximity of a private airstrip.

- g. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The proposed project would not result in any alterations of existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with any emergency evacuation routes within San Mateo County or an adopted emergency response plan, and this impact would be less-than-significant.

- h. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (No Impact)*

The project site is located in an urban area and is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wildland fires and there would be no impact.

<sup>30</sup> Cal Fire, 2008. *San Mateo County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA*. November 24.

## 4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 4.9.1 Impact Analysis

#### a. *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

The State Water Resources Control Board and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards regulate water quality of surface water and groundwater bodies throughout California. In the Bay Area, including the project site, the Water Board is responsible for implementation the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan establishes beneficial water uses for waterways and water bodies within the region.

Runoff water quality is regulated by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program (established through the federal Clean Water Act). The NPDES program objective is to control and reduce pollutant discharges to surface water bodies. Compliance with NPDES permits is

mandated by State and federal statutes and regulations. Locally, the NPDES Program is administered by the Water Board. According to the water quality control plans of the Water Board, any construction activities, including grading, that would result in the disturbance of 1 acre or more would require compliance with the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activity (Construction General Permit). The project site is approximately 2.41 acres and as such, would be required to comply with the Construction General Permit.

The proposed project would be subject to the Water Board Municipal Regional Permit (MRP), implemented in October 2009 by Order R2-2009-0074. Provision C.3 of the MRP requires new development and redevelopment projects that would replace more than 10,000 square feet of existing impervious surfaces to include post-construction stormwater control in project designs. Under the C.3 requirements, the preparation and submittal of a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) would be required for the project site. The purpose of an SCP is to detail the design elements and implementation measures necessary to meet the post-construction stormwater control requirements of the MRP. In particular, SCPs must include Low Impact Development (LID) design measures, which reduce water quality impacts by preserving and recreating natural landscape features, minimizing imperviousness, and using stormwater as a resource, rather than a waste product. The proposed project would also be required to prepare a Stormwater Facility Operation and Maintenance Plan to ensure that stormwater control measures are inspected, maintained, and funded for the life of the project.

As previously described, the proposed project would increase the total amount of impervious surface on the project site. The increase in impervious surface could result in increased stormwater runoff (both flow rate and volume) from the project site relative to pre-project conditions, which may result in hydromodification impacts (i.e., increased potential for erosion of creek beds and banks, silt pollutant generation, or other adverse impacts on beneficial uses due to increased erosive force).

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would cause disturbance of soil during excavation work, which could adversely impact water quality. Contaminants from construction vehicles and equipment and sediment from soil erosion could increase the pollutant load in runoff being transported to receiving waters during development. Although surface runoff from the site would likely decrease with the proposed project (due to the proposed stormwater treatment measures), runoff from the proposed landscaped areas may contain residual pesticides and nutrients (associated with landscaping) and sediment and trace metals (associated with atmospheric deposition) during operation of the project. Operation of the proposed project could incrementally contribute to the long-term degradation of runoff water quality and as a result, adversely affect water quality in the receiving waters and San Francisco Bay. The proposed project would be considered a "regulated project" under the MRP, indicating that the State Water Resources Control Board has determined the size and nature of the project has the potential to discharge a significant pollutant load to stormwater runoff and receiving waters. Therefore, the potential discharges associated with the proposed project are considered to be a potentially significant impact.

Implementation of the following two mitigation measures would ensure that the proposed project complies with the Water Board's water quality standards by reducing the potential construction- and operation-period impacts to water quality to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure HYD-1:** Prior to construction, the project applicant shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), meeting Construction General Permit requirements (State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2009-000-DWQ, as amended) designed to reduce potential adverse impacts to surface water quality through the project construction period. The SWPPP shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of any permits for ground disturbing activities.

The SWPPP shall be prepared by a Qualified SWPPP Developer in accordance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. These include: Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion and sediment control, site management/housekeeping/waste management, management of non-stormwater discharges, run-on and runoff controls, and BMP inspection/maintenance/repair activities. BMP implementation shall be consistent with the BMP requirements in the most recent version of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Handbook-Construction.

The SWPPP shall include a construction site monitoring program that identifies requirements for dry weather visual observations of pollutants at all discharge locations, and as appropriate (depending on the Risk Level), sampling of the site effluent and receiving waters. A Qualified SWPPP Practitioner shall be responsible for implementing the BMPs at the site and performing all required monitoring and inspection/maintenance/repair activities.

**Mitigation Measure HYD-2:** The project applicant shall fully comply with San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board stormwater permit requirements, including Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit. The project applicant shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) for the project. The SCP shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of any permits for ground disturbing activities. The SCP would act as the overall program document designed to provide measures to mitigate potential water quality impacts associated with the operation of the proposed project. At a minimum, the SCP for the project shall include:

- An inventory and accounting of existing and proposed impervious areas.
- Low Impact Development (LID) design details incorporated into the project. Specific LID design may include, but is not limited to: using pervious pavements and green roofs, dispersing runoff to landscaped areas, and/or routing runoff to rain gardens, cisterns, swales, and other small-scale facilities distributed throughout the site.
- Measures to address potential stormwater contaminants. These may include measures to cover or control potential sources of stormwater pollutants at the project site.
- A Draft Stormwater Facility Operation and Maintenance Plan for the project site, which will include periodic inspection and maintenance of the storm drainage system. Persons responsible for performing and funding the requirements of this plan shall be identified. This plan must be finalized prior to issuance of building permits for the project.

*b. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The proposed project would connect to the existing water lines located within Burlingame Avenue and would not use groundwater at the site. Although no use of groundwater is proposed for the proposed project, some dewatering may be required during construction. Any dewatering activities would be expected to be temporary in nature. Therefore, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

*c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

The proposed project would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river. The project site is located in a developed area and would not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Furthermore, compliance with construction- and operation-phase stormwater requirements (Mitigation Measures HYD-1 and HYD-2) would further ensure that development of the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to existing drainage patterns.

- d. *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

Refer to Section 4.9.1.c. The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage or flooding pattern of the project site.

- e. *Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

Refer to Section 4.9.1.a and 4.9.1.c. The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff that would exceed the existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. The proposed project could potentially provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; however, implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 and HYD-2 would ensure that potential impacts are reduced to less-than-significant levels.

- f. *Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Operation of the proposed project would not result in any substantial changes to on-site water quality, with the exception of the potential impacts associated with stormwater runoff described in Section 4.9.1.a. The proposed project would not adversely affect water quality, and would have a less-than-significant impact.

- g. *Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (No Impact)*

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone as mapped by FEMA.<sup>31</sup> In addition, no housing is included in the proposed project, and therefore no impact related to placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area would occur.

- h. *Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (No Impact)*

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by FEMA.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to the placement of structures within a floodplain.

<sup>31</sup> Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2015. *Flood Insurance Rate Map San Mateo County, California*. July 16.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.



i. *Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The project site is not located within a mapped dam failure inundation area or within a 100-year flood hazard area.<sup>33</sup> In addition, there are no levees protecting the site from flooding and as a result, no risk of failure. Therefore, the potential of the proposed project to be subject to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding is less than significant.

j. *Would the project be inundated by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (No Impact)*

The project site and surrounding areas are generally level and would not be subject to mudflows. The project site is located within close proximity to the San Francisco Bay. However, the project site is not located within a mapped tsunami inundation area for Burlingame,<sup>34</sup> and no seismically induced seiche waves have ever been documented in the San Francisco Bay.<sup>35</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

#### 4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

##### 4.10.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project physically divide an established community? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a physical feature (such as an interstate highway or railroad tracks) or removal of a means of access (such as a local road or bridge) that would impair mobility with an existing community, or between a community and outlying areas. For instance, the construction of an interstate highway through an

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> California, State of, 2009. California Emergency Management Agency. *Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning: San Mateo Quadrangle*.

<sup>35</sup> Association of Bay Area Governments and Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2017. *Plan Bay Area 2040 Final Environmental Impact Report*. July 16.



existing community may constrain travel from one side of the community to another; similarly, such construction may also impair travel to areas outside of the community.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the demolition of the existing community center and adjacent park, and the construction of a new community center and park. The proposed project would not result in the realignment or closure of any existing roads. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

*b. Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The project site is designated as Parks – Community on the City’s General Plan Land Use Map<sup>36</sup> and has an unclassified zoning district on the City’s Zoning Map.<sup>37</sup> Following is an evaluation of the proposed project’s consistency with the applicable goals and policies of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. In reviewing this section, it is important to understand that the determination of whether a project is consistent with a specific policy can be subjective, and that consistency determinations are best made with a broad understanding of the often-competing policy objectives in a planning document. As a result, policy consistency determinations are ultimately made by the local decision-making body. As previously discussed, the City is the lead agency for environmental review. Therefore, the City Council would determine the proposed project’s consistency with the City’s applicable plans and policies. The analysis in this chapter is intended to provide decision-makers with a list of the goals and policies that are pertinent to the proposed project and the project site, and a recommendation regarding whether or not the proposed project would directly conflict with relevant planning directives. These recommendations are intended to supplement decision-makers’ own understanding of the various policy considerations. A conflict with an applicable policy is not itself a significant impact unless it results in a significant environmental impact, as described below.

Per CEQA Guidelines, policy conflicts do not, in and of themselves, constitute significant environmental impacts. Policy conflicts are considered to be environmental impacts only when they would result in direct physical impacts or where those conflicts relate to avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts. As such, associated physical environmental impacts are discussed in this Initial Study under specific topical sections.

As the project site has an unclassified zoning district and the proposed project would expand the existing legally permitted use, a Conditional Use Permit would be required.<sup>38</sup> The proposed project would be consistent with the type and intensity of development assumed for the project site in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, and would not require any variances. Therefore, the proposed

<sup>36</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2000. *City of Burlingame General Plan*, Land Use Map. April.

<sup>37</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2016. *Burlingame General Plan: Zoning – Southeast Areas*. Available online: [www.burlingame.org/document\\_center/Zoning/ZoningMap-Burlingame-SE.pdf](http://www.burlingame.org/document_center/Zoning/ZoningMap-Burlingame-SE.pdf) (accessed June 8, 2018).

<sup>38</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2018. op. cit.

project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigation an environmental effect and this impact would be less than significant.

*c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (No Impact)*

Refer to Section 4.4.1.f. The proposed project would have no impact related to any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

#### 4.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

##### 4.11.1 Impact Analysis

*a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (No Impact)*

There are no known mineral resources within or in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region or residents of the State.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

*b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (No Impact)*

Refer to Section 4.11.1.a. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known locally-important mineral resource recovery sites. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

<sup>39</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2015. *City of Burlingame General Plan*. As amended.

## 4.12 NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 4.12.1 Impact Analysis

Noise is usually defined as unwanted sound. Noise consists of any sound that may produce physiological or psychological damage and/or interfere with communication, work, rest, recreation, or sleep. Several noise measurement scales exist that are used to describe noise in a particular location. A decibel (dB) is a unit of measurement that indicates the relative intensity of a sound. Sound levels in dB are calculated on a logarithmic basis. An increase of 10 dB represents a 10-fold increase in acoustic energy, while 20 dB is 100 times more intense and 30 dB is 1,000 times more intense. Each 10 dB increase in sound level is perceived as approximately a doubling of loudness; and similarly, each 10 dB decrease in sound level is perceived as half as loud. Sound intensity is normally measured through the A-weighted sound level (dBA). This scale gives greater weight to the frequencies of sound to which the human ear is most sensitive. The A-weighted sound level is the basis for 24-hour sound measurements that better represent human sensitivity to sound at night.

As noise spreads from a source, it loses energy so that the farther away the noise receiver is from the noise source, the lower the perceived noise level would be. Geometric spreading causes the sound level to attenuate or be reduced, resulting in a 6 dB reduction in the noise level for each doubling of distance from a single point source of noise to the noise sensitive receptor of concern.

There are many ways to rate noise for various time periods, but an appropriate rating of ambient noise affecting humans also accounts for the annoying effects of sound. Equivalent continuous sound level ( $L_{eq}$ ) is the total sound energy of time varying noise over a sample period. However, the predominant rating scales for human communities in the State of California are the  $L_{eq}$ , the community noise equivalent level (CNEL), and the day-night average level ( $L_{dn}$ ) based on dBA. CNEL is the time varying

noise over a 24-hour period, with a 5 dBA weighting factor applied to the hourly  $L_{eq}$  for noises occurring from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. (defined as relaxation hours) and 10 dBA weighting factor applied to noise occurring from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. (defined as sleeping hours).  $L_{dn}$  is similar to the CNEL scale, but without the adjustment for events occurring during the evening relaxation hours. CNEL and  $L_{dn}$  are within one dBA of each other and are normally exchangeable. The noise adjustments are added to the noise events occurring during the more sensitive hours.

A project would have a significant noise effect if it would substantially increase the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas or be in conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of applicable regulatory agencies, including, as appropriate, the City of Burlingame.

The City of Burlingame addresses noise in the Noise Element of the General Plan<sup>40</sup> and in the Municipal Code. The Noise Element of the General Plan provides goals, policies, and implementation programs in order to exclude and prohibit all annoying, excessive, and unnecessary noises from all sources. The Noise Element also identifies maximum noise emission standards for construction equipment operating within the City, which are summarized in Table 4.D below. The Noise Element also states that no project shall emit noise past the property line so as to create a noise level increase of more than 5 dBA over the ambient noise level.

**Table 4.D: Maximum Allowable Noise Levels from Construction Equipment**

Equipment		Peak Noise Level in dBA at 50 Feet
<b>Earthmoving</b>	Front loader	75
	Backhoes	75
	Dozers	75
	Tractors	75
	Scrapers	80
	Graders	75
	Truck	75
	Paver	80
<b>Materials Handling</b>	Concrete Mixer	75
	Concrete Pump	75
	Crane	75
	Derrick	75
<b>Stationary</b>	Pumps	75
	Generators	75
	Compressors	75
<b>Impact</b>	Pile Drivers	95
	Jackhammers	75
	Rock Drills	80
	Pneumatic tools	80
<b>Other</b>	Saws	75
	Vibrators	75

Source: City of Burlingame (1975).

<sup>40</sup> Burlingame, City of, 1975. *City of Burlingame General Plan, Noise Element*. September 15.

The Noise Element also sets noise exposure land use compatibility standards, as shown in Table 4.E below.

**Table 4.E: Planning Criteria – Maximum Outdoor Noise Levels (dBA)**

Land Use Categories	CNEL
Public, Quasi-Public, and Residential: Schools, Hospitals, Libraries, Auditoriums, Intensively Used Parks and Playgrounds, Public Buildings, Single Family Home, Multiple Family Apartments and Condominiums, Mobile Home Parks	60
Passively-Used Open Space: Wilderness-Type Parks, Nature or Contemplation Areas of Public Parks	45
Commercial: Shopping Centers, Self-Generative Business, Commercial Districts, Offices, Banks, Clinics, Hotels and Motels	65
Industrial: Non-Manufacturing Industry, Transportation, Communications, Utilities, Manufacturing	75

Source: City of Burlingame (1975).

Note: These criteria may be invoked for the following purposes:

<sup>a</sup> To determine the suitability of development on lands considered as receptors to which the standards apply; and

<sup>b</sup> To determine the suitability of building types and proposed construction materials to be applied on the site.

The Building Construction Section of the Municipal Code establishes permissible hours for construction in the City of Burlingame.<sup>41</sup> Chapter 18.07.110 states that no person shall erect, demolish, alter, or repair any building or structure other than between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No person shall erect (including excavation and grading), demolish, alter, or repair any building or structure on Sundays or holidays. In addition, Chapter 10.40.039 limits loading/unloading activities to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays if they would result in a noise disturbance across a residential real property line.

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples of these land uses include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, childcare facilities, and senior housing. A portion of Washington Park and the lands of the former Gunst Estate are immediately north of the project site. are Single-family residential units and US 101 are further north of the project site. The project site is bounded to the east by single-family residential uses, which also make up the land uses further east. Burlingame Avenue bounds the project site to the south, with single- and multi-family residential uses, as well as institutional uses, including Washington Elementary School. The Burlingame Lions Club and Washington Park bound the project site to the west. Further west is Burlingame High School, the Burlingame Aquatic Club, and the Burlingame Caltrain Station and tracks. The closest sensitive receptors to the project site include the single- family residences located immediately east of the project site, along Burlingame Avenue and Concord Way.

<sup>41</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2018. *Burlingame Municipal Code*. May.

- a. *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

The following section describes how the short-term construction and long-term operational noise impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.

**Short-Term (Construction) Noise Impacts.** Project construction would result in short-term noise impacts on the nearby sensitive receptors. Maximum construction noise would be short-term, generally intermittent depending on the construction phase, and variable depending on receiver distance from the active construction zone. The duration of noise impacts generally would be from one day to several days depending on the phase of construction. The level and types of noise impacts that would occur during construction are described below.

Short-term noise impacts would occur during grading and site preparation activities. Table 4.F lists typical construction equipment noise levels ( $L_{max}$ ) recommended for noise impact assessments, based on a distance of 50 feet between the equipment and a noise receptor, obtained from the FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels currently in the project area but would no longer occur once construction of the project is completed.

**Table 4.F: Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels**

Equipment Description	Acoustical Usage Factor (%)	Maximum Noise Level ( $L_{max}$ ) at 50 Feet <sup>1</sup>
Backhoes	40	80
Compactor (ground)	20	80
Compressor	40	80
Cranes	16	85
Dozers	40	85
Dump Trucks	40	84
Excavators	40	85
Flat Bed Trucks	40	84
Forklift	20	85
Front-end Loaders	40	80
Graders	40	85
Impact Pile Drivers	20	95
Jackhammers	20	85
Pick-up Truck	40	55
Pneumatic Tools	50	85
Pumps	50	77
Rock Drills	20	85
Rollers	20	85
Scrapers	40	85
Tractors	40	84
Welder	40	73

Source: Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA 2006).

Note: Noise levels reported in this table are rounded to the nearest whole number.

<sup>1</sup> Maximum noise levels were developed based on Spec 721.560 from the Central Artery/Tunnel (CA/T) program to be consistent with the City of Boston's Noise Code for the "Big Dig" project.

$L_{max}$  = maximum instantaneous sound level

Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction of the proposed project. The first type involves construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site, which would incrementally increase noise levels on roads leading to the site. As shown in Table 4.F, there would be a relatively high single-event noise exposure potential at a maximum level of 84 dBA  $L_{max}$  with trucks passing at 50 feet.

The second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during excavation, grading, and construction on the project site. Construction is performed in discrete steps, or phases, each with its own mix of equipment and, consequently, its own noise characteristics. These various sequential phases would change the character of the noise generated on site. Therefore, the noise levels vary as construction progresses. Despite the variety in the type and size of construction equipment, similarities in the dominant noise sources and patterns of operation allow construction-related noise ranges to be categorized by work phase.

Table 4.F lists maximum noise levels recommended for noise impact assessments for typical construction equipment, based on a distance of 50 feet between the equipment and a noise receptor. Typical maximum noise levels range up to 87 dBA  $L_{max}$  at 50 feet during the noisiest construction phases. The site preparation phase, including excavation and grading of the site, tends to generate the highest noise levels because earthmoving machinery is the noisiest construction equipment. Earthmoving equipment includes excavating machinery such as backfillers, bulldozers, draglines, and front loaders. Earthmoving and compacting equipment includes compactors, scrapers, and graders. Typical operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve 1 or 2 minutes of full-power operation followed by 3 or 4 minutes at lower power settings. Excavation for the below ground level parking levels would take place on the eastern side of the project site adjacent to the backyards of single-family homes.

As shown in Table 4.F, typical construction equipment noise levels could exceed the standard established by the City, which are shown in Table 4.D. However, construction noise would be intermittent and sporadic as construction occurs over the 2.41-acre site. Noise levels would attenuate at sensitive receptors as construction activity moves further into the site due to distance divergence factors. In addition, construction noise is permitted by the Municipal Code when activities occur between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays.

As discussed above, construction noise would result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Implementation of the following mitigation measure for project construction would reduce potential construction period noise impacts for the indicated sensitive receptors to less-than-significant levels.

- Mitigation Measure NOI-1:** The project contractor shall implement the following best management practice measures during construction of the project:
- Equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards.
  - Place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the active project site.
  - Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all project construction.
  - Install temporary noise barriers around stationary noise sources (such as compressors) and locate stationary noise sources as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible.
  - Prohibit extended idling time of internal combustion engines.
  - All construction equipment shall not exceed the noise levels established in the General Plan (Table 4).
  - All noise producing construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays.
  - Designate a "disturbance coordinator" at the City of Burlingame who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler) and would determine and implement reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem.

**Operational Noise Impacts.** The project would generate long-term noise impacts from both traffic and stationary noise sources, as discussed below.

**Traffic Noise Impacts.** Motor vehicles with their distinctive noise characteristics are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity. The amount of noise varies according to many factors, such as volume of traffic, vehicle mix (percentage of cars and trucks), average traffic speed, and distance from the observer. Implementation of the proposed project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project site vicinity. A characteristic of sound is that a doubling of a noise source is required in order to result in a perceptible (3 dBA or greater) increase in the resulting noise level.



As identified in the TIA, the proposed project would generate approximately 308 net new average daily trips, with 19 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 25 trips occurring during the PM peak hour. The adjacent Burlingame Avenue carries approximately 2,240 average daily trips. Project trips would represent a small fraction of the overall roadway traffic volumes. Therefore, project daily trips would not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any roadway segment in the project vicinity and would not result in a perceptible increase in traffic noise levels at receptors in the project vicinity. This impact would be less than significant.

**Stationary Noise Impacts.** The proposed project would redevelop the Burlingame Community Center which would include playground and site improvements and parking improvements, which could result in an increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site with additional parking and improved and increased outdoor play areas. Outdoor activity typically generates maximum noise levels of 70 dBA  $L_{max}$ .

The closest residential receptors are located approximately 390 feet east of the nearest outdoor activity areas, which would provide a minimum of 38 dBA reduction in noise levels due to distance. Therefore, maximum noise levels generated by the outdoor activity would be approximately 32 dBA. The dominant noise source in the project vicinity is from traffic noise. Vehicle passing on roadways result in approximately 60 dBA  $L_{max}$ , while truck pass-bys typically generate noise levels of 80 dBA  $L_{max}$ . Therefore, noise levels associated with the project, including the outdoor active use areas would not be substantially greater than existing noise sources. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial increases in noise at noise sensitive land uses due to distance attenuation; therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

In addition, with the increase in daily vehicle trips, use of the parking lot would intensify. Implementation of the proposed project would include a surface parking lot and a below-ground level parking garage in the eastern corner of the project site. The surface parking lot would include a drop-off area adjacent to the new Community Center building. Representative parking lot activities, such as visitors conversing and slamming doors, would generate approximately 60 to 70 dBA  $L_{max}$  at 50 feet. The proposed parking lot area is approximately 15 feet east of the nearest sensitive receptors. Adjusted for distance, the nearest sensitive receptors would be exposed to a noise level of 70 to 80 dBA  $L_{max}$  generated by parking lot activities. Noise levels associated with the surface parking lot would be higher than the below-ground level parking garage as the garage would shield the residences from project-related parking lot noise. In addition, as identified in Section 2.0, Project Description, the parking garage would also include a vegetated sound wall along its northern border, which would reduce parking lot noise at the nearest sensitive receptors. When averaged over a 24-hour period, parking lot activities would not cause an increase in noise levels of more than 3 dBA. Therefore it is not expected that the proposed project would substantially increase noise levels over existing conditions and impacts would be less than significant.

However, peak noise levels from loading and unloading would be intermittent and when averaged over 30 minutes, these sources would not exceed the Municipal Code standard. Additionally, when averaged over the 24-hour period, noise would not cause an increase in noise levels of more than 3 dBA. Therefore it is not expected that the proposed project would

substantially increase noise levels over existing conditions and impacts would be less than significant.

*b. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Vibration refers to groundborne noise and perceptible motion. Groundborne vibration is almost exclusively a concern inside buildings and is rarely perceived as a problem outdoors. Vibration energy propagates from a source, through intervening soil and rock layers, to the foundations of nearby buildings. The vibration then propagates from the foundation throughout the remainder of the structure. Building vibration may be perceived by the occupants as the motion of building surfaces, rattling of items on shelves or hanging on walls, or as a low-frequency rumbling noise. The rumbling noise is caused by the vibrating walls, floors, and ceilings radiating sound waves. Annoyance from vibration often occurs when the vibration exceeds the threshold of perception by 10 dB or less. This is an order of magnitude below the damage threshold for normal buildings.

Typical sources of groundborne vibration are construction activities (e.g., pavement breaking and operating heavy-duty earthmoving equipment), and occasional traffic on rough roads. In general, groundborne vibration from standard construction practices is only a potential issue when within 25 feet of sensitive uses. Groundborne vibration levels from construction activities very rarely reach levels that can damage structures; however, these levels are perceptible near the active construction site. With the exception of old buildings built prior to the 1950s or buildings of historic significance, potential structural damage from heavy construction activities rarely occurs. When roadways are smooth, vibration from traffic (even heavy trucks) is rarely perceptible.

The streets surrounding the project area are paved, smooth, and unlikely to cause significant groundborne vibration. In addition, the rubber tires and suspension systems of buses and other on-road vehicles make it unusual for on-road vehicles to cause groundborne noise or vibration problems. It is, therefore, assumed that no such vehicular vibration impacts would occur and, therefore, no vibration impact analysis of on-road vehicles is necessary. Additionally, once constructed, the proposed project would not contain uses that would generate groundborne vibration. This impact would be less than significant.

*c. Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

As discussed above, audible increases in noise levels generally refer to a change of 3 dB or more, as this level has been found to be barely perceptible to the human ear in outdoor environments. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial increases in traffic noise levels on local roadways in the project vicinity or operational noise at sensitive receptor locations. Therefore, project-related noise increases would be less than significant.

- d. *Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

Although there would be temporary high intermittent construction noise at times in the project area during project construction, construction of the proposed project would not significantly affect land uses adjacent to the project site. In addition, construction of the project would comply with the hourly limits specified by the City, as required by Mitigation Measure NOI-1. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.

- e. *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (No Impact)*

The project area is not located within an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest airport to the project site is San Francisco International Airport, located approximately 2.2 miles north of the project site. In addition, the Oakland International Airport is located approximately 10.8 miles northeast of the project site and the San Jose International Airport is located approximately 26.3 miles south of the project site. Although aircraft-related noise is occasionally audible on the project site, the site does not lie within an airport land use plan area or within the 60 dBA  $L_{dn}$  noise contours of any of these public airports or private airfields. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels due to the proximity of a public airport.

- f. *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (No Impact)*

The project is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport and would not expose future site users to excessive noise levels.

#### 4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 4.13.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (No Impact)*

The proposed project would be undertaken to provide the residents of the City with a new and updated community center and improved park facilities and parking. The proposed project does not include residential units and would not directly induce population growth on the project site. The new community center would include similar staffing levels to the existing community center, and therefore would not indirectly induce substantial population growth. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to population growth.

- b. *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (No Impact)*

The project site is currently developed with park uses and City buildings, which does not include any residential units. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the displacement of existing housing. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to the displacement of homes.

- c. *Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (No Impact)*

Refer to Section 4.13.1.b. The proposed project would have no impact related to displacement of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

#### 4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4.14.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: i. Fire protection?; ii. Police protection?; iii. Schools?; iv. Parks?; v. Other public facilities? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The following section addresses the proposed project's potential effects on: fire service, police service, schools, parks, and other public facilities. Impacts to public services would occur if the proposed project increases demand for services such that new or expanded facilities would be required, and construction or operation of these new facilities would cause environmental impacts.

**Fire Protection.** The Central County Fire Department (CCFD) provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the project site. The CCFD continuously operates six fire stations, including six fire engines and one ladder truck. The CCFD responds to approximately 5,000 calls for service on an annual basis.<sup>42</sup> Primary service to the project site would be provided by Fire Station 34, which is located at 799 California Drive, approximately 0.7 miles east of the project site. Fire Station 34 houses both an Engine Company and the Truck Company. Currently, the CCFD is staffed with 76 sworn firefighters and 9.95 full-time equivalent (FTE) civilian staff.

The proposed project would result in an increase in the daytime population of the project site and incrementally increase the demand for emergency fire service and emergency medical services compared to existing conditions. However, the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable codes for fire safety and emergency access. In addition, the CCFD would also review the project site plans to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided prior to issuance of building permits.

The CCFD would continue providing services to the project site and would not require additional firefighters to serve the proposed project. The construction of a new or expanded fire station would not be required. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact on the physical environment due to the incremental increase in demand for fire protection and life safety services, and the potential increase in demand for services is not expected to adversely affect existing responses times to the site or within the City. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on fire protection and safety services and facilities.

**Police Protection.** The Burlingame Police Department (BPD) provides police protection to the project site. The BPD headquarters are located at 1111 Trousdale Drive, approximately 2.7 miles northwest of the project site. BPD currently employs 37 sworn police officers and 25 civilian staff.<sup>43</sup> The proposed project would result in an increase in daytime population on the project site and

<sup>42</sup> Central County Fire Department, 2018. CCFD Overview. Website: [www.ccfdonline.org/about-ccfd/ccfd-overview](http://www.ccfdonline.org/about-ccfd/ccfd-overview) (accessed June 26, 2018).

<sup>43</sup> Burlingame Police Department, 2018. About Us. Website: [www.burlingame.org/departments/police\\_department/about\\_us.php](http://www.burlingame.org/departments/police_department/about_us.php) (accessed June 26, 2018).

incrementally increase demand for emergency police services to the project site compared to existing conditions. However, BPD would continue to provide services to the project site and would not require additional officers to serve the project site. The construction of new or expanded police facilities would not be required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse impact associated with the provision of additional police facilities or services, and impacts to police services represent a less-than-significant impact.

**Schools.** The proposed project does not include the construction of any new residential uses. As described in Section 4.13, Population and Housing, the proposed project would not substantially induce housing or population growth, either directly or indirectly, within the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an increase in the number of school-age children in the area. As such, the proposed project would not increase demand for schools and no impact would occur.

**Parks.** The project site is located within the existing Washington Park, which includes tennis courts, a children's playground, and baseball facilities, among other amenities. As a part of the proposed project, improvements would be made to Washington Park, including updating the children's playground and moving it further away from Burlingame Avenue, and updating the basketball court. Portions of Washington Park would be inaccessible during construction of the proposed project, therefore increasing demand for other nearby parks. However, this impact would be temporary in nature and would subside after construction of the proposed project is complete. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to the provision of park facilities.

**Other Public Facilities.** The project site includes the existing Burlingame Community Center. During construction of the proposed project, the existing Community Center would be inaccessible to residents of the City. However, this impact would be temporary in nature and would subside after construction of the proposed project is complete. Once complete, the proposed project would result in a larger community center with more capacity to serve users. Therefore, the proposed project would reduce demand at other public facilities, and this impact would be less-than-significant.

#### 4.15 RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4.15.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

Refer to Section 4.14.1.a. The proposed project would temporarily increase use at other parks during the construction period; however, this impact would be temporary in nature and would subside after construction of the proposed project is complete. Additionally, improvements made to Washington Park as a part of the proposed project may decrease use at other parks once the project is completed. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on existing parks.

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

Refer to Section 4.14.1.a and 4.15.1.a. The proposed project would have a minor beneficial impact on existing recreation facilities, and this impact would be less-than-significant.

#### 4.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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



The following section is based on information provided in the Transportation Impact Analysis<sup>44</sup> (TIA) prepared for the proposed project by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, included in Appendix B. The TIA evaluates the transportation impacts that could result from the proposed project, including impacts associated with traffic congestion, transit services, and pedestrian and bicycle circulation.

#### 4.16.1 Impact Analysis

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

**Overview.** The TIA for the proposed project was conducted in accordance with the standards set forth by the City of Burlingame and the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County. The C/CAG administers the San Mateo County Congestion Management Program (CMP). Given that the project is expected to add fewer than 100 peak hour trips to nearby CMP roadways (El Camino Real), a C/CAG trip reduction analysis was not prepared. The traffic study includes an analysis of AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions for six (6) unsignalized intersections in the vicinity of the project site.<sup>45</sup> The study also includes an analysis of site access and on-site circulation, vehicle queuing, and transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access. Based on consultation with the City as the Lead Agency, the following intersections were analyzed for the proposed project:

1. Carolan Avenue and Oak Grove Avenue
2. California Drive and North Lane
3. Carolan Avenue and North Lane
4. Carolan Avenue/East Lane and Burlingame Avenue
5. Myrtle Road and Burlingame Avenue
6. Anita Road and Burlingame Avenue

Traffic conditions at the study intersections were analyzed for both the weekday AM and PM peak hours of adjacent street traffic. The AM peak hour typically occurs between 7:00 am and 9:00 am and the PM peak hour typically occurs between 4:00 pm and 6:00 pm on a regular weekday. These are the peak commute hours during which traffic volume is highest on the roadways in the study area.

<sup>44</sup> Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., 2018, op. cit.

<sup>45</sup> Intersections along Rollins Road and El Camino Real, as well as other intersections in the vicinity of the project site, were not analyzed due to their distance from the project site and the small number of trips that would be added to these intersections as a result of the proposed project.



Study intersections were evaluated under five different scenarios to determine the proposed project's effects on level of service. These scenarios provide detailed analysis of the incremental effects of the proposed project on traffic conditions, and allow a comparison of the traffic anticipated to be generated by the proposed project to the amount of traffic expected to be generated by future development. Each of the scenarios is described below.

- **Existing Conditions.** Existing traffic volumes at the study intersections were obtained from traffic counts conducted in May of 2017 and 2018. The study intersections were evaluated with a level of service analysis using Synchro software in accordance with the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual methodology. **Background Conditions.** Background traffic volumes reflect traffic added by projected volumes from approved but not yet completed developments in the project area. The approved project trips and/or approved project information were obtained from recent traffic studies in the City of Burlingame.
- **Existing plus Project Conditions.** Existing traffic volumes with the project were estimated by adding to existing traffic volumes the additional traffic generated by the project. Existing plus Project conditions were evaluated relative to Existing Conditions in order to determine the effects the project would have on the existing roadway network.
- **Project Conditions.** Background traffic volumes with the project (hereafter called project traffic volumes) were estimated by adding to background traffic volumes the additional traffic generated by the project. Project Conditions were evaluated relative to background conditions to determine potential project impacts.
- **Cumulative Conditions.** Cumulative traffic volumes represent traffic growth through the year 2028. Cumulative traffic volumes were estimated by applying an annual growth factor of 1.0 percent to the existing volumes, then adding trips from approved developments, as well as project-generated traffic. Cumulative plus Project conditions were evaluated relative to cumulative no project conditions to determine potential project impacts.

**Analysis Methodology.** Traffic conditions within the study area are assessed through the evaluation of intersection Levels of Service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative description of operating conditions ranging from LOS A, or free-flowing conditions with little or no delay, to LOS F, or jammed conditions with excessive delays.

Level of service analysis at unsignalized intersections is generally used to determine the need for modification in the type of intersection control (i.e., all-way stop or signalization). As part of the evaluation, traffic volumes, delays and traffic signal warrants are evaluated to determine if the existing intersection control is appropriate.

The City of Burlingame evaluates intersection level of service based on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010 method using Synchro software.<sup>46</sup> This method is applicable for both side-street and all-

---

<sup>46</sup> The 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) does not support intersections with three stop or yield-controlled approaches and one free-flowing approach. Intersections with these features were evaluated as an all-way stop control intersection to provide a conservative level of service analysis.

way stop-controlled intersections. At side-street stop-controlled intersections (e.g., the Myrtle Road/Burlingame Avenue and Anita Road/Burlingame Avenue intersections), the levels of service reported are for the worst stop-controlled approach delay. For all-way stop-controlled intersections (e.g., the Carolan Avenue/Oak Grove Avenue, Carolan Avenue/North Lane, and the Carolan Avenue/Burlingame Avenue intersections), a weighted average delay of the entire intersection is presented.

The City of Burlingame does not have a formally-adopted level of service standard for unsignalized intersections. While the City of Burlingame does not have a Council-adopted level of service threshold for unsignalized intersections, a standard of LOS D or better has typically been applied in local traffic studies and EIRs. The correlation between average control delay and LOS for unsignalized intersections is shown in Table 4.G.

**Table 4.G: Unsignalized Intersection Level of Service Definitions Based on Delay**

Level of Service	Description	Average Control Delay Per Vehicle (sec.)
A	Little or no traffic delay	Up to 10.0
B	Short traffic delays	10.1 to 15.0
C	Average traffic delays	15.1 to 25.0
D	Long traffic delays	25.1 to 35.0
E	Very long traffic delays	35.1 to 50.0
F	Extreme traffic delays	Greater than 50.0

Source: 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board 2010).

As previously mentioned, the City of Burlingame does not have any Council-adopted definitions of significant traffic impacts. Standards that have been typically used in traffic studies and EIRs are described below. The project is said to create a significant adverse impact on traffic conditions at an unsignalized intersection if for any peak-hour:

1. The level of service at the intersection (or movement/approach at side-street stop controls) degrades from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E or F and causes the intersection to meet the peak hour signal warrant; or
2. The level of service at the intersection is an unacceptable LOS E, or F and the addition of project trips causes the intersection to meet the peak hour signal warrant and the intersection (or movement/approach at side-street stop controls) to increase by five (5) or more seconds.

A significant impact typically is said to be satisfactorily mitigated when measures are implemented that would restore intersection level of service to insignificant conditions or better.

**Project Trip Estimates.** The amount of traffic produced by a new development and the locations where that traffic would appear were estimated using a three-step process: (1) trip generation; (2) trip distribution; and (3) trip assignment. In determining project trip generation, the magnitude of traffic traveling to and from the proposed community center was estimated for the AM and PM peak hours. As part of the project trip distribution, the directions to and from which the project trips would travel were estimated.

Project trip generation was estimated by applying to the size and uses of the development the appropriate trip generation rates obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition.<sup>47</sup> The average trip generation rates for Recreational Community Center (Land Use 495) were applied to the project. The ITE trip rates reflect between 10 and 13 surveyed recreational community center locations during peak hours and comprise building sizes ranging from 30,000 square feet to 350,000 square feet. The project as proposed would replace the existing 25,000-square-foot recreation center with a new 35,700-square-foot community center. Based on ITE trip generation rates for Land Use 495, the project would generate 308 new daily vehicle trips, with 19 new trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 25 new trips occurring during the PM peak hour, as shown in Table 4.H.

**Table 4.H: Project Trip Generation Estimates**

Land Use	Size	Daily		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		Rate	Trips	Rate	In	Out	Total	Rate	In	Out	Total
Proposed Uses											
Burlingame Community Center <sup>1</sup>	35.7 ksf	28.82	1,029	1.76	41	22	63	2.31	39	43	82
Existing Uses											
Recreation Center <sup>1</sup>	25.0 ksf	28.82	(721)	1.76	(29)	(15)	(44)	2.31	(27)	(31)	(58)
Net Project Trips			308		12	7	19		12	13	25

Source: *Draft Transportation Impact Analysis* (Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. 2018)

<sup>1</sup> Recreational Community Center (Land Use 495) average rates published in ITE's Trip Generation Manual, 106y Edition, 2017.  
ksf = 1,000 square feet

The trip distribution pattern, shown in Figure 4-1, for the project was developed based on existing travel patterns on the surrounding roadway system and the locations of complementary land uses. The peak hour vehicle trips generated by the project were assigned to the roadway network in accordance with the trip distribution pattern.

**Existing and Existing Plus Project Conditions.** Existing traffic volumes are shown in Figure 4-2 and the result of the intersection LOS analysis under Existing Conditions are shown in Table 4.I. As shown in Table 4.I, all intersections currently operate at an acceptable LOS.

<sup>47</sup> Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2018. *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition*. March.

Existing plus Project traffic volumes are shown in Figure 4-3 and the results of the intersection LOS analysis under Existing plus Project Conditions are shown in Table 4.I. As shown in Table 4.I, all of the study intersections would continue to operate at LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on the operations of any study area intersections under Existing plus Project Conditions.

**Table 4.I: Existing Plus Project Level of Service Summary**

Study Number	Intersection	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	No Project		With Project	
				Avg. Delay (sec)	LOS	Avg. Delay (sec)	LOS
1	Carolan Avenue and Oak Grove Avenue <sup>1</sup>	AWSC <sup>2</sup>	AM	14.0	B	14.1	B
			PM	12.1	B	12.1	B
2	California Drive and North Lane	SSSC <sup>3</sup>	AM	21.2	C	21.8	C
			PM	29.1	D	29.7	D
3	Carolan Avenue and North Lane <sup>1</sup>	AWSC <sup>2</sup>	AM	10.2	B	10.2	B
			PM	8.9	A	8.9	A
4	Carolan Avenue/East Lane and Burlingame Avenue <sup>1</sup>	AWSC <sup>2</sup>	AM	8.3	A	8.4	A
			PM	8.6	A	8.7	A
5	Myrtle Road and Burlingame Avenue	SSSC <sup>3</sup>	AM	10.4	B	10.5	B
			PM	10.6	B	10.8	B
6	Anita Road and Burlingame Avenue	SSSC <sup>3</sup>	AM	7.8	A	7.8	A
			PM	7.7	A	7.7	A

Source: *Draft Transportation Impact Analysis* (Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. 2018)

<sup>1</sup> Due to limitations within the Synchro software, three of the intersections along Carolan Avenue (Oak Grove Avenue, North Lane, and Burlingame Avenue) cannot be evaluated with three stop or yield-controlled approaches and one free-flowing approach. Therefore, the study intersections were evaluated as an all-way stop control intersection to provide a conservative level of service analysis.

<sup>2</sup> Average delay for an all-way stop controlled intersection is reported for the entire intersection.

<sup>3</sup> Average delay for a side-street stop controlled intersection is reported for the worst stop-controlled approach.

AWSC = All-Way Stop Control

sec = seconds

LOS = level of service+

SSSC = Side-Street Stop Control

**Background and Background Plus Project Conditions.** The results of the intersection LOS analysis under Background Conditions are shown in Table 4.J. As shown in Table 4.J, all intersections currently operate at an acceptable LOS.

Background plus Project traffic volumes are shown in Figure 4-4 and the results of the intersection LOS analysis under Background plus Project Conditions are shown in Table 4.J. As shown in Table 4.J, all of the study intersections would continue to operate at LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on the operations of any study area intersections under Background plus Project Conditions.

**Figure 4-1: Project Trip Distribution**

8.5x11, color

**Figure 4-2: Existing Traffic Volumes**

8.5x11, color

**Figure 4-3: Existing Plus Project Traffic Volumes**

8.5x11, color

**Figure 4-4: Background Plus Project Traffic Volumes**

8.5x11, color



**Table 4.J: Background Plus Project Level of Service Summary**

Study Number	Intersection	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	No Project		With Project	
				Avg. Delay (sec)	LOS	Avg. Delay (sec)	LOS
1	Carolan Avenue and Oak Grove Avenue <sup>1</sup>	AWSC <sup>2</sup>	AM	14.1	B	14.2	B
			PM	12.1	B	12.2	B
2	California Drive and North Lane	SSSC <sup>3</sup>	AM	21.8	C	22.3	C
			PM	30.7	D	31.5	D
3	Carolan Avenue and North Lane <sup>1</sup>	AWSC <sup>2</sup>	AM	10.2	B	10.2	B
			PM	8.9	A	8.9	A
4	Carolan Avenue/East Lane and Burlingame Avenue <sup>1</sup>	AWSC <sup>2</sup>	AM	8.3	A	8.4	A
			PM	8.6	A	8.7	A
5	Myrtle Road and Burlingame Avenue	SSSC <sup>3</sup>	AM	10.4	B	10.5	B
			PM	10.6	B	10.8	B
6	Anita Road and Burlingame Avenue	SSSC <sup>3</sup>	AM	7.8	A	7.8	A
			PM	7.7	A	7.7	A

Source: *Draft Transportation Impact Analysis* (Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. 2018)

<sup>1</sup> Due to limitations within the Synchro software, three of the intersections along Carolan Avenue (Oak Grove Avenue, North Lane, and Burlingame Avenue) cannot be evaluated with three stop or yield-controlled approaches and one free-flowing approach. Therefore, the study intersections were evaluated as an all-way stop control intersection to provide a conservative level of service analysis.

<sup>2</sup> Average delay for an all-way stop controlled intersection is reported for the entire intersection.

<sup>3</sup> Average delay for a side-street stop controlled intersection is reported for the worst stop-controlled approach.

AWSC = All-Way Stop Control

sec = seconds

LOS = level of service+

SSSC = Side-Street Stop Control

**Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions.** The results of the intersection LOS analysis under Cumulative Conditions are shown in Table 4.K. As shown in Table 4.K, all intersections currently operate at an acceptable LOS, with the exception of California Drive and North Lane, which would operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour.

Cumulative plus Project traffic volumes are shown in Figure 4-5 and the results of the intersection LOS analysis under Cumulative plus Project Conditions are shown in Table 4.K. As shown in Table 4.K, all of the study intersections would continue to operate at LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of California Drive and North Lane, which would continue to operate at LOS E. However, the addition of project traffic would not create a significant impact at this intersection because the increase to the stop-controlled delay per vehicle would be less than the standard threshold of 5 seconds. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on the operations of any study area intersections under Cumulative plus Project Conditions.

**Table 4.K: Cumulative Level of Service Summary**

Study Number	Intersection	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	No Project		With Project	
				Avg. Delay (sec)	LOS	Avg. Delay (sec)	LOS
1	Carolan Avenue and Oak Grove Avenue <sup>1</sup>	AWSC <sup>2</sup>	AM	16.4	C	16.5	C
			PM	13.2	B	13.3	B
2	California Drive and North Lane	SSSC <sup>3</sup>	AM	28.3	D	29.6	D
			PM	<b>46.5</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>49.2</b>	<b>E</b>
3	Carolan Avenue and North Lane <sup>1</sup>	AWSC <sup>2</sup>	AM	10.8	B	10.9	B
			PM	9.1	A	9.2	A
4	Carolan Avenue/East Lane and Burlingame Avenue <sup>1</sup>	AWSC <sup>2</sup>	AM	8.5	A	8.6	A
			PM	9.0	A	9.0	A
5	Myrtle Road and Burlingame Avenue	SSSC <sup>3</sup>	AM	10.6	B	10.7	B
			PM	11.0	B	11.1	B
6	Anita Road and Burlingame Avenue	SSSC <sup>3</sup>	AM	7.9	A	8.0	A
			PM	7.8	A	7.8	A

Source: *Draft Transportation Impact Analysis* (Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. 2018)

<sup>1</sup> Due to limitations within the Synchro software, three of the intersections along Carolan Avenue (Oak Grove Avenue, North Lane, and Burlingame Avenue) cannot be evaluated with three stop or yield-controlled approaches and one free-flowing approach. Therefore, the study intersections were evaluated as an all-way stop control intersection to provide a conservative level of service analysis.

<sup>2</sup> Average delay for an all-way stop controlled intersection is reported for the entire intersection.

<sup>3</sup> Average delay for a side-street stop controlled intersection is reported for the worst stop-controlled approach.

AWSC = All-Way Stop Control

sec = seconds

LOS = level of service+

SSSC = Side-Street Stop Control

**BOLD** indicates a substandard level of service.

*b. Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The C/CAG administers the CMP of San Mateo County. Per CMP technical guidelines, all new developments estimated to add at least 100 net peak hour trips to the CMP roadway network are required to implement Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures in accordance with the C/CAG CMP checklist. The proposed project is expected to add fewer than 100 net peak hour vehicle trips to the CMP roadway network. Additionally, there are no CMP intersections located within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable CMP or other standards set forth by the C/CAG, and this impact would be less than significant.

*c. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location which results in substantial safety risks? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The San Francisco International Airport is the closest airport to the project site, located approximately 2.5 miles to the north. As noted in Section 4.8.1.e, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic levels or a change in location which result in substantial risks, and there would be a less-than-significant impact.

**Figure 4-5: Cumulative Plus Project Traffic Volumes**

8.5x11, color

**This page intentionally left blank**

*d. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Vehicle queuing, site access, and on-site circulation issues that could contribute to hazardous conditions are discussed below. As discussed, these impacts would be less than significant.

**Site Access and Vehicle Queuing.** The proposed project would replace two of the existing partial-access driveways, east of the Anita Road/Burlingame Avenue intersection, with a single full-access driveway. The project as proposed would provide a width of 18 feet for the proposed driveway that would provide access to the surface parking area and the subterranean parking garage adjacent to the building. The City of Burlingame Zoning Code requires a minimum of either two 12-foot driveways or one 18-foot driveway for parking areas of more than 30 vehicle spaces. Therefore, the project site plan would conform to the City's minimum width requirement for a two-way driveway.

The location of the project driveway was also reviewed with respect to other driveways in the vicinity of the project site. Nearby driveways are located across from and approximately 50 feet west of the exit-only driveway of the City-owned parking Lot X on Burlingame Avenue. Similarly, nearby residential driveways and an alleyway are located across from the proposed driveway leading to the parking area adjacent to the community center building. While both project driveways would be close in proximity to the neighboring driveways, vehicles are still expected to be able to make turns in and out of the project driveway without affecting similar operations at the adjacent driveways due to the low traffic volumes and speed along Burlingame Avenue. Therefore, the driveway location as proposed was found to be adequate.

There are no existing trees or visual obstructions along the project frontage that could obscure sight distance at the project driveway. The project access points should be free and clear of any obstructions to provide adequate sight distance, thereby ensuring that exiting vehicles can see pedestrians on the sidewalk and vehicles and bicycles traveling on Burlingame Avenue. Any landscaping and signage should be located in such a way to ensure an unobstructed view for drivers exiting the site.

Adequate sight distance (sight distance triangles) should be provided at the project driveway in accordance with Caltrans standards. Sight distance triangles should be measured approximately 10 feet back from the traveled way. Providing the appropriate sight distance reduces the likelihood of a collision at a driveway or intersection and provides drivers with the ability to exit a driveway or locate sufficient gaps in traffic. The minimum acceptable sight distance is often considered the Caltrans stopping sight distance. Sight distance requirements vary depending on the roadway speeds. For driveways on Burlingame Avenue, which has a posted speed limit of 25 mph, the Caltrans stopping sight distance is 200 feet (based on a design speed of 30 mph). Thus, a driver must be able to see 200 feet in both directions along Burlingame Avenue in order to stop and avoid a collision. Based on the project site plan, it can be concluded that the project driveways would meet the Caltrans stopping sight distance standards.

The project-generated gross trips that are estimated to occur at the project driveway are 41 inbound trips and 22 outbound trips during the AM peak hour, and 39 inbound trips and 43 outbound trips during the PM peak hour. Based on the relatively low traffic volumes near the project site and observations of existing traffic operations along Burlingame Avenue, vehicle queues should rarely exceed 1 or 2 vehicles in length during the peak hours.

The project driveway adjacent to the community center building would provide full-access, allowing right and left inbound and outbound turns to and from Burlingame Avenue. Outbound left turns from the project driveway would require vehicles to wait for gaps in traffic in both the eastbound and westbound directions, while inbound left turns would require vehicles to wait for a gap in the westbound traffic flow only. Given that Burlingame Avenue consists of only one lane in each direction with no left-turn pockets, inbound left turns at the project driveway would be made from the through lane. Thus, there would be interruptions to the through traffic flow while left-turn vehicles wait for a gap in the on-coming traffic flow, albeit momentary. Driveways at the City-owned parking lot would operate similarly, except the partial-access driveway, which only allows right and left outbound turns.

A level of service analysis was conducted for left turns at the project driveways to ensure that vehicles would operate without excessive delays or queues. Under all scenarios with project traffic, the project driveways would operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours. This indicates that left-turning vehicles at the project driveway would experience minor delays and are expected to have a minimal effect on operations at the adjacent intersections.

**Site Circulation.** On-site vehicular circulation was reviewed in accordance with the City of Burlingame Zoning Code and generally accepted traffic engineering standards. In general, the proposed site plan would provide vehicle traffic with adequate connectivity through the parking areas. The project would provide 90-degree parking stalls throughout surface level parking area as well as the parking garage. The City's standard minimum width for two-way drive aisles is 18 feet wide and 24 feet wide where 90-degree parking is provided. This allows sufficient room for vehicles to back out of the parking spaces. Currently, the project site plan does not show the width of the drive aisles. The project as proposed would provide 24-foot drive aisles, which would conform to the City's minimum width requirement for drive aisles adjacent to 90-degree parking.

Typical engineering standards require garage ramps to have no greater than a 20 percent grade with transition grades of 10 percent. The garage ramp slope and transition grade are not noted on the project plans. The proposed project would conform to typical engineering standards.

A single-level parking structure would occupy the eastern half of the project site. Access to the parking garage would be provided via an entrance/exit ramp located at the center of the surface parking lot. Circulation through the surface level of the surface parking lot would allow vehicles to adequately access the pick-up/drop-off area adjacent to the building entrance.

Pedestrian access between the parking structure and on-site uses are typically provided via elevators and stairways on each parking level. Elevators and stairways would be located along the western edge of the lower level of the garage, providing access to the building's main lobby. A

stairway would also be located in the southeast corner of the garage and would provide access to an exit corridor leading to Burlingame Avenue.

The site plan shows adequate pedestrian circulation throughout the site, as well as between the site and the surrounding pedestrian facilities. The site plan shows continuous walkways along the northern and southern edges of the site, including a pedestrian connection that would stretch from the western side of the project building to the existing park promenade and bike path that bisects Washington Park. The pedestrian connection would also provide access to the community center terraces, the proposed picnic tables, the proposed playground, and the proposed new basketball court, adjacent to the Lions Club Hall building. In addition, the project would provide a pedestrian plaza adjacent to the building entrance. As previously mentioned, the parking garage also includes a few areas with elevators and stairs so that pedestrians would have convenient access to them from any part of the garage.

Bicycle parking would be located adjacent to the designated drop-off/pick-up area near the building entrance, as well as near the western building entrance on the park-side of the building. This would allow bicyclists to enter and leave the project site using either the existing park promenade or the pedestrian plaza and connect to Burlingame Avenue. Providing convenient bike parking would help create a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly environment and encourage bicycling by patrons. In addition, the inclusion of convenient bike parking would complement the bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the project site.

Therefore, given the reasons above, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to design hazards and incompatible uses.

*e. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The design, construction, and maintenance of project site access locations and on-site roads would be in compliance with the City's Municipal Code and would be required to meet all emergency access standards. The CCFD would also review the proposed site plan and would provide input on final design in relation to emergency access prior to issuance of a building permit. Also, as noted in Section 4.16.1, an implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in the amount of traffic volume or delay experienced on the local roadway network. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on emergency access.

*f. Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The following includes a discussion of potential impacts to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit systems within the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would have a significant impact related to adopted programs, plans, or policies regarding these facilities if it generated pedestrian, bicycle, or transit travel related demand that could not be accommodated by existing facilities, or those proposed by the project. Additionally, parking related impacts, such as insufficient parking supply to meet demand, are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA. Therefore, the discussion of parking demand and supply is provided for informational purposes only.

**Pedestrian Facilities.** Pedestrian facilities in the study area consist of sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian signals at signalized intersections. The project is expected to increase the number of pedestrians using the sidewalks and crosswalks. The project plans show existing sidewalks of approximately 5 feet in width along the Burlingame Avenue frontage, with a 9-foot landscaped setback from the curb and landscaping in between the sidewalk and building facade. The overall network of sidewalks and crosswalks in the vicinity of the project site has adequate connectivity and provides pedestrians with safe routes to nearby destinations. The project would not remove any pedestrian facilities, nor would it conflict with any adopted plans or policies for new pedestrian facilities.

As previously mentioned, the project proposes to develop a pedestrian plaza adjacent to the building entrance, as well as picnic tables, a new playground, and a new basketball court on the park-side of the building and adjacent to the Lions Club Hall and Washington Park. Comprised of landscaping and benches, both the pedestrian-centric areas would connect to the existing pedestrian facilities along Burlingame Avenue as well as within Washington Park.

**Bicycle Facilities.** There are some bike facilities in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Bicycles are also allowed on Caltrain and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART). The Burlingame Station is served by Caltrain (approximately a quarter-mile north of the project site), while the Millbrae Station is served by Caltrain and BART (located about 3 miles from the project site). There are bicycle racks and bicycle lockers available at both transit stations.

Bicyclists north of the Burlingame Station could take California Drive and Carolan Avenue to Burlingame Avenue, while cyclists traveling to the site from the Burlingame Caltrain station could use Burlingame Avenue as a direct route to the project site. Although Burlingame Avenue is not a designated bike route, due to its low speed limit and traffic volumes, it is conducive to bicycle travel.

The proposed project would not remove any bicycle facilities, nor would it conflict with any adopted plans or policies for new bicycle facilities.

**Public Transit.** The project study area is well-served by SamTrans, Caltrain, and the Burlingame Trolley. The study area is served directly by one limited bus route, one express bus route, and two shuttle routes. The proposed project would generate about 63 person-trips during the AM peak hour and 82 person-trips during the PM peak hour. Given the project site's proximity to transit services, it could be expected that a portion (10 percent) of patrons' trips would be made by transit. Assuming up to 10 percent of the total trips are made by transit, which translates into a maximum of about eight new transit riders during the peak hours. There are four buses and a trolley that serve the transit stop and Burlingame Caltrain station near the site during peak hours. This calculates to an average of about two new transit riders per bus or trolley. It is assumed that the buses have sufficient capacity to accommodate this minor increase in ridership.

The project would not remove any transit facilities, nor would it conflict with any adopted plans or policies associated with new transit facilities.



The Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) is expected to increase service by up to six Caltrain trains per peak hour per direction by 2020. With the proposed electrification project, it is expected that the transit ridership at the Burlingame Station will increase. Given the nearby Caltrain station, development of this community center project would potentially result in new transit riders, thus reducing vehicle trips. The Burlingame Station is within walking distance (approximately 0.25 miles west of the project site). Bicycling to the site would also be a suitable option, given that Burlingame Avenue between the Burlingame Station and the project site consists of low speed limits and traffic volumes, which makes it conducive to bicycle travel.

**Parking Supply.** The project site would be required to provide a total of 143 off-street parking spaces. Of the required 143 parking spaces, 59 spaces are currently provided in the City-owned public parking Lot X, adjacent to the Lions Club Hall. Therefore, the proposed project would be required to provide 84 new parking spaces. Per CBC Table 11B-6, five ADA accessible spaces are required for projects with 101 to 150 parking spaces, one of which would need to be van accessible.

The proposed project would provide a total of 84 parking spaces, with 44 spaces located within the surface parking lot and 40 spaces located within the subterranean parking garage. The existing Lot X contains three accessible spaces, and the proposed project would include four accessible spaces, of which two would be van accessible. Therefore, the proposed project would meet the City's parking supply and adhere to the CBC accessible parking provisions.

#### 4.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)? Or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4.17.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*
- i. *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)? Or*
  - ii. *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. **(Less-Than-Significant Impact)***

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), which became law on January 1, 2015, provides for consultation with California Native American tribes during the CEQA environmental review process, and equates significant impacts to “tribal cultural resources” with significant environmental impacts. Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21074 states that “tribal cultural resources” are:

- Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and are one of the following:
- Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
- Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of PRC Section 5020.1.
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

A “historical resource” (PRC Section 21084.1), a “unique archaeological resource” (PRC Section 21083.2(g)), or a “nonunique archaeological resource” (PRC Section 21083.2 (h)) may also be a tribal cultural resource if it is included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register.

The consultation provisions of the law require that a public agency consult with local Native American tribes that have requested placement on that agency’s notification list for CEQA projects. Within 14 days of determining that a project application is complete, or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency must notify tribes of the opportunity to consult on the project, should a tribe have previously requested to be on the agency’s notification list. California Native American tribes must be recognized by the California Native American Heritage Commission as traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project site, and must have previously

requested that the lead agency notify them of projects. Tribes have 30 days following notification of a project to request consultation with the lead agency.

The purpose of consultation is to inform the lead agency in its identification and determination of the significance of tribal cultural resources. If a project is determined to result in a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource, the consultation process must occur and conclude prior to adoption of a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration, or certification of an Environmental Impact Report (PRC Sections 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3).

**Tribal Outreach and Consultation.** The City sent letters describing the project and maps depicting the project site via certified mail on August 2, 2018, to Native American contacts that had previously requested to be contacted by the City for potential consultation pursuant to AB 52. The City did not receive any requests for consultation during the 30-day notification period. Therefore, the City considers the AB 52 consultation process to be concluded.

#### 4.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

##### 4.18.1 Impact Analysis

##### *a. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Wastewater service for the project site is provided by the City. The City operates and maintains the wastewater collection system that conveys wastewater from the users to the Burlingame

Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The City's wastewater collection system includes gravity pipelines, lift stations, and force mains.<sup>48</sup>

Burlingame's WWTP treatment process includes four treatment steps: 1) primary sedimentation; 2) secondary biological treatment; 3) sodium hypochlorite disinfection, and 4) contact time in a plug flow detention facility. Recycled wastewater undergoes an additional flocculation and clarification treatment step. Following treatment at the Burlingame WWTP, the effluent is sent to South San Francisco through the Burlingame-Millbrae Central Bay Outfall system and discharged after dechlorination into the South San Francisco Outfall.

The average dry weather flow (ADWF) of wastewater treated at the Burlingame WWTP is approximately 3.5 million gallons per day (mgd), about 63 percent of its 5.5 mgd capacity, which includes service to the project site.<sup>49</sup> The proposed project would include the demolition and redevelopment of the project site with a new community center. In total, the proposed project would add approximately 10,700 square feet of new buildings to the project site. The proposed project would generate additional domestic wastewater, which would be treated by the Burlingame WWTP. Wastewater generated by the proposed project would be minimal when compared to the average daily flow for the Burlingame WWTP and would not exceed the capacity of the Burlingame WWTP. The increase in daytime population during operation hours that would result from the proposed project would incrementally increase the amount of wastewater generated on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to wastewater treatment requirements.

*b. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

**Wastewater.** Refer to Section 4.18.1.a for a discussion of wastewater treatment within the City. The proposed project would not have a substantial effect on the Burlingame WWTP's capacity. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing ones.

**Water Service.** Burlingame's Public Works Department operates the water distribution system, providing water service to approximately 30,000 people through 9,000 connections. The majority of the water supply is provided by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) via the Hetch Hetchy reservoir. The City is represented in wholesale transactions by the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA). Burlingame has a water supply assurance agreement to receive an allotment of 5.23 mgd on annual average, or 1,909 million gallons per year. By 2035, the City is projected to use approximately 5.22 mgd.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2016. *2015 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Burlingame*. June.

<sup>49</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2018. Wastewater Treatment. Website: [www.burlingame.org/departments/sustainability/wastewater\\_treatment.php](http://www.burlingame.org/departments/sustainability/wastewater_treatment.php) (accessed July 30, 2018).

<sup>50</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2015. Existing Conditions Report. November.

As discussed in Section 4.18.1.d, the proposed project would not substantially increase demand for water and would therefore not exceed the capacity of the existing water treatment facilities. The proposed project would not require the construction of new water treatment facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities, other than those already planned. The proposed project would connect with the existing water service lines located within Burlingame Avenue, which are currently being upgraded and would provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed project. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on water infrastructure would be less-than-significant.

*c. Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The proposed project would include new connections and upgrades to existing stormwater infrastructure on the project site. Development of the proposed project would increase impervious surfaces on the project site. As such, the proposed project would result in an increase in stormwater runoff. Refer to Section 4.9.1.a and 4.9.1.d for a complete discussion of stormwater drainage facilities. Bio-retention areas and permeable paving would be incorporated into the landscape design to provide appropriate vegetation and water quality treatment in vegetated areas, terraces, and parking lots. As previously noted, an SWPPP and SCP would both be required for the proposed project, which would ensure that stormwater drainage facilities would not need to be expanded as a result of the proposed project.

*d. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

As stated above, the majority of the water supply is provided by the SFPUC via the Hetch Hetchy reservoir. The City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) describes the existing and planned sources of water available in the water system service area over the next 20 years, in 5-year increments.

The City has determined that existing water supply entitlements are sufficient to serve the City at least through 2040 and no additional water supply entitlements are necessary. Over this time period, the City projects population to increase by 27 percent and jobs are expected to increase by approximately 30 percent.<sup>51</sup> The proposed project's incremental increase in water demand would be included in the anticipated growth within the City. Therefore, existing water entitlements are sufficient to serve the proposed project, and impacts related to water supply would be less-than-significant.

---

<sup>51</sup> Burlingame, City of, 2016, *2015 Urban Water Management Plan*, op. cit.

- e. *Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Please refer to Section 4.18.1.a for a discussion of the project's impacts to wastewater treatment. The proposed project would result in a very minor contribution to the daily permitted capacity of the wastewater treatment plant and would not exceed the plant's capacity. Therefore, impacts related to the capacity of the existing wastewater treatment plant would be less than significant.

- f. *Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

Solid Waste and recycling pickup and disposal in the City of Burlingame is provided by Recology San Mateo (Recology). Solid waste, recycling, and organics collected by Recology are transported to the Shoreway Environmental Center, which includes a transfer station and materials recovery facility.<sup>52</sup> The Shoreway Environmental Center has a maximum daily permitted throughput of 3,000 tons per day.<sup>53</sup> Solid waste is then transported to the Corinda Los Trancos Landfill (Ox Mountain). Ox Mountain has a maximum daily permitted throughput of 3,598 tons per day and a remaining capacity of 22.18 million cubic yards (CY). Ox Mountain's estimated closure date is currently January 2034.<sup>54</sup>

On average, public/institutional uses generate 0.007 pounds per square foot of garbage per day.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, because the proposed project would result in the addition of 10,700 square feet of building space, the new Community Center would generate approximately 75 pounds of garbage per day, or 0.04 tons. Therefore, the proposed project would reduce the maximum daily permitted throughput of the Shoreway Environmental Center and Ox Mountain by 0.001 percent, each. As noted above, Ox Mountain has adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. As such the proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's waste disposal needs, and impacts associated with the disposition of solid waste would be less than significant.

- g. *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Less-Than-Significant Impact)*

The proposed project would comply with all federal, State, and local solid waste statutes and/or regulations related to solid waste. Also refer to Section 4.18.1.f. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to solid waste regulations.

<sup>52</sup> South Bay Recycling, n.d. Shoreway Environmental Center. Using the Facility. Website: [www.sbrecycling.net/about](http://www.sbrecycling.net/about) (accessed July 30, 2018).

<sup>53</sup> CalRecycle, 2018. Facility/Site Summary Details: Shoreway Environmental Center (41-AA-0016). Website: [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0016/Detail](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0016/Detail) (accessed July 30, 2018).

<sup>54</sup> CalRecycle, 2018. Facility/Site Summary Details: Corinda Los Trancos Landfill ( Ox Mtn) (41-AA-0002). Website: [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Detail](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Detail) (accessed July 30, 2018).

<sup>55</sup> CalRecycle, 2018. Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates. Website: [www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/Waste/Characterization/General/Rates](http://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/Waste/Characterization/General/Rates) (accessed July 30, 2018).

#### 4.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

##### 4.19.1 Impact Analysis

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-1 through CULT-3 would ensure that potential impacts to cultural resources that could be uncovered during construction activities would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure that potential impacts to special-status species are reduced to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, development of the proposed project would not: 1) degrade the quality of the environment; 2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; 3) cause a fish or wildlife species population to drop below self-sustaining levels; 4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; 5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; or 6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history.



- b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation)*

The proposed project's impacts would be individually limited and not cumulatively considerable. The potentially significant impacts that can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation measures include the topics of air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology and water quality, and noise. For the topic of air quality, potentially significant impacts to air quality standards would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1. For the topic of biological resources, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure that impacts to special status-species are reduced to a less-than-significant level. For the topic of cultural resources, potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources and paleontological resources would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-1, CULT-2 and CULT-3. For the topic of hydrology and water quality, implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 and HYD-2 would ensure that potential water quality impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. For the topic of noise, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would ensure that potentially significant impacts associated with construction noise are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

For the topics of aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, traffic, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems, the project would have no impacts or less-than-significant impacts, and therefore, the project would not substantially contribute to any potential cumulative impacts for these topics. All environmental impacts that could occur as a result of the proposed project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in this document.

Implementation of these measures would ensure that the impacts of the project would be below established thresholds of significance and that these impacts would not combine with the impacts of other cumulative projects to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on the environment as a result of project development. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (No Impact)*

The proposed project would not result in any environmental effects that would cause substantial direct or indirect adverse effects to human beings.



## 5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

### LSA

**Prime Consultants:** *Project Management and Report Production; Aesthetics; Agricultural Resources; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Mineral Resources; Population and Housing; Public Services; Recreation; Transportation and Circulation; Tribal Cultural Resources; Utilities and Service Systems*

157 Park Place

Pt. Richmond, CA 94801

Judith H. Malamut, AICP, Principal in Charge

Laura Lafler, Principal

Matthew Wiswell, Project Manager

Patty Linder, Graphics/Document Production

Charis Hanshaw, Document Management

*Air Quality; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Noise*

7086 N. Maple, Suite 104

Fresno, CA 93720

Amy Fischer, Principal, Air Quality and Noise Specialist

Cara Carlucci, Planner

**This page intentionally left blank**

## 6.0 REFERENCES

Association of Bay Area Governments and Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2017. *Plan Bay Area 2040 Final Environmental Impact Report*. July 16.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2017. *Clean Air Plan*. April 19.

Burlingame Police Department, 2018. About Us. Website: [www.burlingame.org/departments/police\\_department/about\\_us.php](http://www.burlingame.org/departments/police_department/about_us.php) (accessed June 26, 2018).

Burlingame, City of, 1975. *City of Burlingame General Plan, Noise Element*. September 15.

Burlingame, City of, 2000. City of Burlingame General Plan Land Use Map. April.

Burlingame, City of, 2009. *City of Burlingame Climate Action Plan*. June.

Burlingame, City of, 2014. *Burlingame Community Center Master Plan*. July 7.

Burlingame, City of, 2015. *City of Burlingame General Plan*. As amended.

Burlingame, City of, 2015. *Existing Conditions Report*. November.

Burlingame, City of, 2016. *2015 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Burlingame*. June.

Burlingame, City of, 2016. *Burlingame General Plan: Zoning – Southeast Areas*. Available online: [www.burlingame.org/document\\_center/Zoning/ZoningMap-Burlingame-SE.pdf](http://www.burlingame.org/document_center/Zoning/ZoningMap-Burlingame-SE.pdf) (accessed June 8, 2018).

Burlingame, City of, 2016. *Burlingame General Plan: Zoning – Southeast Areas*. Available online: [www.burlingame.org/document\\_center/Zoning/ZoningMap-Burlingame-SE.pdf](http://www.burlingame.org/document_center/Zoning/ZoningMap-Burlingame-SE.pdf) (accessed June 8, 2018).

Burlingame, City of, 2018. *Burlingame Municipal Code*, as amended. May.

Burlingame, City of, 2018. Wastewater Treatment. Website: [www.burlingame.org/departments/sustainability/wastewater\\_treatment.php](http://www.burlingame.org/departments/sustainability/wastewater_treatment.php) (accessed July 30, 2018).

Cal Fire, 2008. *San Mateo County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA*. November 24.

California Department of Conservation, 2012. San Mateo County Williamson Act FY 2006/2007 (map). Available online at: [ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/SanMateo\\_06\\_07\\_WA.pdf](http://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/SanMateo_06_07_WA.pdf) (accessed July 6, 2018).

California Department of Conservation, 2016. Division of Land Use Resource Protection. California Important Farmland Finder. Website: [maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF](http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF) (accessed July 6, 2018).

California Department of Transportation, 2011. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. Website: [www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16\\_livability/scenic\\_highways/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm) (accessed July 6, 2018). September 7.

California State Mining and Geology Board, 2014. Surface Mining Reclamation Act Regulations. California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 2, Chapter 8, Subchapter 1.

California, State of, 1974. Department of Conservation. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation – San Mateo Quadrangle. July 1.

California, State of, 2009. California Emergency Management Agency. *Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning: San Mateo Quadrangle*.

California, State of, 2018. Department of Toxic Substances Control. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. Website: [www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public](http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public) (accessed July 24, 2018).

CalRecycle, 2018. Facility/Site Summary Details: Corinda Los Trancos Landfill ( Ox Mtn) (41-AA-0002). Website: [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Detail](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Detail) (accessed July 30, 2018).

CalRecycle, 2018. Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates. Website: [www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/Waste/Characterization/General/Rates](http://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/Waste/Characterization/General/Rates) (accessed July 30, 2018).

CalRecycle, 2018. Facility/Site Summary Details: Shoreway Environmental Center (41-AA-0016). Website: [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0016/Detail](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0016/Detail) (accessed July 30, 2018).

Cecil H. Wells, Jr & Associates. 2009. Partial Seismic Evaluation for City of Burlingame Recreation Center. June.

Central County Fire Department, 2018. CCFD Overview. Website: [www.ccfdonline.org/about-ccfd/ccfd-overview](http://www.ccfdonline.org/about-ccfd/ccfd-overview) (accessed June 26, 2018).

Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2015. *Flood Insurance Rate Map San Mateo County, California*. July 16.

Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning, Inc., 2018. *Burlingame's New Community Center Conceptual Design Executive Report*. March.

Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., 2018. *Burlingame Community Center Draft Transportation Impact Analysis*. June 27.

Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2018. *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition*. March.

Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2017. *Web Soil Survey*. Website: [websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx](http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx) (accessed September 4).

Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2018. GeoTracker. Website: [geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map) (accessed July 24, 2018).

RestCon Environmental, 2017. *Asbestos Investigation for 850 Burlingame Avenue, Burlingame, CA 94010*. July 3.

South Bay Recycling, n.d. Shoreway Environmental Center. Using the Facility. Website: [www.sbrecycling.net/about](http://www.sbrecycling.net/about) (accessed July 30, 2018).

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2018. National Wetlands Inventory (Map). Website: [www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html](http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html) (accessed July 26, 2018). June 25.

**This page intentionally left blank**

---

## **APPENDIX A**

### **CALEEMOD OUTPUT SHEETS**

**This page intentionally left blank**



---

## **APPENDIX B**

# **TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**This page intentionally left blank**