

CITY OF BURLINGAME

City Hall – 501 Primrose Road
Burlingame, California 94010-3997



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division
PH: (650) 558-7250
FAX: (650) 696-3790

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

To: Interested Individuals
County Clerk of San Mateo

From: City of Burlingame
Community Development Department
Planning Division
501 Primrose Road
Burlingame, CA 94010

Subject: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (ND-587-P)
988 Howard Avenue – Construction of a New 3- Story Commercial Building

Project Location: 988 Howard Avenue, Burlingame, CA 94010

Project Description: The applicant is proposing to construct a new three-story commercial building. The proposed building would contain 1,325 SF of retail space on the ground floor with 22,295 SF of office space on the two floors above. The proposal also includes a 3,800 SF roof deck. The building height proposed is 45-feet.

There would be at-grade parking located behind the lobby and retail space on the ground floor, with access off of East Lane. In addition there would be below-grade parking provided as well with access off of Howard Avenue with a total of 68 on-site parking spaces provided and a car share program.

In accordance with Section 15072(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, notice is hereby given of the City's intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project listed above. A mitigated negative declaration is a negative declaration prepared for a project when the initial study has identified potentially significant effect on the environment, but (1) revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by, the applicant before the proposed negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid effect or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur, and (2) there is no substantial evidence in the light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment. The City of Burlingame has completed a review of the proposed project, and on the basis of an Initial Study and mitigations, finds that the project will not have a significant effect upon the environment. The Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study are available for public review at City Hall, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California, 94010.

As mandated by State Law, the minimum comment period for this document is 20 (twenty) days and begins on November 16, 2015 and ends on December 7, 2015. Comments may be submitted during the review period. Persons having comments concerning this project, including objections to the basis of determination set forth in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, are invited to furnish their comments summarizing the specific and factual basis for their comments, in writing to:

William Meeker, Community Development Director
City of Burlingame Community Development Department
Planning Division
501 Primrose Road
Burlingame, CA 94010-3997
Fax: (650) 696-3790 / Email: wmeeker@burlingame.org

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21177, any legal challenge to the adoption of the proposed Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration will be limited to those issues presented to the City during the public comment period described above.

PUBLIC HEARING: The Planning Commission hearing to review the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, Commercial Design Review, Conditional Use Permit for building height, and Setback Variance for this project has not been scheduled at this time.

Posted: November 16, 2015

988 HOWARD AVENUE PROJECT

DRAFT INITIAL STUDY



Prepared for City of Burlingame

November 2015

Page left intentionally blank

Table of Contents

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	1
Determination	1
Project Description.....	1
Environmental Impact Checklist	
1 Aesthetics	6
2 Agriculture Resources.....	10
3 Air Quality	11
4 Biological Resources	20
5 Cultural Resources	24
6 Geology and Soils.....	27
7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	31
8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	34
9 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	40
10 Land Use and Planning	45
11 Mineral Resources	47
12 Noise.....	48
13 Population and Housing	54
14 Public Services	56
15 Recreation	59
16 Transportation and Traffic.....	60
17 Utilities and Service Systems.....	64
18 Mandatory Findings of Significance	69
References.....	71

List of Tables

Table 1	Project Components
Table 2	Air Quality Significance Thresholds
Table 3	Construction Period Emissions
Table 4	Short-term Measurement Data
Table 5	Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

List of Figures

Figure 1	Project Site
Figure 2	Proposed Design

Appendices

Appendix A	Project Plans
Appendix B	Shadow Analysis and Peer Review
Appendix C	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment
Appendix D	California Historical Resources Information System Records Search
Appendix E	Geotechnical Report
Appendix F	Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessment
Appendix G	Noise Assessment
Appendix H	Trip Generation and Parking Demand Analysis; and Peer Review

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

1. **Project Title:** 988 Howard Avenue
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Burlingame
501 Primrose Road
Burlingame, CA 94010
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Catherine Barber, Senior Planner
Telephone: (650) 558-7252
Email: cbarber@burlingame.org
4. **Project Location:** 988 Howard Avenue
Burlingame, CA 94010
5. **San Mateo County Assessor's Parcel Number:** 029-214-220
6. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Dimitrios Sogas
1290 Howard Ave, Suite 323,
Burlingame CA 94010
Telephone: (650) 703-1042
E-mail: dsogas@yahoo.com
7. **General Plan Designation:** MMU (Myrtle Road Mixed Use Area)
8. **Zoning:** MMU (Myrtle Road Mixed Use Area)
9. **Description of Project:** See project description below
10. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** See project description below

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 on the following pages.

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

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 EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



William Meeker, Community Development Director

11/16/2015

Date

Page left intentionally blank

Summary of Mitigation Measures	
Mitigation Measure AES-1	The project developer shall install low-profile, low-intensity lighting directed downward to minimize light and glare. Exterior lighting shall be low mounted, downward casting, and shielded. In general, the light footprint shall not extend beyond the periphery of each property. Implementation of exterior lighting fixtures on all buildings shall also comply with the standard California Building Code (Title 24, Building Energy Efficiency Standards) to reduce the lateral spreading of light to surrounding uses, consistent with Burlingame Municipal Code Section 18.16.030 that requires that all new exterior lighting for commercial developments be designed and located so that the cone of light and/or glare from the light element is kept entirely on the property or below the top of any fence, edge or wall.
Mitigation Measure AQ-1	<p>The contractor shall implement the following best management practices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 3. All visible mud or dirt track-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. 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour. 5. 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. 6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five 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. 7. 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. 8. Post a publicly visible sign 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. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
Mitigation Measure AQ-2	The contractor shall select specific equipment during construction in order to minimize emissions. The equipment selection would include the regulation that all diesel-powered equipment larger than 50 horsepower and operating on the site for more than two days continuously shall, at a minimum, meet the U.S. EPA particulate matter standards for Tier 2 engines or equivalent.
Mitigation Measure BIO-1	If construction activities would commence anytime during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting near the site (typically February through August in the project region), a pre-construction survey for nesting birds would be conducted by a qualified biologist within two weeks of the commencement of construction activities. The pre-construction survey would encompass the project site and surrounding area, within 150 feet, so as to account for construction-related noise.
Mitigation Measure CUL-1	In the event archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work will be halted within 100 feet of the discovered materials and workers will avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations.

Summary of Mitigation Measures	
Mitigation Measure CUL-2	A discovery of a paleontological specimen during any phase of the project shall result in a work stoppage in the vicinity of the find until it can be evaluated by a professional paleontologist. Should loss or damage be detected, additional protective measures or further action (e.g., resource removal), as determined by a professional paleontologist, shall be implemented to mitigate the impact.
Mitigation Measure CUL-3	In the event that human remains are discovered during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains. The county coroner shall be informed to evaluate the nature of the remains. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Lead Agency shall work with the Native American Heritage Commission and the applicant to develop an agreement for treating or disposing of the human remains.
Mitigation Measure GEO-1	Project design and construction shall adhere to Title 18, Chapter 18 of the Burlingame Municipal Code, and demonstrate adherence to the latest seismic design parameters as required by the California Building Code including, but not limited to, anchorage, load combinations, and structure integrity.
Mitigation Measure GEO-2	Project design and construction, including excavation activities, shall comply with Chapter 33 of the California Building Code (CBC), which specifies the safety requirements to be fulfilled for site work. This would include the prevention of subsidence or pavement or foundations caused by dewatering. Adherence must also be demonstrated to Chapter 18 of the CBC, which sets forth building construction standards including, but limited to, expansive soils.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-1	The contractor shall comply with Title 8, California Code of Regulations/Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) requirements that cover construction work where an employee may be exposed to lead. This includes the proper removal and disposal of peeling paint, and appropriate sampling of painted building surfaces for lead prior to disturbance of the paint and disposal of the paint or painted materials.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-2	The applicant shall contract a Certified Asbestos Consultant to conduct an asbestos survey prior to disturbing potential asbestos containing building materials and shall implement the Consultant's recommendations for proper handling and disposal.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-3	The applicant shall prepare, and submit, a Soils Management Plan (SMP) to the San Mateo County Health Department for approval, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The SMP will address the possibility of encountering subsurface contaminants, including groundwater, during construction activities, and the measures for identifying, handling, and disposing of subsurface contaminants. The SMP shall be submitted to the City prior to issuance of a building permit.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-4	The contractor shall ensure the appropriate handling, storing, and sampling of any soil to be removed from the subject property, as per the SMP, so as to eliminate potential health and safety risks to the public, including construction workers.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-5	In the event that groundwater, or other subsurface contaminants, are encountered during excavation, grading, or any other demolition/construction activities at the project site, the contractor shall ensure that the procedure for evaluating, handling, storing, testing, and disposing of contaminated groundwater is implemented, as per the SMP.

Summary of Mitigation Measures	
Mitigation Measure HAZ-6	Workers handling demolition and renovation activities at the project site shall be trained in the safe handling and disposal of residual chemicals, solvents, heavy metals, motor and transmission oils, lubes, greases, antifreeze, Freon, solvents, and lead-acid batteries etc. associated with the former gas station and auto repair maintenance shop.
Mitigation Measure NOI-1	The contractor shall ensure that the interior noise levels are maintained at or below 50 dBA L_{eq} (1-hr). Treatments would include, but are not limited to, sound-rated wall and window constructions, acoustical caulking, protected ventilation openings, etc. The specific determination of what noise insulation treatments are necessary shall be conducted on a room-by-room basis during final design of the project. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, shall be submitted to the City, along with the building plans and approved design, prior to issuance of a building permit.
Mitigation Measure NOI-2	The contractor shall install forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all exterior-facing rooms of the office building so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control interior noise and achieve the interior noise standards.

Page left intentionally blank

Project Description

Existing Project Setting

The project site, 988 Howard Avenue, is located within the downtown area of Burlingame, in San Mateo County. The 0.35-acre parcel (Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 029-214-220) project site is surrounded by East Lane to the west, Howard Avenue south, and Myrtle Road to the north and west.

Existing Conditions and Land Use

The project site is located within the Myrtle Road Mixed Use (MMU) planning area of the *Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan*.¹ MMU allows for a variety of small commercial, residential, and retail uses. The MMU planning area is meant to serve as a buffer between the downtown commercial district and the residential neighborhoods located east of this area.

The project site is relatively flat and is located approximately 30 feet above mean sea level. The site is located approximately 0.2 miles east of the Caltrain tracks and approximately 1 mile west of the San Francisco Bay. The site is fully developed with a gas station/auto repair maintenance business. Vegetation is limited with several shrubs, but includes three (3) deciduous trees (approximately 4 to 5 feet high) and one (1) City of Burlingame Street Tree (approximately 12 feet high). The project site is currently occupied with two attached buildings: a one-story building with a footprint of approximately 1,000 square feet (sf) and a second attached one-story building of approximately 4,000 sf. Fuel pumps and underground storage tank associated with a fuel station are located at the site; however, the gas station has not been active for approximately 2 years. Access to the site is provided by driveways at Myrtle Road, Howard Avenue, and East Lane (see **Figure 1**).

Residential land uses and several commercial businesses, including a fitness studio and market, surround the site to the east and north. Other key surrounding land uses are shown on **Figure 1**. As shown, the Caltrain corridor is to the southwest; the Burlingame Caltrain Station approximately 0.2 miles west of site; Washington Elementary School approximately 0.1 miles northeast of the site; Burlingame High School is approximately 0.5 miles north of the site; and Washington Park within 0.1 mile of the project site.

Proposed Project Components

The project includes the construction of a three-story building that would include a mix of retail and commercial uses and an underground parking garage (see **Table 1**). The building footprint would cover approximately 73 percent of the lot (11,160 sf of the 15,352 sf lot). The building height would be 45 feet from average top of curb, measured to the top of the parapet wall on the roof deck. A conditional use permit would be required to exceed the MMU zoning district allowance of 35-foot high structures. Approximately 68 standard commercial parking spaces (8 feet-6 inches x 18 feet) would be provided, which includes car stackers that would provide 27 standard commercial spaces. A detailed description of each level is provided below. The project plans are included as **Appendix A**.

¹ The Downtown Burlingame Specific Plan area is framed by Oak Grove Avenue to the north, Anita Road to the east, Peninsula Avenue to the south, and El Camino Real to the west.

Table 1 Project Components

Proposed Component Type	Square Feet (sf)	
Retail Use	1,325	
Commercial Use	22,295	
Roof Deck	3,800	
Landscaping	820	
Parking Spaces	68 parking spaces	Standard – 30 spaces
		Stacked– 27 spaces
		Tandem – 8 spaces
		ADA – 3 spaces

Source: Levy Design Partners, 2015

Proposed Building***Basement Level***

The basement level would be approximately 9 feet below grade and include 39 commercial parking spaces. Access to the basement level would be via the ground floor entrance and downward vehicular ramp that would be provided from Howard Avenue. The parking area would include a bicycle room, an elevator room, and two staircases with access to the above three levels. The basement also includes a mechanical room, bicycle storage and building storage.

Ground Level

The ground level would be at grade and would include the main commercial lobby, 1,325 sf of retail space, and parking. The 27 car stackers would be located at this level and would be accessed via East Lane. Three handicap parking spaces would be located immediately adjacent to the lobby area and elevator. Pedestrians' could enter the building from doors on East Lane, Howard Avenue, or Myrtle Road. Upper floors would be accessible via an elevator or staircase in the lobby or a staircase on the northeast side of the project site near the Myrtle Road entrance.

Second Level

The second level would include 11,180 sf of commercial space, including five exterior decks located around the perimeter of the space. Structural columns would be scattered throughout the commercial area for support for the overall structure. A men and women's restroom and closet are located on northern side of the second level.

Third Level

The third level would include 11,115 sf of commercial space, including five exterior decks that would be located around the perimeter of the space. A men and women's restroom and closet would be located on northern side of the third level, directly above the second level restrooms.

Roof Level

The roof level would be accessible via two staircases and an elevator and would contain 3,800 sf of exterior deck space. The deck would include tables, lounge chairs, and landscaping for users of the building. A 42-inch tall glass railing would surround the deck and a low-height parapet would extend past the deck an additional few feet.² The roof would also contain mechanical equipment and exhaust from the garage.

Design and Landscaping

The project would be designed with modern design concepts. The ground level lobby and store front would have large floor to ceiling glass windows. The commercial floor would have a similar open feel, with floor to ceiling windows and aluminum sun screens. The commercial floors would also include exterior decks that wrap around the building. The exterior siding would either be finished with stucco, metal panel, or composite wood ranging between beige, brown, and grey color tones.

The four existing trees and several shrubs located on the western portion of the project site along East Lane would be removed to accommodate project components. Landscaping on the ground level perimeter would include a variation of permeable pavers, decorative pebbles, traditional planters on top of 42-inch concrete structures, evergreen shrubs, Ginkgo Biloba street trees, and other tree planting in 24-inch box structures. The roof level would be landscaped with traditional 4-foot square planter pots with 24-inch palm trees or drought tolerant evergreen trees.

Utilities

The Burlingame Public Works Department provides water and wastewater service to the project site. The project site is connected to the City's utility infrastructure and includes 10-inch water lines and 6-inch sanitary sewer lines. The new building would tie-in to these existing lines. The Department of Public Works has indicated that the 6-inch sanitary sewer line that serves the subject property is at or near capacity. The applicant will need to do an analysis to determine if the sewer main requires upsizing. This analysis will be reviewed by the City and if required, the applicant will be required to pay for their pro-rata share of the upsizing or a designated run of the line, the details of which would be determined by the Department of Public Works prior to building permit approval. The existing 10-inch water line is sufficient to provide for the increased need in water usage for the proposed uses; however new construction is required to comply with California Fire Code requirements for fire flow, based on the size of the building and type of construction, and hydrant spacing. Upon building permit submittal Central County Fire Department will require that the project comply with State fire code for emergency water supply (hydrants) with regard to the increase of square footage at the project site and necessary flow rate (gallons per minutes); if the existing 10-inch cannot meet

² A parapet is a low protective barrier along the edge of a roof, terrace, balcony, etc.

the flow rate then the applicant would be responsible for upsizing the water line. The Street and Sewer Division of the Department of the City Public Works Department maintains Burlingame's stormwater infrastructure. The project site is connected to an existing 15-inch stormwater line and the new building would tie-in to this existing line to convey stormwater infrastructure. Bio-swales for stormwater treatment and drainage around the project site would be installed as well. Best management practices would be implemented with regard to site development, energy efficiency, water conservation, and pollutant control.

Construction

The existing buildings, concrete, and paving on the site would be demolished and removed as part of the project. Additionally, the project would remove the underground fuel pumps and storage tank. Principal construction would take between 12 to 18 months. The walls of the basement level would require shoring or bracing technique to retain surrounding areas below grade and would not exceed 12 feet in excavation. The project would remove approximately 6,000 cubic yards of soil, which would be disposed of at either Ox Mountain (Half Moon Bay) or Dumbarton Quarry (Newark). Typical construction equipment would include dozers, graders, tractors, cranes, forklifts, and generators. No pile driving would be required. Materials would be staged on site, mostly on the eastern portion of the site (adjacent to Myrtle Rd). Construction would occur during the construction hours allowed by the Burlingame Municipal Code, Section 18.07.110, specifically:

Weekdays: 7:00 am – 7:00 pm

Saturdays: 9:00 am – 6:00 pm

Sunday and Holidays: 10:00 am – 6:00 pm

2013 California Green Building Code

The project would comply with the 2013 California Green Building Code and implement energy efficiency measures to comply with the 2013 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Water efficiency and conservation measures such as metering, efficient plumbing fixtures, and wastewater reduction would be implemented. Furthermore, outdoor landscaping would be designed with automatic irrigation controllers and sensors to reduce outdoor water usage. The project would install a heating, ventilation, and air conditioning unit (HVAC) and refrigeration system that are energy efficient and reduce potential leak reduction.

Access and Circulation

The project site is located just west of US 101 and east of El Camino Real; both major traffic corridors providing access to Burlingame. Currently there are four driveways on the site, two would be removed and vehicles would access and exit the project site via entrances either on Howard Avenue or East Lane. The project location would provide easy access to the Burlingame Caltrain station. Bicycle parking areas would be provided as well. Future employees in the building would be within walking distance to the downtown portion of Burlingame, on the west side of the Caltrain corridor, where there are a number of restaurants and amenities.

Project Approvals

The project requires the following approvals:

- Design review – required for new commercial buildings to determine (Code Section 25.57.010(c)).
- Conditional Use Permit for building height (45'-0" proposed where 35'-0" is the maximum allowed in the Myrtle Road Mixed Use District) (Code Section 25.34.055).
- Rear Setback variance to relocate the formal front entrance on East Lane (proposed rear setback of 10'-0" where a 20'-0" is the minimum required) (Code Section 25.34.060).
- Parking variance for reduction of required on-site parking by 5 spaces or consideration for the approval of a car share program. If the City approves the car share program, the project applicant would withdraw the request for parking variance because the car share program would qualify the project for a 10 percent reduction in parking (Code Section 25.70.010(a)).
- Adoption of a mitigated negative declaration – California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) clearance
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) permit is to be obtained for the shoring at the excavation in the basement per CAL/OSHA requirements
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to obtain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit
- Grading permit
- Tree removal permit from the City Director prior to construction

Environmental Impacts

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1. AESTHETICS—Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The City of Burlingame is located within San Mateo County, east of the Santa Cruz Mountains and west of the San Francisco Bay (Bay). Burlingame is surrounded by the City of Millbrae to the northwest, the Bay to the east, the City of San Mateo to the southeast, and the Town of Hillsborough to the southwest. Most of the City is located on gently sloping valley floor and is a highly developed, urban/suburban area. The western portions of the City are located on foothills rising to the Santa Cruz Mountains that offer scenic views of the Santa Cruz Mountains, the Bay, and the East Bay Hills.

The project site lies within the Myrtle Road Mixed Use Area (MMU) in the northeastern portion of the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan area. According the *Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration* (Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND), Mixed Use Areas should be encouraged to create active public places. New buildings would contribute to existing character and pedestrian nature of downtown, with active storefronts, windows, and doors at ground level. Architecture would include the types of details that are common to Burlingame, and would use similar materials, colors, proportions, window types, and overall compositions.

This project is located on a flat, urbanized site surrounded by retail, commercial, and residential uses. Existing development on the project site includes a gas station and an automobile repair business housed in two attached single-story commercial buildings. Remaining portions of the site are fully paved and used for automotive storage. Four trees and small patches of existing landscaping are scattered around the edges of the site. Sightlines within the project vicinity are typically restricted by flat topography, low elevation, and surrounding development.

The surrounding area consists of one- and two-story buildings with an occasional taller structure. The immediate neighborhood includes an automotive service garage abutting the property to the north; an automobile storage lot across Howard Avenue; a two-story mixed use building across the Myrtle Road; and on-street parking, automobile storage, and the Caltrain railroad tracks, approximately 0.2 miles west, across East Lane. Many commercial structures in the area have no setback from the road, while other structures have paved parking lots between the sidewalk and the front of the building.

A shadow report was prepared as part of the proposed project in response to public concern of potential aesthetic impacts of the project. While shadow effects are not a CEQA topic, this report is included as **Appendix B.**

Discussion

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (No Impact)

According to the City of Burlingame General Plan (general plan), important vistas include the hillside leading to the Skyline Ridge as seen from the Bay plain, and the Bay as seen from the hillside. The project would not impact either scenic resource. Public views of the foothills rising to the Santa Cruz Mountains are obscured by existing development and landscaping in the project vicinity. The project would not alter public views of the Bay from the hillside, which would be relatively similar in scale to other existing structures in the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan area. No impact to scenic vistas would occur.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (No Impact)

The intent of the California Scenic Highway Program is to protect and enhance California's natural beauty and to protect the social and economic values provided by the state's scenic resources. State scenic highways are officially designated by Scenic Highways Advisory Committee. According the General Plan Scenic Roads and Highways Element, the project is not located near a state scenic highway. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

Construction

Construction of the proposed project would involve earthmoving operations and grading activities. As a result, construction equipment, construction vehicles, staging areas, and associated construction debris would be visible on the project site for the duration of construction (approximately 12-18 months). The visual character and quality of the site would change for a temporary period of time, depending on the work and equipment used. However, the visual effects of construction activities would be similar to other types of development and construction that typically occur within the area and are temporary in nature.

Operation

The proposed project would construct a three-story mixed-use structure with a rooftop garden on a currently developed parcel surrounded by residential neighborhoods, commercial uses, and transportation corridors. As discussed below, the project is designed to be compatible with the light/industrial vernacular of the existing neighborhood while incorporating a visual transition into the neighboring Lyon Hoag neighborhood and creating a pedestrian-oriented atmosphere. **Figure 2** depicts renderings of the proposed project. The proposed structure is located on the northern portion of the site, adjacent to the northern property line to maximize separation from residential developments. The solid vertical mass along East Avenue is consistent with the industrial buildings that face the railroad tracks, while staggered surfaces along Howard Avenue and Myrtle Avenue prevent the structure from looming over the sidewalk and other public areas. The exterior siding would either be finished with stucco, metal panel, or composite wood ranging between beige, brown, and grey color tones. The various architectural textures, profiles, materials, and color palettes were selected based on their consistency with the visual character of the area; however, the overall design reflects a more modern architectural style than what currently exists in the surrounding community.

The project applicant proposes a three-story structure that would measure 45 feet to the top of the parapet from average top of curb. The new structure would greatly exceed the height of the existing single-story building by approximately 35 feet. In response, the project design incorporated upper-story setbacks and balconies to reduce the structure's imposition on the surrounding area. The open roof level would consist of a 3,800 sf exterior deck with landscaping, a glass railing, and a low-height parapet. The roof would also contain mechanical equipment and exhaust from the garage. The project has been designed for the pedestrian nature of the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan area. The ground level would feature large floor-to-ceiling glass windows to provide active storefronts. Commercial floors would have an open feel, with floor-to-ceiling windows, aluminum sun screens, and exterior decks that wrap around the building. The project would also incorporate 820 square feet of landscaping on the ground level perimeter that would include a variety of permeable pavers, decorative pebbles, traditional planters, evergreen shrubs, and street trees. Parking would be underground and on the ground level.

The project applicant is requesting a Rear Setback Variance to locate the formal front yard on East Lane. This variance would allow a 20-foot setback along Myrtle Road, which would be landscaped to create a well-scaled transition along Howard Street into the mixed-use Lyon Hoag neighborhood. The variance would also result in a 10-foot setback along East Lane. This smaller setback would have less of a visual impact to East Lane, which is essentially a frontage road alongside the Caltrain tracks that consists of surface parking and low-scale industrial buildings converted into offices.

Although the height of the proposed building would be 45-feet, which is taller than the surrounding buildings, the height is allowed with a Conditional Use Permit and this scale of development was envisioned as part of the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan. The increased landscaping and articulated façade would provide a more pedestrian atmosphere consistent with the Specific Plan. The project would not substantially degrade the visual quality and character of the site and project area and therefore would have a less-than-significant impact.

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 with Mitigation Incorporated)

The project site is currently developed and urbanized. Streetlights, exterior commercial lighting, and vehicular lights exist in the surrounding area and along adjacent corridors. The new building would contribute additional sources of light; however exterior lighting shall be designed and installed to comply with existing regulations to reduce light pollution. The glass surfaces on the proposed structure would result in increased sunlight reflection, ambient light, and glare beyond existing conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The following mitigation measure is anticipated to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure AES-1: The project developer shall install low-profile, low-intensity lighting directed downward to minimize light and glare. Exterior lighting shall be low mounted, downward casting, and shielded. In general, the light footprint shall not extend beyond the periphery of each property. Implementation of exterior lighting fixtures on all buildings shall also comply with the standard California Building Code (Title 24, Building Energy Efficiency Standards) to reduce the lateral spreading of light to surrounding uses, consistent with Burlingame Municipal Code Section 18.16.030 that requires that all new exterior lighting for commercial developments be designed and located so that the cone of light and/or glare from the light element is kept entirely on the property or below the top of any fence, edge or wall.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

2. AGRICULTURE 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

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) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Setting

The project site is fully developed with a gas station and auto repair services. The United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service soil map delineates the project site as Urban Land, with the farmland classification as Not Prime Farmland. The California Department of Conservation, Natural Resources Agency 2010 map of Important Farmland identifies Burlingame as Urban and Built Up Land.

Discussion

- 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? (No Impact)
- and
- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (No Impact)
- and
- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (No Impact)

There are no active agricultural lands on or adjacent to the property site, or properties subject to a Williamson Act contract. The project site is not designated for agricultural uses in the General Plan Land Use Map; therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Furthermore, the proposed project site is currently in an urban setting and falls within a planning area of the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan area, which contains land use policies intended to promote and expand development. Consequently, the project would not result in farmland conversion to non-agricultural use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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) Frequently create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment was prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin in September 2015 to identify and evaluate the potential air quality effects related to the project (see **Appendix C** of this initial study).

Air Pollutants of Concern

The San Francisco Bay Area (Bay Area) meets all ambient air quality standards with the exception of ground-level ozone, respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀), and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). High ozone levels are caused by the cumulative emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x). These precursor pollutants react under certain meteorological conditions to form high ozone levels. Controlling the emissions of these precursor pollutants is the focus of the Bay Area's attempts to reduce ozone levels. The highest ozone levels in the Bay Area occur in the eastern and southern inland valleys that are downwind of air pollutant sources. High ozone levels aggravate respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, reduced lung function, and increase coughing and chest discomfort.

Particulate matter is another problematic air pollutant of the Bay Area. Particulate matter is assessed and measured in terms of respirable particulate matter or particles that have a diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM_{10}) and fine particulate matter where particles have a diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less ($PM_{2.5}$). Elevated concentrations of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ are the result of both region-wide (or cumulative) emissions and localized emissions. High particulate matter levels aggravate respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, reduce lung function, increase mortality (e.g., lung cancer), and result in reduced lung function growth in children.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) are a broad class of compounds known to cause morbidity or mortality (usually because they cause cancer) and include, but are not limited to, the criteria air pollutants. TACs are found in ambient air, especially in urban areas, and are caused by industry, agriculture, fuel combustion, and commercial operations (e.g., dry cleaners). TACs are typically found in low concentrations, even near their source (e.g., diesel particulate matter [DPM] near a freeway). Because chronic exposure can result in adverse health effects, TACs are regulated at the regional, state, and federal level.

Diesel exhaust is the predominant TAC in urban air and is estimated to represent about three-quarters of the cancer risk from TACs (based on the Bay Area average). According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), diesel exhaust is a complex mixture of gases, vapors, and fine particles. This complexity makes the evaluation of health effects of diesel exhaust a complex scientific issue. Some of the chemicals in diesel exhaust, such as benzene and formaldehyde, have been previously identified as TACs by the CARB, and are listed as carcinogens either under the state's Proposition 65 or under the Federal Hazardous Air Pollutants programs.

CARB adopted and implemented a number of regulations for stationary and mobile sources to reduce emissions of DPM. Several of these regulatory programs affect medium and heavy duty diesel trucks that represent the bulk of DPM emissions from California highways. These regulations include the solid waste collection vehicle (SWCV) rule, in-use public and utility fleets, and the heavy-duty diesel truck and bus regulations. In 2007, CARB approved a new regulation to reduce emissions of DPM and nitrogen oxides from existing on-road heavy-duty diesel fueled vehicles. The regulation requires affected vehicles to meet specific performance requirements between 2014 and 2023, with all affected diesel vehicles required to have 2010 model-year engines or equivalent by 2023. These requirements are phased in over the compliance period and depend on the model year of the vehicle.

BAAQMD is the regional agency tasked with managing air quality in the region. At the state level, the CARB (a part of the California Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]) oversees regional air district activities and regulates air quality at the state level. The BAAQMD has recently published California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Guidelines that are used in this assessment to evaluate air quality impacts of projects.

Sensitive Receptors

There are groups of people more affected by air pollution than others. CARB has identified the following persons who are most likely to be affected by air pollution: children under 14, the elderly over 65, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. These groups are classified as sensitive receptors. Locations that may contain a high concentration of these sensitive population groups include residential areas, hospitals, daycare facilities, elder care facilities, elementary schools, and parks. The closest

off-site sensitive receptors are residences located above the street level retail shops on the corner of Howard Avenue and Myrtle Road, approximately 50 feet across from the project site. Other sensitive receptors are located, across Myrtle Road, to the north, northeast, and east of the project site.

Significance Thresholds

In June 2010, BAAQMD adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under CEQA. These thresholds were designed to establish the level of air pollution emissions that could cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website and included in the Air District's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2011). The significance thresholds identified by BAAQMD and used in this analysis are summarized in **Table 2**.

Table 2 Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds	Operational Thresholds	
	Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	Annual Average Emissions (tons/year)
Criteria Air Pollutants			
ROG	54	54	10
NO _x	54	54	10
PM ₁₀	82	82	15
PM _{2.5}	54	54	10
CO	Not Applicable	9.0 ppm (8-hour average) or 20.0 ppm (1-hour average)	
Fugitive Dust	Construction Dust Ordinance or other Best Management Practices	Not Applicable	
Health Risks and Hazards for New Sources			
Excess Cancer Risk	10 per one million		
Chronic or Acute Hazard Index	1.0		
Incremental annual average PM _{2.5}	0.3 µg/m ³ *		
Health Risks and Hazards for Sensitive Receptors (Cumulative from all sources within 1,000 foot zone of influence) and Cumulative Thresholds for New Sources			
Excess Cancer Risk	100 per one million		
Chronic Hazard Index	10.0		
Annual Average PM _{2.5}	0.8 µg/m ³		
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG Annual Emissions	Compliance with a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy OR 1,100 metric tons or 4.6 metric tons per capita		
Note: lbs = pounds, ppm = parts per million, ROG = reactive organic gases, NO _x = nitrogen oxides, PM ₁₀ = course particulate matter or particulates with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers (µm) or less, PM _{2.5} = fine particulate matter or particulates with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5µm or less; and GHG = greenhouse gas; µg/m ³ = Micrograms per meter cubed			

Source: Illingworth & Rodkin, 2015

BAAQMD's adoption of significance thresholds contained in the 2011 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines was called into question by an order issued March 5, 2012, in *California Building Industry Association (CBIA) v. BAAQMD* (Alameda Superior Court Case No. RGI0548693). The order requires BAAQMD to set aside its approval of the thresholds until it has conducted environmental review under CEQA. The ruling made in the case concerned the environmental impacts of adopting the thresholds and how the thresholds would indirectly affect land use development patterns. In August 2013, the Appellate Court struck down the lower court's order to set aside the thresholds. However, this litigation remains pending as the California Supreme Court recently accepted a portion of CBIA's petition to review the appellate court's decision to uphold BAAQMD's adoption of the thresholds. The specific portion of the argument to be considered is in regard to whether CEQA requires consideration of the effects of the environment on a project (as contrasted to the effects of a project on the environment). Therefore, the significance thresholds contained in the 2011 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines are applied to this project.

The project site is located in the northeastern portion of San Mateo County, within the San Francisco Area Air Basin. Ambient air quality standards have been established at both the state and federal level. The San Francisco Area Air Basin meets all such ambient air quality standards requirements, with the exception of ground-level ozone, respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀) and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). High ozone levels are caused by the cumulative emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x). These precursor pollutants react under certain meteorological conditions to form high ozone levels. Controlling the emissions of these precursor pollutants is the focus of the Bay Area's attempts to reduce ozone levels.

Discussion

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (No Impact)

As noted above in the setting discussion, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is in non-attainment for state and federal standards for O₃, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Steps needed to achieve compliance with these regulations have been identified, as described below.

The state-mandated regional air quality plan is the Clean Air Plan. The Clean Air Plan includes about 55 control measures that are intended to reduce air pollutant emissions in the Bay Area either directly or indirectly. The control measures are divided into five categories that include:

- Measures to reduce stationary and area sources
- Mobile source measures
- Transportation control measures
- Land use and local impact measures
- Energy and climate measures

A project would be determined to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality plan if it would be inconsistent with the regional growth assumptions, in terms of population, employment, or regional growth in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). The emission strategies in the Clean Air Plan were developed, in part,

on regional population, housing, and employment projections prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The project is consistent with the Myrtle Mixed Use zoning for the site. As such, the use of this site for commercial purposes is already included in the Clean Air Plan.

The project would not directly increase the City's population as it does not include residential units. The existing garage and automobile repair shop, on the project site, would be replaced with a single three-story mixed-use building. Due to the close proximity of public transit, including Caltrain, Samtrans, and BART, no net increase in traffic is anticipated with project implementation. Consequently, development of the project would not conflict with population and VMT projections used to develop the Clean Air Plan planning projections (see **Section 16**). The project would not obstruct implementation of these plans, and therefore no impact would occur.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Less Than Significant)

BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for the non-attainment air pollutants and their precursors. These thresholds are for ozone precursor pollutants (ROG and NO_x), PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, and apply to both the construction period and the operational period impacts.

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2.2 was used to predict emissions from construction of the site assuming full build out of the project, by inputting the project land use types and size, and anticipated construction schedule. The proposed project land uses were factored into the CalEEMod land use categories as follows: 22,295 sf of "General Office Building," 1,325 sf of "Strip Mall" (which refers to the proposed retail land uses), and 68 parking spaces entered as "Enclosed Parking with Elevator." Additionally, the project would require approximately 6,000 cubic yards (cy) of soil export, and default construction settings for the proposed project footprint, all of which were accounted for in CalEEMod.

Construction

The air quality emissions modeling assumes the project would be constructed over 123 work days (e.g., approximately 6 months) as a conservative scenario. Average daily emissions were computed by dividing the total construction emissions by the number of construction days. **Table 3** below shows average daily construction emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ exhaust, and PM_{2.5} exhaust during construction of the project. As indicated in **Table 3**, predicted project emissions would not exceed the BAAQMD significance thresholds (see **Appendix C** for additional information). Construction activities would generate dust and equipment exhaust on a temporary basis during construction activities from site preparation, demolition, ground disturbance, and the operation of construction equipment and other vehicles. The effects of construction activities would be locally elevated levels of TACs, ozone precursors (ROG and NO_x), PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} downwind of construction activity (see **Table 3**). Construction dust has the potential for creating a nuisance at nearby properties. Standard Permit Conditions require that all basic BAAQMD BMPs be implemented, as described in **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** below.

Implementation of the measures recommended by BAAQMD and listed below would reduce the air quality and fugitive dust-related impacts associated with grading and new construction to less than significant.

Table 3 Construction Period Emissions

Scenario	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀ Exhaust	PM _{2.5} Exhaust
Construction emissions (tons)	0.35 tons	0.96 tons	0.06 tons	0.05 tons
Average daily emissions (pounds) ¹	5.7 lbs	15.6 lbs	1.0 lbs	0.8 lbs
BAAQMD Thresholds (pounds per day)	54 lbs	54 lbs	82 lbs	54 lbs
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Note: ¹ Assumes 123 Work Days (approximately 6 months)

Source: Illingworth & Rodkin, 2015

Mitigation Measure AQ-1. The contractor shall implement the following best management practices:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-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.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.
5. 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.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five 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.
7. 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.
8. Post a publicly visible sign 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's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Operation

In the 2011 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines update, BAAQMD identifies screening criteria for the sizes of land use projects that could result in significant air pollutant emissions. For operational impacts, the screening project size is identified at 346,000 sf for commercial developments. Office projects of smaller size would be expected to have less-than-significant impacts with respect to operational-period emissions. Since the project proposes to operate at 22,295 sf of office space and 1,325 sf of retail, it is concluded that emissions would be below the

BAAQMD significance thresholds for the operational period. Additionally, development would be near existing transit with regional connections and could reduce vehicle-related emissions, as well as potentially provide employment for the surrounding residential uses.

Carbon monoxide emissions from traffic generated by the project would be the pollutant of greatest concern at the local level. Congested intersections with a large volume of traffic have the greatest potential to cause high-localized concentrations of carbon monoxide. Air pollutant monitoring data indicate that carbon monoxide levels have been at healthy levels (i.e., below state and federal standards) in the Bay Area since the early 1990s. As a result, the region has been designated as attainment for the standard. The highest measured level over any 8-hour averaging period during the last 3 years in the Bay Area is less than 3.0 parts per million (ppm), compared to the ambient air quality standard of 9.0 ppm. According to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared for the project, intersections affected by the project would have traffic volumes less than the BAAQMD screening criteria. Therefore, the project would not cause a violation of an ambient air quality standard for CO.

Project construction and operation would not cause a violation of any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore this impact would be less than significant.

- 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)? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)**

Past, present and future development projects contribute to the region's adverse air quality impacts on a cumulative basis. By its very nature, 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. If a project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable, then the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.

The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines state that a significant air quality impact would result if the project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant or a precursor to that pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable national or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for O₃ precursors). This is judged by comparing direct and indirect project emissions to the BAAQMD significance thresholds of 54 pounds per day for ROG, NO_x, or PM_{2.5}, and 82 pounds per day for PM₁₀. Annual significance thresholds are 10 tons per year for ROG, NO_x, or PM_{2.5}, and 15 tons per year for PM₁₀.

As stated above, according to BAAQMD, implementation of the project would, therefore, result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact to air quality from criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions. Given the nature of the proposed use (i.e., office/retail) and given the mixed-use land use type, the operational criteria pollutant screening size for the project is 346,000 sf. The project would implement 22,295 sf of office space

and 1,325 sf of retail, and would therefore be below the screening criteria developed by BAAQMD. Given this, the project would not exceed the pollutant emissions thresholds. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is not considered cumulatively considerable.

Due to the project size, operational period emissions would be less than significant. However, because the project proposes to demolish existing facilities onsite, modeling of construction emissions was conducted to quantify project impacts (see **Table 3**). The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines consider these impacts to be less than significant if best management practices (BMPs) are employed to reduce these emissions.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** would reduce any violation or contribution to existing or projected air quality violations to a less-than-significant level.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

Operation of the project is not expected to cause any localized emissions that could expose sensitive receptors to unhealthy air pollutant levels. No stationary sources of TACs (typically factories, refineries, power plants, etc.), are proposed as part of the project. Construction activity would generate dust and equipment exhausts on a short-term temporary basis. The project would not introduce any new sensitive receptors to the area. Construction equipment and associated heavy-duty truck traffic could generate diesel exhaust, which is a known TAC. Diesel exhaust and $PM_{2.5}$ can pose both potential health and nuisance impacts to nearby receptors. The nearest sensitive receptors are residences located above the street level retail shops on the corner of Howard Avenue and Myrtle Road, approximately 50 feet east of the project site. There are other residences located further from the project site, across Myrtle Road to the north, northeast, and east.

Refined community risk assessment modeling for the project buildout was conducted using CalEEMod. BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer causing carcinogens are set at $0.3\mu/m^3$ for $PM_{2.5}$, and $5\mu/m^3$ for Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM). Lifetime cancer risks associated with project implementation were calculated using a dispersion model; the maximum modeled annual $PM_{2.5}$ concentration was $0.22\mu/m^3$, and the maximum modeled annual residential DPM concentration was $0.212\mu/m^3$, both of which are significantly lower than the BAAQMD significance thresholds. During project construction, the incremental residential childhood cancer risk at the maximally exposed individual (MEI) receptor would be 18.6 in one million and the maximum incremental residential adult cancer risk would be 1.0 in one million. Cancer risk and non-cancer impacts to adult residents are below BAAQMD significance thresholds of 10 in one million or greater for $PM_{2.5}$ and DPM (see **Appendix C**). However, the residential childhood cancer risk of 18.6 in one million is above the BAAQMD threshold of 10 in one million, and would be considered a significant impact. **Mitigation Measure AQ-2** would reduce risks associated with construction emissions, and increased cancer risk, to a less than significant level. The implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** and **Mitigation Measure AQ-2** would further reduce impacts from fugitive dust. Any impacts associated with project implementation and the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2. The contractor shall select specific equipment during construction in order to minimize emissions. The equipment selection would include the regulation that all diesel-powered equipment larger than 50 horsepower and operating on the site for more than two days continuously shall, at a minimum, meet the U.S. EPA particulate matter standards for Tier 2 engines or equivalent

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

The project would generate localized emissions of diesel exhaust during construction from equipment operation and truck activity. These emissions may be noticeable from time to time by adjacent receptors. However, they would be localized and are not likely to adversely affect people off site by resulting in confirmed odor complaints. No sources of significant odors that would cause complaints from surrounding uses are anticipated with the construction of the mixed use building; the proposed uses include office space and retail, neither of which typically produces objectionable odors. Therefore any impacts associated with the creation of frequently occurring, objectionable odors would be less than significant.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—				
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US 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.) or state-protected wetlands, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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) Fundamentally 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"/>

Setting

The biological resources occurring on and near the project site were evaluated by Pacific Biology on August 4, 2015. The project site is located in an urban area and is surrounded by dense commercial and residential development. The project site is completely developed and is currently used as a gas station and auto repair maintenance business. Vegetation on the site is limited to small areas of landscaping along the sidewalk and to several non-native trees along the fence line.

Discussion

- a) **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)**

The California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) was reviewed to identify the location of special-status species documented in surrounding areas, and the suitability of onsite habitats to support special-status species was evaluated during the August 2015 site visit. Based on the CNDDDB, no special-status species have been documented on the project site or within approximately 2 miles of the site. The project site does not provide suitable habitat for any regionally occurring special-status plant or wildlife species for the following reasons: (1) the site is in a densely developed urban area and is isolated from areas of natural habitat; and (2) the site is paved and is being actively used as a gas station and auto repair maintenance shop. Therefore, impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species from development and operation of the project are not expected to occur.

The trees on and near the project site provide potential nesting habitat for common, urban adapted bird species. The active nests of most native bird species are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 704) and the California Fish and Game Code (Section 3503). The proposed project may require the removal of four trees, which could result in the loss of an active bird nests. Additionally, construction noise has the potential to disturb nesting potentially occurring in nearby areas. Therefore, the loss of an active bird nest protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: If construction activities would commence anytime during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting near the site (typically February through August in the project region), a pre-construction survey for nesting birds would be conducted by a qualified biologist within two weeks of the commencement of construction activities. The pre-construction survey would encompass the project site and surrounding area, within 150 feet, so as to account for construction-related noise.

If active nests are found in areas that could be directly affected or are within 150 feet of construction and would be subject to prolonged construction-related noise, a no-disturbance buffer zone should be created around active nests during the breeding season or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged. The size of the buffer zones and types of construction activities restricted within them would be determined by taking into account factors such as the following:

- Noise and human disturbance levels at the construction site at the time of the survey and the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity;
- Distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the construction site and the nest; and
- Sensitivity of individual nesting species and behaviors of the nesting birds.

- 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service? (No Impact)**

During the August 2015 site visit, it was confirmed that no riparian habitat or other sensitive plant communities exist on or near the project site. Therefore, no impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive plant communities would occur.

- c) Have a substantial adverse impact 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)**

During the August 2015 site visit, it was confirmed that no creeks, wetlands, and other potentially jurisdictional resources are present on or near the project site. Therefore, no impacts to federally protected wetlands and other waters would occur.

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

Wildlife corridors are described as pathways or habitat linkages that connect discrete areas of natural open space otherwise separated or fragmented by topography, changes in vegetation, and other natural or manmade obstacles such as urbanization. The project site is paved and is surrounded by dense residential and commercial development and does not connect areas of natural open space. Therefore, the project site is not part of an expected wildlife movement corridor. For these reasons, the proposed project would not substantially interfere with the local or regional movement of wildlife species and related impacts would be less than significant.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Less Than Significant)**

The City of Burlingame defines a "protected tree" as any tree with a trunk circumference of 48 inches or more measured 54 inches above the ground. The City of Burlingame defines a "street tree" as any woody perennial plant that grows on City property (right-of-way). The proposed project requires the removal of four trees, all of which have a circumference of less than 48 inches and do not meet the definition of a "protected tree". Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on protected trees. However, one of the trees to be removed is located in the City right-of-way and is a City of Burlingame street tree. The proposed project includes planting seven City of Burlingame street trees. Additionally in compliance with the Burlingame Municipal Code 11.04.035, prior to removal of any street tree, the project applicant would be required to obtain a permit from the City Arborist. With adherence to such policies and replanting efforts, the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, Regional, or state habitat Conservation plan? (No Impact)**

The site is not part of or near an existing Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Communities Conservation Plan or any other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES—				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique 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"/>

Setting

A cultural records search for the project site was conducted through the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) in August 2015. The results of this records search are discussed below and included as **Appendix D**. A number of archaeological sites, Native American cultural resources, and paleontological resources have been discovered throughout San Mateo County. Given this, there is potential to uncover unrecorded buried cultural resources. The City of Burlingame does not contain buildings and structures that appear to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Discussion

- a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (No Impact)**

There are 23 structures within the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan area that were identified as potentially eligible for the CRHP and the NRHP. In addition, there are 51 structures within the downtown area that convey certain aspects of Burlingame's history and heritage, but are not eligible for the CRHR and NRHP. However, none of these potentially historic resources are on the project site. According to the CHRIS records search, no recorded buildings or structures are located within or immediately adjacent to the project site. Therefore, implementation of the project would have no impact on a historical resource.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

Native American cultural resources have been found within San Mateo County, but none have been identified within the project area. The CHRIS records search stated there is a low potential for unrecorded Native American resources in the project area, as well as low potential for unrecorded historic-period archaeological resources. Moreover, because the project site is fully developed, construction of the project would occur in an area that has been subject to deep subsurface disturbance for over 80 years. Therefore, implementation of the project is anticipated to have no effect on a known unique archaeological resource. However, there is a potential to discover unidentified cultural resources during construction activities. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the mitigation measures below would reduce this potentially significant impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: In the event archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work will be halted within 100 feet of the discovered materials and workers will avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations.

If an archaeological site is encountered in any stage of development, a qualified archeologist will be consulted to determine whether the resource qualifies as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource. In the event that it does qualify, the archaeologist will prepare a research design and archaeological data recovery plan to be implemented prior to or during site construction. The archaeologist shall also prepare a written report of the finding, file it with the appropriate agency, and arrange for curation of recovered materials.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

No known paleontological resources have been recorded at the project site or within the vicinity; the nearest known fossil-bearing site is located at least 4 miles removed. Further, the site is fully developed. A gas station and auto repair maintenance shop currently occupy the site; the gas station is not operational and has been inactive for approximately two years, but the associated underground storage tank remain. Given the lack of known resources and that the fully-developed site has been previously disturbed, the probability of encountering paleontological resources is low. However, construction activities could potentially destroy unknown paleontological resources. This is considered a potentially significant impact. In the event that paleontological resources are discovered during site development, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-2** would mitigate this potentially significant impact to less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: A discovery of a paleontological specimen during any phase of the project shall result in a work stoppage in the vicinity of the find until it can be evaluated by a professional paleontologist. Should loss or damage be detected, additional protective measures or further action (e.g., resource removal), as determined by a professional paleontologist, shall be implemented to mitigate the impact.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

It is possible that unmarked burials may be unearthed during project construction. This is considered a potentially significant impact. If human remains are uncovered, the project applicant would comply with the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 regarding human remains, and the California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 regarding the treatment of Native American human remains. As a result, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-3** would reduce the potential impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: In the event that human remains are discovered during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains. The county coroner shall be informed to evaluate the nature of the remains. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Lead Agency shall work with the Native American Heritage Commission and the applicant to develop an agreement for treating or disposing of the human remains.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on 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 checked="" 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, as it may be revised), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

Burlingame is in the Coast Ranges geomorphic province, in eastern San Mateo County, adjacent to the San Francisco Bay. The Bay Area is considered one of the most seismically active areas in the country and is subject to the effects of future earthquakes. The majority of Burlingame (except for the northwestern portion) is essentially flat (less than 1 percent slope) and is underlain by geologic materials consisting mostly of dense clay and clayey sand alluvial fan deposits dating 1.6 million to 10,000 years. These soils tend toward general stability and have a low infiltration rate (less than 0.2 inches per hour).

Qualified geotechnical engineers recently completed a geotechnical investigation for a project located at 225 California Drive, which is within less than a 0.1 mile radius. Due to the close proximity to that site and the project site, the findings of the investigation related to regional setting, site conditions and geologic hazards are assumed to be similar and that report was used to prepare this section (**Appendix E**).

Discussion

- 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. (No Impact)**

The following four historically active faults are located within 15.5 miles of the project site:

- San Andreas Fault (approximately 2.9 miles west)
- San Gregorio Fault (approximately 9.9 miles northeast)
- Monte Vista-Shannon Fault (approximately 10.9 miles southeast)
- Hayward (Total Length) Fault (approximately 15.5 miles east)

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (1972) and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (1990) direct the State Geologist to delineate regulatory zones to assist cities and counties in preventing the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. According to the California Department of Conservation, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, nor is Burlingame affected by Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Additionally, no known surface expression of fault traces cross the site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- ii. **Strong seismic ground shaking? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)**

The City is in relative proximity to historically active faults; as such, there is potential for development within the sphere to be subject to strong seismic ground shaking, including the project site. The intensity of earthquake ground motions would depend on the characteristics of the generating fault, distance to the fault and rupture zone, earthquake magnitude, earthquake duration, and site-specific geologic conditions. The San Andreas Fault is the closest active fault to the project site, approximately 2.9 miles west. Earthquakes along this fault are characteristically very strong (Modified Mercalli Intensity VIII) and groundshaking of this intensity could result in heavy damage. Given this, implementation of the project would expose people and structures to strong seismic groundshaking if an earthquake were to occur in the area. This is a potentially significant impact. Adherence to **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would ensure maximum practicable protection available to users of the buildings and associated infrastructure and reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Project design and construction shall adhere to Title 18, Chapter 18 of the Burlingame Municipal Code, and demonstrate adherence to the latest seismic design parameters as required by the California Building Code including, but not limited to, anchorage, load combinations, and structure integrity.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Less Than Significant)

Because the project site is in a seismically active region, some potential for seismic-related ground failure exists. The project site is flat and is underlain predominately by stiff to very stiff clays and medium dense to dense sands. Given this, the potential for significant seismic settlement is low. The Association of Bay Area Governments mapped the project site as having low potential for liquefaction. Additionally, an analysis performed by geotechnical engineers (see **Appendix E**) concluded low potential for liquefaction to affect the site. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides? (No Impact)

The downtown area of Burlingame experiences a grade change of approximately 15 feet (less than 1 percent slope). The area is relatively flat, without steep or unstable slopes, and does not have an irregular surface. As such, natural slope instability does not affect the project site. Landslides are not considered a hazard in the area. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

The project site is developed and is occupied with a gas station and auto repair maintenance shop. The existing building and asphalt would be demolished and removed as part of the project. Construction activities would be required to comply with the provisions in Appendix J of the California Building Code (CBC) (2007) in regards to grading, excavating, and earthwork construction. Soil erosion after construction would be controlled by implementation of approved landscape and irrigation plans, as needed. Additionally, the building footprint would cover approximately 73 percent of the lot (11,160 sf of the 15,352 sf lot) with the rest of the site mostly paved or landscaped. Therefore, there would be little exposed soil on site that would contribute to soil erosion effects. Further, conformance to the City grading standards and the county Stormwater Management Plan would prevent substantial erosion as a result of construction and implementation associated with the project. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

and

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1b of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

As previously discussed, the project site is not located in an area with high susceptibility to landslide effects or liquefaction owing to its flat topography. The geotechnical report determined the potential for lateral spreading to be low. While the soil is adequate to support the proposed infrastructure, geotechnical engineers recently measured ground water at a depth at 16.5 feet below grade, which could significantly impact excavation and other underground construction.

Expansive soils typically have a plasticity index (PI) of 15 or greater. According to the geotechnical report, test results indicated a PI of 7 for surface soils, which indicates a low expansion potential to wetting and drying cycles, and a PI of 16 for soils at a depth of 9.5 feet, which indicates medium swelling potential. This is considered a significant impact. The following mitigation would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Project design and construction, including excavation activities, shall comply with Chapter 33 of the CBC, which specifies the safety requirements to be fulfilled for site work. This would include the prevention of subsidence or pavement or foundations caused by dewatering. Adherence must also be demonstrated to Chapter 18 of the CBC, which sets forth building construction standards including, but limited to, expansive soils.

- e) **Adherence to Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would ensure maximum practicable protection available to users of the buildings and associated infrastructure and reduce impacts from expansive soils to a less-than-significant-level. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (No Impact)**

The project site would dispose of wastewater using existing wastewater infrastructure operated by the City of Burlingame. No aspect of the project would entail any use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact would occur.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—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"/>

Setting

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Assessment was prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin in September 2015 to address air quality and GHG emission impacts associated with the project (see **Appendix C**).

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere, GHGs, regulate the earth's temperature. This phenomenon, known as the greenhouse effect, is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate. The most common GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO₂) and water vapor but there are also several others, most importantly methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). These are released into the earth's atmosphere through a variety of natural processes and human activities. Sources of GHGs are generally as follows:

- CO₂ and N₂O are byproducts of fossil fuel combustion
- N₂O is associated with agricultural operations such as fertilization of crops
- CH₄ is commonly created by off-gassing from agricultural practices (e.g., keeping livestock) and landfill operations
- Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) were widely used as refrigerants, propellants, and cleaning solvents but their production has been stopped by international treaty
- HFCs are now used as a substitute for CFCs in refrigeration and cooling
- PFCs and sulfur hexafluoride emissions are commonly created by industries such as aluminum production and semi-conductor manufacturing

Each GHG has its own potency and effect upon the earth's energy balance. This is expressed in terms of a global warming potential (GWP), with CO₂ being assigned a value of 1 and sulfur hexafluoride being several orders of magnitude stronger with a GWP of 23,900. In GHG emission inventories, the weight of each gas is multiplied by its GWP and is measured in units of CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e).

An expanding body of scientific research supports the theory that global warming is currently affecting changes in weather patterns, average sea level, ocean acidification, chemical reaction rates, and precipitation rates, and that it would increasingly do so in the future. The climate and several naturally occurring resources within California could be adversely affected by the climate change trend. Increased precipitation and sea level rise could increase coastal flooding, saltwater intrusion, and degradation of wetlands. Mass migration and/or loss of plant and animal species could also occur. Potential effects of global climate change that could adversely affect human health include more extreme heat waves and heat-related stress; an increase in climate-sensitive diseases; more frequent and intense natural disasters such as flooding, hurricanes and drought; and increased levels of air pollution.

The BAAQMD May 2011 CEQA Guidelines included GHG emissions-based significance thresholds. These thresholds include a “bright-line” emissions level of 1,100 metric tons per year for land-use type projects and 10,000 metric tons per year for stationary sources. Land use projects with emissions above the 1,100 metric ton per year threshold would then be subject to a GHG efficiency threshold of 4.6 metric tons per year per capita. Projects with emissions above the thresholds would be considered to have an impact, which, cumulatively, would be significant.

According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the City adopted the Burlingame Climate Action Plan in June 2009 with the goal reducing GHG emissions to 286,402 MT CO₂e by 2020.³ Although the Burlingame Climate Action Plan is not an established Climate Action Plan, the City also conforms to the state target for 2050 (emissions at 80 percent below 1990 levels) set forth in Executive Order (EO) S-03-05. Additionally, EO B-30-15 establishes an interim statewide GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Additionally, the construction and operation of all new buildings in the City are required to comply with energy efficiency standards included in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Title 24 identifies specific energy efficiency requirements for building construction and systems operations that are intended to ensure efficient energy usage over the long-term life of the building.

Discussion

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

GHG emissions associated with development of the proposed project would occur over the short-term from construction activities, consisting primarily of emissions from equipment exhaust and worker and vendor trips. There would also be long-term operational emissions associated with vehicular traffic within the project vicinity, energy and water usage, and solid waste disposal. Emissions for the proposed project are discussed below and were analyzed using the methodology recommended in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.

Construction

Project construction activities are predicted to generate 108 MT of CO₂e using the conservative “default” construction scenario outlined in **Section 3, Air Quality**. Neither BAAQMD nor the City has an adopted

³ Downtown Burlingame Specific Plan IS/MND, May 2010.

threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions and project construction emissions would be below the BAAQMD operational significance threshold of 1,100 MT of CO₂e annually. Using this threshold, the project's impact is considered less than significant. However, BAAQMD encourages the incorporation of best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction where feasible and applicable. Best management practices may include, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment for at least 15 percent of the fleet; using at least 10 percent local building materials; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials (see **Mitigation Measure AQ-1**). **Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2** would reduce construction-related impacts to a less than significant level.

Operation

Due to the project size, operational period GHG emissions would be less than significant. BAAQMD identified screening criteria for the sizes of land use projects that could result in significant GHG emissions in their May 2011 update to the CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. For operational impacts, the screening project size is identified at 53,000 sf for commercial land uses. Mixed use development projects of smaller size would be expected to have less-than-significant impacts with respect to operational period GHG emissions. Since the project proposes to operate 22,295 sf of office space and 1,325 sf of retail, it is concluded that emissions would be below the BAAQMD significance threshold of 1,100 MT of CO₂e annually. Impacts associated with the generation of greenhouse gas emissions, directly or indirectly, would be less than significant with project implementation.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Less Than Significant)

As stated above, the project would be subject to the most recent requirements under rule making developed at the state and local level regarding greenhouse gas emissions and would be subject to local policies that may affect emissions of greenhouse gases. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and any impacts would be less than significant.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Setting

The project site has been operating as a gas station and auto repair maintenance shop for the past several decades. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared by Green Environment, Inc. (GEI) in September 2014 to identify and evaluate the potential hazardous materials on and in the project

vicinity. Due to the historic and present use of the project site a Phase II ESA was also conducted to evaluate the subsurface soil and groundwater conditions and to examine any potential impacts resulting from the past use and storage of petroleum hydrocarbons or other chemical substances (see **Appendix F**).

The existing buildings were constructed between 1959 and 1978 and have the potential to contain asbestos and lead-based paint. Health hazards associated with asbestos include increased risks of cancer and respiratory-related illnesses and diseases, while lead may cause a range of health effects, including behavioral problems, learning disabilities, seizures and death. Exposure to groundwater contamination, asbestos, and lead-based paint during construction and demolition activities could result in a potentially significant hazard to human health unless properly mitigated.

Discussion

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

The project applicant is proposing office and retail land uses at the project site. Common chemicals used for such land uses include cleaners, toners, correction fluid, paints, and maintenance materials. Use of these types of products and chemical would not involve substantial use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials.

During construction, paint, building material finishing products, and automotive oil would be used as well. However, such materials are used temporarily and typically do not generate hazardous air emissions or pose a long-term threat to human health or the environment. The project would remove approximately 6,000 cubic yards of soil, which would be disposed of at the appropriate facility. Contaminated soil would be sent to either Ox Mountain (Half Moon Bay) or Dumbarton Quarry (Newark), as outlined in the Soils Management Plan (SMP) described in **Mitigation Measure HAZ-3** below. Improper disposal could increase risk of exposure for nearby residents through direct contact or by adversely affecting soil, groundwater, or other surface waters on and around the site. **Mitigation Measure HAZ-4** would ensure proper disposal methods for such resources.

Hazardous materials transportation, use, and disposal, as part of the project, would be subject to state and federal hazardous materials laws and regulations. Additionally, the project would comply with hazardous materials policies in the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND. With adherence to local, state, and federal regulation regarding the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.

- 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? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)**

The project site is currently developed with a gas station, and an automobile repair business. According to the Phase I ESA, hazardous material use and storage on the project site includes the retail dispensing of gasoline and diesel fuel from underground storage tank via fuel pumps, the use and storage of motor and transmission oils, lubes, greases, antifreeze, Freon, solvents, and lead-acid batteries for automobile repair and service, as well as potential risk from halogenated volatile organic compounds from an unidentified local area plume. The Phase I report determined that 32 Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites are located within 0.5 miles of the project site, and concluded that only 1 of these sites has the potential to impact the project site. The

LUST and Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups (SLIC) sites are located at 215 California Drive, approximately 600 feet southwest from the project site. As described above, a Phase II ESA was conducted to sample the soil and groundwater at the project site for potential hazardous substances. Based on the Phase II ESA, the soil sample and soil vapor results contain Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), and Heavy Metals. However, these levels were determined to be below the environmental screening levels (ESL) published by the RWQCB's *Screening for Environmental Concerns at Sites with Contaminated Soil and Groundwater*. As a result, exposure to these soil contaminants is not expected to cause a significant impact to human health during construction and operation of the project.

The Phase II also collected groundwater samples at the project site and the samples showed that the TPH_{mo} result of 1,000 µg/L and the methyl tert butyl ether (MTBE) result of 28 µg/L (recovered at 32 ft below grade) exceeded the thresholds for potable drinking water resource protection. Furthermore, the TPH_{mo} result also exceeded the threshold for non-potable water resources.

Operation

The project would connect to the existing municipal services, which would not use the extraction of groundwater for water supply. The San Mateo Health Department was consulted regarding the groundwater contamination and indicated that the groundwater contamination is not a concern for project implementation. The project proposes to construct an office building on the project site; after construction, employees and guests operating from the new building would not come into contact with any contaminated soils/groundwater.

Construction

As described above, reported groundwater contamination at the project site was found to be at approximately 32 feet below ground surface. Construction workers are not anticipated to come into contact with groundwater because project excavation would reach approximately 12 feet. Additionally, construction workers could potentially be exposed to asbestos and lead-based products during the demolition/construction activities. Although construction workers are not expected to come into contact with subsurface contaminants, the San Mateo County Health Department requires that a Soils Management Plan (SMP) be submitted for their approval prior to issuance of a building permit (**Mitigation Measure HAZ-3**). The SMP shall address the possibility of encountering subsurface contaminants, including groundwater, during construction activities, and the relevant measures for identifying, handling, and disposing of subsurface contaminants. Furthermore, implementation of the Title 8, California Code of Regulations/Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) requirements, outlined in **Mitigation Measures HAZ-1** and **HAZ-6** below would reduce the potential hazard with asbestos and lead-based paint to a less-than-significant level.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures HAZ-1** through **HAZ-6** would reduce the impacts associated with demolition and construction to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. The contractor shall comply with Title 8, California Code of Regulations/Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) requirements that cover construction work where an employee may be exposed to lead. This includes the proper removal and disposal of peeling paint, and appropriate sampling of painted building surfaces for lead prior to disturbance of the paint and disposal of the paint or painted materials.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-2. The applicant shall contract a Certified Asbestos Consultant to conduct an asbestos survey prior to disturbing potential asbestos containing building materials and shall implement the Consultant's recommendations for proper handling and disposal.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-3. The applicant shall prepare, and submit, a Soils Management Plan (SMP) to the San Mateo County Health Department for approval, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The SMP shall address the possibility of encountering subsurface contaminants, including groundwater, during construction activities, and the relevant measures for identifying, handling, and disposing of subsurface contaminants. The SMP shall be submitted to the City prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-4. The contractor shall ensure the appropriate handling, storing, and sampling of any soil to be removed from the subject property, as per the SMP, so as to eliminate potential health and safety risks to the public, including construction workers.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-5. In the event that groundwater, or other subsurface contaminants, are encountered during excavation, grading, or any other demolition/construction activities at the project site, the contractor shall ensure that the procedure for evaluating, handling, storing, testing, and disposing of contaminated groundwater is implemented, as per the SMP (see **Mitigation Measure HAZ-3**).

Mitigation Measure HAZ-6. Workers handling demolition and renovation activities at the project site shall be trained in the safe handling and disposal of residual chemicals, solvents, heavy metals, motor and transmission oils, lubes, greases, antifreeze, Freon, solvents, and lead-acid batteries etc. associated with the former gas station and auto repair maintenance shop.

With implementation of **Mitigation Measures HAZ 1 through HAZ-6**, impacts associated with hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant.

c) 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)

Washington Elementary School, located approximately 0.1 miles east of the property, is the only school within 0.25 miles of the project site (see **Figure 1**). As stated above, hazardous material use and storage on the project site includes the retail dispensing of gasoline and diesel fuel from underground storage tank via fuel pumps, the use and storage of motor and transmission oils, lubes, greases, antifreeze, Freon, solvents, and lead-acid batteries for automobile repair and service, as well contaminated soil and groundwater from an unidentified plume in the project vicinity. Additionally, during construction, the project could involve the handling, and disposal, of hazardous waste products, such as asbestos and lead. Most of the above-mentioned substances are typically found within commercial sites. Handling of such substances from the site would be

regulated by state and federal hazardous material laws, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, State Water Code, Underground Storage Tank Code, Cortese Act (listing of hazardous waste and substances sites), and Proposition 65 (safe drinking water and toxics enforcement); all of which would minimize the risk of exposure to nearby land uses, including Washington Elementary. Additionally, implementation of **Mitigation Measures HAZ-1** through **HAZ-6** would further reduce potential impacts to risk of exposure to nearby land uses.

As stated above, the project would include office and retail land uses on the project site. Common chemicals used in commercial and office settings include cleaners, toners, correction fluid, paints, and maintenance materials. Use of these types of products and chemicals would not emit hazardous emissions or require the handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials. For these reasons, the project would have a less-than-significant impact to schools with 0.25 mile of project site.

- 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? (No Impact)**

The State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (also known as the "Cortese List") is a planning document used by state and local agencies and developers to comply with CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials sites. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the project site is not currently listed on the 'Cortese' list pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, the project would have no impact.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (No Impact)**

San Francisco International Airport (SFO) is approximately 2 miles north of the project site. According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the project site is within the *1996 San Mateo Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP)*⁴. The ALUP is subject to land use policies and restrictions, which includes a 300 feet height restriction associated with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations. The proposed project includes the construction of a three story, 45-foot, office building. Given that the height of the building is below the 300-foot height restriction, there are no anticipated safety hazards to people residing or working in the project area as a result of project implementation. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- 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)**

There are no private airstrips within the project vicinity. Therefore, there would be no safety hazards to people residing or working in the project area as they pertain to private airstrips and no impact would occur.

⁴ Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan, 2010. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (pg. 149).

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (No Impact)

The project would build the new structure on previously developed commercial land. Access points to the site would be constructed to ensure proper access for emergency vehicles. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan and no impact would occur.

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? (No Impact)

The project site and the surrounding vicinity are entirely developed. The area does not contain, and is not adjacent to wildlands. Accordingly, implementation of the project would not result in the exposure of people or structures to significant loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires and no impact would occur.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 of 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 of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

San Mateo County is within the San Francisco Bay portion of the Coast Range Geologic Province. Annual average precipitation in San Mateo County is reported at approximately 19.6 inches. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) monitor water quality in the Bay Area. These agencies oversee the implementation of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater discharge permits. The SWRCB has implemented a NPDES General Construction Permit for the State of California for projects disturbing 1 or more of acres of soil. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. Dischargers are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit and are required to file a Notice of Intent (NOI) and prepare a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) prior to commencement of construction. The City participates in the San Mateo Countywide Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP),

and is required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs under Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit (MRP)(Provision C.3.b.). LID practices include source control BMPs, site design BMPs, and stormwater treatment BMPs onsite or at a joint stormwater treatment facility.

Burlingame Water Division of the Public Works Department, which purchases treated water from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, provides potable water to the project site. Approximately 85 percent of the water supply comes from the Hetch Hetchy watershed in the Sierra Nevada Mountains and approximately 15 percent comes from local watersheds. The project area does not contain any natural surface drainage. Stormwater runoff is entirely contained within a storm drainage system that utilizes Burlingame Creek, Ralston Creek, and Terrace Creek for drainage purposes. The project site does not include any surface waters; the nearest body of surface water to the subject property is the San Francisco Bay, located approximately 1 mile east of the project site. Groundwater was encountered intermittently during the Phase II ESA testing at approximately 32 feet below ground surface (see **Appendix F**). According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the project site is located within Zone B, which is an area subject to inundation by a 0.2 percent annual chance flood event.

Discussion

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Less Than Significant)

Construction of the new building would involve ground disturbing activities such as trenching, grading, demolition, and vegetation removal. The maximum depth of these activities would be approximately 12 feet below ground surface. Groundwater is approximately 32 feet below ground surface and would therefore not be encountered during construction activities.

Construction activities also have the potential to result in runoff that contains sediment and other pollutants that could degrade water quality if not properly controlled. Sources of pollution associated with construction include chemical substances from construction materials and hazardous or toxic materials, such as fuels. As stated above, over 1 acre of soil would be disturbed during construction; therefore, the project would be subject to a State NPDES General Construction Permit which would require submittal of a NOI to the SWRCB.

Erosion control requirements are stipulated in the NPDES Permit issued by the RWQCB. These requirements include the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP that contains BMPs. The purpose of the SWPPP is to identify potential sediment sources and other pollutants and prescribe BMPs to ensure that potential adverse erosion, siltation, and contamination impacts would not occur during construction activities. Implementation of a SWPPP with BMPs would control erosion and protect water quality from potential contaminants in stormwater runoff emanating from the construction site. BMPs may include damp street sweeping, providing appropriate covers, drains, and storage precautions for outdoor material storage areas, temporary cover of disturbed surfaces, etc., which would help to protect water quality.

Once operational, the project site would generate wastewater associated with office and retail land uses. Such land uses do not contribute significant amounts of pollutants that would violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, impacts associated with water quality standards and wastewater discharge requirements would be less than significant.

- 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)? (No Impact)**

The project site is fully paved and developed and does not directly contribute to groundwater recharge. The groundwater basin in the existing project site is not currently utilized for potable water. The project does not include plans to use groundwater resources for future uses. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater as there is no plan to create water wells on the site and the future land users on the site would receive municipal water from the City of Burlingame Water Division of Public Works. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- 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? (Less Than Significant)**
- and**
- 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? (Less Than Significant)**

There are no natural drainage features on or near the project site. The existing drainage pattern entails the use of lined channels, culverts, and underground pipes, all of which eventually drain into the San Francisco Bay. Project construction would involve ground disturbing activities. As noted above under item 9a, project construction would be subject to the NPDES General Construction Permit that imposes strict requirements and control on construction and post-construction activities. Furthermore, the site is currently developed with areas of impervious pavement. Once operational, the amount of surface runoff generated by the project is not expected to increase compared to existing conditions and the new building would not significantly alter the quantity of impervious surfaces or the existing drainage patterns. No new water intensive activities are proposed that would contribute substantial additional runoff that could exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems in the area.

The Street and Sewer Division of the Department of the City Public Works Department maintains Burlingame's stormwater infrastructure. The project site is connected to existing 15-inch stormwater lines and the new building would tie-in to these existing lines to convey stormwater infrastructure. Bio-swales for stormwater treatment and drainage around the project site would be installed as well. Additionally, with compliance to state and local regulations, and the implementation of BMPs, impacts to drainage patterns and surface runoff, resulting in erosion or siltation would be minimized. As such, the project would not contribute substantial amounts of sediment to storm drain systems or alter existing drainage patterns to the extent that would result in flooding on-or off-site. The impact would be less than significant.

- 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? (Less Than Significant)**

and

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Less Than Significant)**

As stated above in **c)**, and **d)**, the proposed project would not alter the existing impervious surface to a point at which the drainage, and surface runoff, in the area would be affected. Standard Permit Conditions would require the project to implement a SWPPP with BMPs during construction activities to protect water quality from potential contaminants in stormwater runoff emanating from the construction site. The project would also be subject to the requirements of Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit.

Use of the project site by motor vehicles would typically result in the deposit of various materials on the roadway and adjacent areas that constitute urban pollution as previously discussed. However, such vehicle use would not be substantially greater than that under existing conditions, and no new significant sources of polluted runoff would be created. With compliance to state and local regulations, and the implementation of BMPs, impacts to surface runoff, resulting in additional sources of polluted runoff, or degradation to water quality, would be less than significant.

- 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? (No Impact)**

and

- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (No Impact)**

The project site is categorized by FEMA as Zone B (500-year floodplain), which is an area subject to inundation by a 0.2 percent annual chance flood event. The project includes the construction of an office building, and as such, no housing would be constructed as a result of the project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- 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? (Less Than Significant)**

The closest dam to the project site is Crystal Springs Dam, located approximately 5 miles southwest of the project site. Due to the dam's distance from the project site, it does not pose extensive safety hazards to the project; the 5-mile distance would significantly reduce the velocity of moving water, and consequently any possible impacts in the unforeseen incidence of dam failure would not expose people or structures within the project vicinity to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death. Additionally, the dam is currently undergoing

renovations to enhance the safety of the structure in the event of a major earthquake⁵. Implementation of the project would not significantly change the existing conditions and expose people or structures to significant risk due to failure of a levee or a dam. Therefore, the impacts due to development in Flood Hazard Areas would be less than significant.

j) Inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Less Than Significant)

Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by earthquakes and can be damaging to lowland coastal areas. The project site is approximately 10 miles away from the Pacific coast, and the risk of damage due to a tsunami is low. According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, downtown Burlingame is located 25 feet above sea level, and any large wave would have dissipated to less than 18 feet by the time it reaches the City. Large earthquakes can also generate oscillating waves in enclosed bodies of water (seiche), such as bays, lakes and reservoirs. The project site is located approximately 1 mile west of the San Francisco Bay, and 3 miles northeast of Crystal Springs Reservoir (at its closest point), and 5 miles northeast of the Crystal Springs Dam. Since the project site is not located in the immediate vicinity of any bays, lakes, or reservoirs, the probability of a seiche from either the San Francisco Bay, or the Crystal Springs Reservoir, or dam, having enough momentum to affect the property site is low. Furthermore, as no steep slopes are located in close proximity to the project site, the possibility of inundation by landslides or mudflows would be remote. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

⁵ County of San Mateo Public Works. 2015. Crystal Springs Dam Bridge Replacement Project. Available: <http://publicworks.smcgov.org/crystal-springs-dam-bridge-replacement-project>. Accessed: October 15, 2015.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING—				
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Setting

The project site is within Burlingame City limits and within the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan area. Burlingame is divided into a series of planning areas. According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the project site and adjacent parcels are within the Myrtle Road Mixed Use (MMU) planning area. The land use designation for MMU is mixed use retail/residential. The land use designation allows for a variety of small commercial, residential, and retail uses. The area is meant to serve as a buffer between the downtown commercial district and the residential neighborhoods to the east. The downtown area contains a variety of land uses, including commercial, office, cultural, civic, and quasi-civic.

Discussion

a) Physically divide an established community? (No Impact)

As previously discussed, the project site is currently developed with commercial land uses within an existing neighborhood. The project would redevelop the site into retail and office uses. Given this, implementation of the project would not result in physical division of an established community into two or more areas. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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? (No Impact)

The project site is governed by the General Plan, Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan, and the Burlingame Municipal Code (BMC). According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the project site and adjacent parcels are designated MMU, which supports retail and office uses. The project would redevelop a vacant commercial property and construct a building with a mix of retail and commercial uses, which is consistent with Chapter 25.34 MMU District Regulations of the BMC. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any land use plans or policies, and no impact would occur.

c) Conflict with any applicable conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (No Impact)

According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the site is not part of or near an existing Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Communities Conservation Plan or any other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11. MINERAL RESOURCES—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"/>

Setting

The California Geological Survey (CGS) is responsible under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMARA) for classifying land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ) based on the known or inferred mineral resource potential of that land. Based upon available data, the project site and area surrounding the project limits have been classified as MRZ-1, which is defined as “areas where adequate geologic information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.” This finding is reflected in the San Mateo County General Plan Mineral Resources Map.

Discussion

- 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? (No Impact)

and

- 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? (No Impact)

The project site is currently developed and not used for mineral recovery activities. Moreover, no known mineral resources are known to exist within the project site and area surrounding the project limits, as indicated by The Mineral Resource Zones and Resource Sectors San Francisco and San Mateo Counties Maps and the San Mateo County General Plan. Implementation of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and residents of the state, nor of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12. NOISE —Would the project result in:				
a) Expose persons to or generate 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 vibration 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 two 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Setting

Illingworth and Rodkin, Inc. prepared a Noise Assessment for the project site in September 2015 that includes details of the analysis and provides background information noise and vibration. The Noise Assessment is included as **Appendix G**.

Noise sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include residential land uses located approximately 50 feet to the north and northeast across Myrtle Road. San Francisco International Airport is about 2 miles northeast of the site. Railroad noise and vehicle traffic noise are the primary sources of noise in the vicinity of the project site; railroad tracks run parallel to East Lane as close as 110 feet from the project site and the Burlingame Caltrain Station is 0.2 miles from the project site, across East Lane. Additionally, a survey of existing commercial uses in the vicinity of the project site revealed that occasional car washes and servicing at the auto dealership to the northwest are temporary stationary noise sources affecting the site.

A noise monitoring survey was done to quantify ambient noise levels at representative noise-sensitive locations adjacent to the project site. The survey was conducted August 4 to 6, 2015, and included two short-term measurements (ST-1 and ST-2), and two long-term measurements (LT-1 and LT-2), taken throughout the project site as summarized in **Table 4**. Each of the two short-term measurements consisted of two consecutive 10-minute measurement intervals.

Table 4 Short-term Measurement Data

Measurement Location	Date/Time	L_{eq}^*	L_{max}^*	$L_{(1)}^*$	$L_{(50)}^*$	$L_{(90)}^*$	L_{dn}^*
ST-1: 25 feet from center of Howard Avenue, 90 feet from railroad tracks	8/4/2015 13:33-13:40	71	89	83	62	53	79
	8/4/2015 13:40- 14:00	60	70	68	56	50	73
ST-2: 35 feet from center of Howard Avenue, 190 feet from railroad tracks	8/4/2015 13:50- 14:00	59	75	69	54	49	71
	8/4/2015 14:00-14:10	62	80	72	56	50	70

Source: Illingworth & Rodkin, 2015

Notes: * L_{eq} - Most commonly, environmental sounds are described in terms of an average level that has the same acoustical energy as the summation of all the time-varying events. This energy-equivalent sound/noise descriptor is called L_{eq} .

L_{max} - The maximum A-weighted noise level during the measurement period.

$L_{(1)}$ - The A-weighted noise levels that are exceeded 1%, of the time during the measurement period.

$L_{(50)}$ - The A-weighted noise levels that are exceeded 50%, of the time during the measurement period.

$L_{(90)}$ - The A-weighted noise levels that are exceeded 90%, of the time during the measurement period.

$L_{(dn)}$ - The day/night average sound level.

The City established noise and land use compatibility standards in the General Plan, to guide development, and protect citizens from the harmful and annoying effects of excessive noise. The suggested maximum outdoor noise levels for commercial land use zones is 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), while indoor noise level planning criterion are established to be 45 dBA CNEL. Additionally, the General Plan established recommended noise emission standards for construction equipment operating within the City (see **Appendix G**), and states that no construction noise can be emitted past the property line so as to create a noise level increase of more than 5 dBA L_{max} above ambient L_{max} noise levels.

Allowable hours of construction within the City are between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm on weekdays, 9:00 am and 6:00 pm on Saturdays, and 10:00 am and 6:00 pm on Sundays and holidays, as established by the Burlingame Municipal Code Section 18.07.110.

Discussion

- a) **Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)**

Project construction is expected to last 12 to 18 months, and would occur between the hours designated by the General Plan. The development of the project is expected to generate noise, and would temporarily increase noise levels at nearby sensitive land uses. Project construction activities that are expected to impact noise levels within the project vicinity include demolition, site preparation, grading/excavation, trenching,

exterior/interior building, and paving- all of which utilize heavy construction equipment. Construction activities would intermittently exceed the threshold at noise sensitive receivers to the north and northeast. The following Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- Noise-generating activities at the construction site or in areas adjacent to the construction site associated with the project in any way would be restricted to the hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday, and 9:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturdays, and 10:00 am to 6:00 pm on Sundays and holidays. All internal combustion engine driven equipment would be equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Stationary noise generating equipment (e.g., concrete crusher) would be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors, and acoustically shielded with temporary noise barriers, material stockpiles, etc. to reduce noise levels at nearby residences.
- "Quiet" air compressors and other stationery noise sources would be utilized where technology exists.
- The contractor would prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. This plan shall be distributed to noise-sensitive uses within 1,200 feet of the project site.
- A "disturbance coordinator" would be designated, and 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, etc.) and would require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented as soon as possible. A telephone number for the disturbance coordinator should be posted at the construction site and included in the notices sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.

The project would increase noise on- and off-site from existing conditions; the project would place future users in an environment that exceeds the standard for the type of land use proposed. The future noise environment at the project site would continue to result primarily from local transportation, and Caltrain railroad noise within the project vicinity. According to the noise analysis performed for the project, the future exterior noise exposure is calculated to be up to 77 dBA CNEL, which exceeds the City's standard of 65 dBA CNEL. These noise levels at the roof top deck would be reduced by more than 15 dBA as a result of shielding by the proposed building, parapet walls surrounding the deck, and because of increased distance from the western border of the project. Therefore, exterior operational noise sources associated with the project would be reduced to less than 62 dBA, and would not cause a substantial increase in ambient noise levels above existing conditions.

With regard to interior noise levels, due to vehicle traffic and the close proximity of the Caltrain, the future users at the site could potentially experience noise levels ranging from 66 dBA CNEL to 73 dBA CNEL $L_{eq}(1-hr)$, which would exceed interior noise and land use compatibility standards. The State of California's wall and roof-ceiling assemblies exposed to adjacent roadways Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of at least 50 or a

composite Outdoor-Indoor Transmission Class (OITC) rating of no less than 40 would provide at least 35 to 40 dBA of noise reduction in interior spaces. Additionally, the inclusion of adequate forced-air mechanical ventilation systems is normally required so windows may be kept closed at the occupant's discretion.

The sound-rated construction materials established in the California Building Cal Green Code in combination with forced-air mechanical ventilation would satisfy the threshold. However, this is a potentially significant impact that would be minimized to less than significant with the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measure NOI-1. The contractor shall ensure that the interior noise levels are maintained at or below 50 dBA $L_{eq}(1-hr)$. Treatments would include, but are not limited to, sound-rated wall and window constructions, acoustical caulking, protected ventilation openings, etc. The specific determination of what noise insulation treatments are necessary shall be conducted on a room-by-room basis during final design of the project. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, shall be submitted to the City, along with the building plans and approved design, prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mitigation Measure NOI-2. The contractor shall install forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all exterior-facing rooms of the office building so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control interior noise and achieve the interior noise standards.

With implementation of the above BMPs, and **Mitigation Measures NOI-1** and **NOI-2**, noise-related impacts that would expose people to interior noise levels above standards established by local and state policies would diminish, and noise levels associated with construction and operation of the project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

b) Expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne vibration levels? (Less Than Significant)

The California Department of Transportation recommends a vibration limit of 0.5 Peak Particle velocity inches per second (in/sec PPV) for buildings that are structurally sound and designed to modern engineering standards; however, groundborne vibration levels exceeding 0.3 in/sec PPV could have the potential to result in significant vibration impacts. The construction of the project may generate perceptible vibration when heavy equipment or impact tools (e.g. jackhammers, hoe rams) are used, and construction activities such as demolition, site preparation work, foundation work, new building framing and finishing, and paving could result in perceptible groundborne vibration. Vibration levels would vary depending on soil conditions, construction methods, and equipment used (see **Table 5**). The nearest residential land uses would be approximately 50 feet northeast the project site across Myrtle Road. At this distance, vibration levels would be expected to be 0.06 in/sec PPV or less. All vibration levels expected at nearby residences would, therefore, be below the 0.3 in/sec PPV significance threshold. As a result, any exposure of people to groundborne vibrations exceeding established standards would be less than significant.

Table 5 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment		PPV at 25 ft (in/sec)	Approximate L_v at 25 ft (VdB)*
Pile Driver (Impact)	Upper Range	1.158	112
	Typical	0.644	104
Pile Driver (Sonic)	Upper Range	0.734	105
	Typical	0.170	93
Clam Shovel Drop		0.202	94
Hydromill (slurry wall)	In Soil	0.008	66
	In Rock	0.017	75
Vibratory Roller		0.210	94
Hoe Ram		0.089	87
Large Bulldozer		0.089	87
Caisson Drilling		0.089	87
Loaded trucks		0.076	86
Jackhammer		0.035	79
Small Bulldozer		0.003	58

Notes: *VdB – Vibration decibels
 L_v – Vibration Level
 In/sec – Inches per second
 Source: Illingworth & Rodkin, 2015

c) Cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Less Than Significant)

A significant impact would occur if the permanent noise level increase due to project-generated noise was 3 dBA L_{dn} or greater for existing levels exceeding 60 dBA L_{dn} or was 5 dBA L_{dn} or greater for existing levels at or below 60 dBA L_{dn} . Ambient noise levels at the nearest receptors are above 60 dBA CNEL at times, and would exceed 60 dBA CNEL with the project; therefore, the 3 dBA CNEL or greater significance threshold would apply.

A review of the Traffic Analysis Report prepared for the project, concludes that the proposed project would not result in a net increase in the overall vehicle trip generation (see **Section 16** and **Appendix H**). As a result the traffic noise generated by the project would be similar to existing conditions. Additionally, an enclosed parking lot would be located on the basement level. However, the entrance and exit would share the same driveway, accessed via East Lane along the western border of the project site. Noise-generating activities (vehicle circulation, engine starts, door slams, etc.) at the parking lot would generally coincide with activities in

the existing use at the site parking lot, and as a result, the proposed parking lot would not substantially increase ambient noise levels at the project site or in the surrounding vicinity. The project would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels above those noise levels currently generated by existing conditions.

d) 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 Incorporated)

As stated above in a) and c), the development of the project is expected to generate noise, and would temporarily increase noise levels at nearby sensitive land uses. Project construction activities that are expected to impact noise levels within the project vicinity include demolition, site preparation, grading/excavation, trenching, exterior/interior building, and paving- all of which utilize heavy construction equipment. Construction activities would intermittently exceed the threshold at noise sensitive receivers to the north and northeast. This is considered a significant impact. With implementation of the BMPs stated above, and **Mitigation Measures NOI-1** and **NOI-2**, temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Less Than Significant)

SFO is the closest airport to the project site, located approximately 2 miles northeast of the site. While occasional aircraft overflights are audible, intermittent aircraft noise is not a significant contributor to the ambient noise environment. The Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND identifies that the project site is within the airport land use plan (ALUP) for SFO; however, the project site does not fall within the 60 dB CNEL or higher contours of noise generated by planes taking off and landing. As a result, both exterior and interior noise levels resulting from aircraft would be compatible with the project; therefore the project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

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 site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing, or working in the project area to excessive noise levels, and there would be no impact.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING—				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Setting

According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the population in the City of Burlingame was 29,342 in January 2010, and the population is expected to grow by 3.9 percent before 2020, and an additional 2.9 percent between 2020 and 2030. Jobs in the City are expected to increase by 6,340 between 2010 and 2030. Overall, the community is becoming increasingly built-out due to the lack of undeveloped acreage within the City boundary.

Discussion

- 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)? (Less Than Significant)**

The project is mixed use retail/commercial, with a combined maximum occupancy of approximately 359 persons. While the project would provide employment opportunities, it would be unlikely that the development would be large enough to attract growth on a regional level from the amount of jobs it would provide. The project would conform to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan, Zoning Code regulations. The project would be an infill-type development. As a result, the project would not indirectly induce growth through intensification and development of surrounding land uses because the surrounding areas are already developed. Additionally, the project would not involve the extension of an existing road or infrastructure that would provide access to other portions of the City and county. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (No Impact)**

and

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (No Impact)**

As previously discussed, a gas station and auto repair shop currently occupy the site. Given this, project implementation would not cause displacement of existing housing or residents that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impact would occur.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14. PUBLIC SERVICES— 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The Central County Fire Department (CCFD) provides fire protection services within Burlingame, Millbrae, and Hillsborough. CCFD has 87 full-time employees including 82 uniform personnel. CCFD's equipment includes six fire engines, one fire truck, and one search & rescue truck. There are six fire stations within the CCFD's jurisdiction; the closest fire station is located 0.65 miles northwest of the project site at 799 California Drive. The current response time for the CCFD is approximately 4 minutes for 95 percent of emergency calls, which is above the 6 minute 59 second County standard response time.⁶

The Burlingame Police Department (BPD) provides emergency services to the City of Burlingame. BPD has one police station and it is located at 1111 Trousdale Drive. According to a conversation with Lieutenant Kiely, BPD employs 56 employees that include 37 sworn officers. The General Plan does not designate a standard ratio of police officers to residents, or a standard emergency response time; however, Lieutenant Kiely indicated that the current emergency response time is acceptable at approximately 7.5 minutes.⁷

⁶ Christine Reed, Fire Inspector; Central County Fire Department; Personal communication; September 30, 2015.

⁷ Jay Kiely, Lieutenant; Burlingame Police Department; Personal communication; September 24, 2015.

Burlingame contains five neighborhood schools that serve grades Kindergarten through grade 5 (K-5), one middle school for grades 6 through 8, and one high school.

Burlingame also operates 18 recreational facilities, a 34.5-acre Mills Canyon Wildlife Refuge and a 2-acre Shorebird sanctuary. As stated in **Section 15**, the recreational facilities in Burlingame are managed by the Department of Parks and Recreation. The project site is located approximately 0.1 miles from the nearest recreational facility, Washington Park.

Discussion

- 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? (No Impact)**

The project would construct a mixed-used commercial and retail building on the project site that is already developed. No residential land uses are proposed and thus would not result in a direct increase in population. The CCFD has determined that there is adequate equipment, staff, and facilities to provide services to the project site, and no additional staff, facilities, or equipment would be needed as a result of project implementation⁸. As a result, there would be no impact to fire protection services.

- ii) Police protection? (No Impact)**

The project would construct a mixed-used commercial and retail building on the project site that is already developed. No residential land uses are proposed and thus would not result in a direct increase in population. BPD has determined that there is adequate equipment, staff, and facilities to provide police services to the project site, and no additional staff, facilities, or equipment would be needed as a result of project implementation. As a result, there would be no impact to police services.

- iii) Schools? (No Impact)**

The project would construct a mixed-used commercial and retail building on the project site that is already developed. No residential land uses are proposed and thus would not result in a direct increase in population. Since the project would not result in a population increase, or a corresponding increase in school-aged children, the project would have no direct impact on school facilities. Development could indirectly increase population through its close proximity to an existing transit center and job creation associated with project construction and operation; however, this population influx would be minimal and is not likely to create the need for a new school facility. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the project.

⁸ Christine Reed, Fire Inspector; Central County Fire Department; Personal communication; September 30, 2015.

iv) Parks? (No Impact)**and****v) Other public facilities? (No Impact)**

The closest public park to the project site is Washington Park, which lies approximately 0.1 miles northwest of the project site. As discussed above, the project does not propose residential land uses and would not increase the population in Burlingame. Thus, there is no anticipated significant increase in the use of public parks, recreational, or other public facilities associated with project buildout, and no substantial adverse physical impacts associated with project implementation that would require provision of new or physically altered park facilities. Implementation of the project would not alter access to parks or public facilities during construction or operation. Therefore, there would be no impact.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15. RECREATION:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Setting

Burlingame has approximately 18 recreation sites that consist of: 4 playgrounds, 9 parks, and 2 recreational centers. The 18.9-acre Washington Park is located less than 0.1 miles north of the project site. The 1.1-acre Pershing Park is located approximately 0.6 miles west of the project site.

Discussion

- 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? (No Impact)**
- and
- 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? (Less Than Significant)**

As described, Washington Park and Pershing Park are located within 0.25 mile of the project site. These neighborhood parks provide recreational opportunities for the nearby community. The proposed project would construct a mixed-use commercial and retail structure on an already developed project site. As a result, no residential development is proposed and thus would not directly increase the population. Therefore, the project would not require development of new park facilities. Additionally, the proposed roof deck of the project would provide outdoor seating and open space areas for building tenants. Implementation of the project would not alter access to this park during construction or operation. Therefore, there would be no impact.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16. TRANSPORTATION and TRAFFIC—				
Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

A Trip Generation and Parking Demand Analysis was prepared by Nelson/Nygaard in March 2015 for the proposed project and is included in **Appendix H**. The memo describes the existing and future conditions for transportation with and without the proposed commercial development. Additionally, information on the regional and local roadway networks, pedestrian and transit conditions, and an analysis of the effects on transportation facilities associated with the project are included. Additionally, a peer review of the Trip Generation and Parking Analysis was prepared by Abrams Associates in October 2015 to corroborate the deductions made by Nelson/Nygaard.

The project site is located just west of US 101 and east of El Camino Real; both are major traffic corridors providing access to Burlingame. Transit facilities serving the project site include public transit and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Two major public mass transit operators, Samtrans and Caltrain, provide service adjacent to the project area. The project site is approximately 0.2 miles from the Caltrain station, and 0.125 miles from the Samtrans bus station (route 292). Additionally, all of the roads within a 0.25 mile radius of the project site contain sidewalks for pedestrians and 25 percent of the roads include complete bike lanes for bicyclists.

Discussion

- a) **Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (Less Than Significant)**

The project site is fully developed with commercial land uses and the lot is paved and generates approximately 674 daily trips. As outlined in the project description, the project proposes the construction of a new three-story building with a basement that would include a mix of retail and office land uses. New occupants of the building would be within walking distance of the downtown area with easy access to retail and restaurants. Additionally, the project site is located 0.2 miles from the Burlingame Caltrain Station and 0.125 miles from Samtrans public transit. Based on the Trip Generation Analysis, implementation of the project would result in a total trip reduction of up to 16.2 percent.

The standard ITE trip generation rate would be 306 daily trips for proposed office/retail developments of the size and scope of the project; however, the project would generate fewer trips due to the close proximity of public transit and downtown amenities. The Trip generation analysis prepared for the project shows that the number of trips generated by the project would be 256 daily trips, including 27 new AM peak trips and 23 new PM peak trips. As shown in **Table 6**, the net trips, with pass-by trips included, the project would have a similar amount of daily trips when compared to existing conditions⁹. Given the project's close proximity to public transit facilities, and the availability of commercial resources to the project site, there is no expected increase in traffic in relation to the existing conditions. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

Table 6 Existing and Proposed Trips

	Daily Trips Generated	Number of AM Peak Trips	Number of PM Peak Trips
Existing Site	674	49	55
Proposed Project	256	22	32
¹ Net trips with pass-by included	Similar to existing conditions	29	33

Source: Nelson Nygaard, 2015; ¹Abrams Associates, 2015

- b) **Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (No Impact)**

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County 2013 Congestion Management Program (C/CAG 2013, CMP) requires new development projects that generate 100 or more net new peak hour trips to the CMP roadway to implement Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures that would reduce potential impacts. The CMP excludes construction traffic from conformance with CMP traffic Level of Service (LOS) standards.

⁹ A pass-by trip is made by traffic already using the adjacent roadway and enter the site as an intermediate stop on the way from another destination. The trip may not necessarily be "generated" by the land use under study, and thus, not a new trip added to the transportation system.

As described in question a), the project site is fully developed with commercial land uses and the lot is paved and generates approximately 674 trips per day. The project would include the construction of a new three-story building with a basement that would include a mix of retail and commercial land uses. Daily vehicle ingress/egress would generate 256 daily trips and thus would be lower than current vehicle ingress/egress given the close proximity of the proposed project to downtown amenities, and public transit. When taking into account the pass-by traffic from adjacent roadways, the project would generate approximately 29 AM peak trips and 32 PM peak trips, which is the same amount of peak hour traffic as the existing gas station. While construction activities would require additional trips for hauling material and equipment to and from the project site, such efforts would be temporary in nature and limited to associated construction activities. The new facility is not expected to generate 100 or more peak hour trips to the US 101 or SR 82 (CMP roadways) given that the new facility would generate fewer trips than existing conditions. As such, the project would not significantly conflict with the applicable congestion management program, and there would be no impact with project implementation.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (No Impact)

SFO is approximately 2 miles north of the project site. According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the project site is within the *1996 San Mateo Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP)*¹⁰. The proposed development entails the construction of a three-story building, and no aircraft use would be required for operation or construction of any of the project buildout. As such, the project would not lead to an increase in air traffic, and no impact would occur. Therefore, the project would result in no impact.

d) 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)

The project would have two unsignalized entry/exit points; one on East lane, the other on Howard Avenue. Based on the traffic memorandum prepared for the project, there are no anticipated increases in safety or operational hazards associated with project implementation. Motorists exiting the site would have sufficient site distance at the two proposed driveways. The project site design has been required to conform to design standards and is not expected to create impacts to pedestrians, bicyclists, or traffic operations. Therefore, impacts associated with potential increases in hazards due to project design features would be less than significant.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Less Than Significant)

The project would not change the existing roadway systems, and would be easily accessible to emergency vehicles. All lane widths within the project would meet the minimum width that can accommodate emergency vehicles and the final emergency vehicle access plan would be subject to final approval from the Fire Department. Additionally, emergency vehicles have the right of way during an emergency when their sirens are turned on, and other vehicles are required to pull over to the side of the road. No internal site circulation

¹⁰ Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, 2010. Pg. 131

or access issues have been identified that would cause a traffic safety problem or any unusual traffic congestion or delay. Therefore, the development of the project is expected to have a less than significant impact regarding emergency vehicle access.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Less Than Significant)

The proposed three-story building has the potential to attract employees who would commute from nearby areas, and would utilize the public transport in the project area. As stated above, the project site is approximately 0.2 miles from the Caltrain station, and 0.125 miles from the Samtrans bus station, and would promote continued use of these public transit facilities. The amount of daily trips generated by the project would be less than existing conditions, but similar to existing conditions when accounting for pass-by traffic. Therefore, the project would not result in degradation of the level of service on any roadway segments currently being utilized by bus transit in the area and, as such, no significant impacts to transit are expected. As a result, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 stormwater 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The Burlingame Public Works Department administers the City's water system. According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the City receives its water supply from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) which obtains 85 percent of its water supply from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and 15 percent from local watersheds. The City also uses well water and recycled water for supplying non-potable water used for irrigation. According to the *City of Burlingame 2010 Urban Water Management Plan*, the City's average water demand is 4.32 million gallons per day (mgd), or 82 percent of the City's 5.23 mgd allotted supply.

Generally, 43 percent of water consumption is from single-family residential uses, 18 percent by multi-family residential uses, 14 percent by industrial uses, 10 percent from commercial uses, 6 percent from irrigation uses, and 2 percent from institutional uses.¹¹

The City's Public Works Department services the Burlingame's wastewater system. Wastewater flows are carried to the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) at 1103 Airport Boulevard, which serves the entire City of Burlingame as well as approximately one-third of the Town of Hillsborough. According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, average daily flow through the WWTP is 3.2 mgd, or 58 percent of the facility's 5.5 mgd capacity.

Burlingame's stormwater system conveys runoff from upstream residential tributary areas through the Downtown area and east towards the San Francisco Bay. The Street and Sewer Division of the Burlingame Department of Public Works maintains the stormwater infrastructure within the City. The aging downtown system is exceeding design capacity, which makes the downtown area prone to flooding during large storm events.¹² The existing site is completely paved, and drains to a catch basin in the northern portion of the site and curbside gutters that empty to a 15 inch stormwater drain line along Myrtle Road.

Allied Waste Industries (AWI) provides solid waste collection, transportation, and disposal services to the City of Burlingame. AWI hauls waste to the San Carlos Transfer Station, located at 25 Shoreway Road in San Carlos, then to Ox Mountain Sanitary Landfill, located at 12310 San Mateo Rd, Half Moon Bay. This facility has a maximum throughput of 3,598 tons per day and had a remaining capacity of 26,898,089 cubic yards (as of January May 31, 2011)¹³. When the 2001 permit was issued, Ox Mountain Landfill's scheduled closure date was 2023.¹⁴

Discussion

a) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (No Impact)

The project site is fully developed with commercial land uses and the lot is paved. Wastewater generated on the project site would continue to originate from commercial sources and no industrial wastewater would be generated by the project. As a result, no specific changes to the wastewater treatment plan would be required to treat these flows. Therefore, no impacts related to the RWQCB wastewater treatment requirements would be expected.

¹¹ Erler & Kalinowski, Inc., 2011. City of Burlingame Urban Water Management Plan.

¹² Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, May 2010.

¹³ CalRecycle Facility, 2015

¹⁴ CalRecycle Documents, 2015

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)

The project site is fully developed with commercial land uses and the lot is paved. As outlined in the project description, the project would construct a new three-story building with a basement that would include a mix of retail and commercial land uses. The building footprint would cover approximately 73 percent of the lot (11,160 sf of the 15,352 sf lot). The existing project site is connected to the City's utility infrastructure and includes 10-inch water lines and 6-inch sanitary sewer lines. The new building would tie-in to these existing lines. With regards to water and wastewater, the project would increase water demand and wastewater generation because the square footage of the building would increase from the existing site.

The Department of Public Works has indicated that the 6-inch sanitary sewer line that serves the subject property is at or near capacity. While the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in wastewater generation, it may require that the line be upsized. The applicant will need to do an analysis to determine if the sewer main requires upsizing. This analysis will be reviewed by the City and if required, the applicant will be required to pay for their pro-rata share of the upsizing or a designated run of the line, the details of which would be determined by the Department of Public Works prior to building permit approval. The existing 10-inch water line is sufficient to provide for the increased need in water usage for the proposed uses; however new construction is required to comply with California Fire Code requirements for fire flow, based on the size of the building and type of construction, and hydrant spacing. Upon building permit submittal Central County Fire Department will require that the project comply with State fire code for emergency water supply (hydrants) with regard to the increase of square footage at the project site and necessary flow rate (gallons per minutes). However, as noted in the setting discussion above, the City's water and wastewater infrastructure serving the project site would continue to have capacity to handle the project and would not require construction of additional facilities. The impact would be less than significant.

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

The project site is fully developed with commercial land uses and the lot is paved. The building footprint would cover approximately 73 percent of the lot (11,160 sf of the 15,352 sf lot). The proposed project would tie into an existing 15 inch storm drain system. Overall, the project would implement 820 sf of landscaping, including bioswales for stormwater retention and treatment. Pervious pavers would be used in exterior areas to allow for additional stormwater infiltration and detention. These efforts would assist to convey additional stormwater runoff and no expansion of stormwater facilities would be required. The impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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)

The project site is currently developed for commercial uses, and has an estimated existing water demand of 77 gallons per day (gpd). From 2005-2010, Burlingame consumed an average of 4.32 million gallons per day (mgd)¹⁵. According to the project applicant, the project is estimated to require an additional 2,710 gpd, a >.1 percent increase in the average daily demand. According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND and the Urban Water Management Plan, the City is allocated 5.23 mgd (5,230,000 gpd), and proposed development efforts outlined for the downtown area are not expected to exceed its total water supply through 2030. Furthermore, the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND accounted for this project and concluded that it would result in a negligible impact to water supplies. The impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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)

The WWTP located at 1103 Airport Boulevard treats wastewater in Burlingame and one-third of the Town of Hillsborough. This facility's average yearly flow is 3.2 mgd (3,200,000 gpd), which has a total plant capacity of 5.5 mgd (5,500,000 gpd). According to the project applicant, the project is estimated to generate about 2,655 gpd, a <.1 percent increase in current average daily flow. Furthermore, the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND accounted for this project and concluded that it would result in a negligible impact to wastewater treatment capacity. The impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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)

The Ox Mountain Landfill had a remaining capacity of 27 million tons in 2011. There is currently a 15-year agreement for this facility, which will expire in 2018. According to AWI, which owns and operates the Ox Mountain Landfill, the landfill has a remaining life period that extends beyond the existing 15-year agreement at current disposal rates. The existing project site is developed with commercial land uses. The proposed project would likely increase the overall solid waste generation because the building would increase in size. However, such an increase would be negligible and the Ox Mountain landfill would continue to have plenty of capacity for such a negligible increase. Impacts from solid waste disposal would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

¹⁵ Erler & Kalinowski, Inc., 2011. City of Burlingame Urban Water Management Plan.

g) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (No Impact)

The project consists of proposed commercial land uses. These commercial land uses would not result in the generation of unique types of solid waste that would conflict with existing regulations applicable to waste disposal. The project would be required to comply with Burlingame's solid waste disposal requirements, including recycling programs established under Assembly Bill (AB) 939. As a result, the project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste and there would be no impact.

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Significant or Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE-				
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, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable? ("Cumulative 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

- 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, 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)**

The project site does not provide suitable habitat for any regionally occurring special-status plant or wildlife species for the following reasons: (1) the site is in a densely developed urban area and is isolated from areas of natural habitat; and (2) the site is paved and is being actively used as a gas station and auto repair maintenance shop. Therefore, impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species from development and operation of the project are not expected to occur. Mitigation measures are provided for pre-construction surveys for nesting/breeding birds to further protect such bird communities. Mitigation measures that would adequately protect a known historical resource and any currently unknown cultural resources that may be uncovered during project construction are also included herein. With this mitigation, the project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment; affect habitat, fish, and wildlife species; or cultural resources.

- b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable? (“Cumulative 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)**

The existing project site is currently developed for commercial uses. The project includes demolishing the existing structure and constructing a three-story building with a basement and the proposed uses would be a mix of retail and commercial uses.

The project would have potential impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biology, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. Incorporation of mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. The project site is already developed for commercial uses. Although the proposed project would construct a commercial building that would increase the square footage from existing conditions, such an increase would not be substantial enough to make a cumulatively considerable contribution.

Furthermore, the project site is governed by the City’s General Plan, Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan, and the Burlingame Municipal Code (BMC). According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the project site and adjacent parcels are designated MMU, which supports retail and office uses. The project would redevelop a vacant commercial property and construct a building with a mix of retail and commercial uses, which is consistent with Chapter 25.34 MMU District Regulations of the BMC.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Less than Significant)**

The implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein would reduce all potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project would thus not result in impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

References

- Abrams Associates. 2015. *Peer Review of Nelson/Nygaard Vehicle Trip Generation and Parking Demand Analysis*.
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2011. *Truck and Bus Regulation*. Last Revised: September 21, 2015. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm>. Accessed: September 22, 2015.
- California Department of Conservation. (n.d.) *Guidelines for Classification and Designation of Mineral Lands*. Available: <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/smgb/guidelines/documents/classdesig.pdf>. Accessed: August, 2015.
- California Department of Conservation. 2006. Important Farmland in California. Available: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/overview/Documents/fmmp2006_08_11.pdf. Accessed: September 24, 2015.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2015. California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB). Records search for San Mateo County.
- California Geological Survey. 1983. Mineral Resource Zones and Resource Sectors, Special Report 146, Plate 2.3, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.
- CalRecycle. 2015. *Facility/Site Summary Details: Corinda Los Trancos Landfill (OX Mtn) (41-AA-0002)*. Available: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Detail>. Accessed: October 8, 2015.
- CalRecycle. 2015. *Documents: Corinda Los Trancos Landfill (OX Mtn) (41-AA-0002)*. Available: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Document>. Accessed: October 8, 2015.
- Christine Reed, Fire Inspector; Central County Fire Department; Personal communication; September 30, 2015.
- City of Burlingame. April 2000. *City of Burlingame General Plan*.
- City of Burlingame. (n.d.). Burlingame Parks and Playgrounds. Available: <http://www.burlingame.org/index.aspx?page=419&recordid=201>.
- City of Burlingame. October 2010 (Amended September 2011). *Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan*.
- Cornerstone Earth Group. March 2015. *Geotechnical Investigation 215 California Drive Office Building*.
- County of San Mateo Public Works. 2015. *Crystal Springs Dam Bridge Replacement Project*. Available: <http://publicworks.smcgov.org/crystal-springs-dam-bridge-replacement-project>. Accessed: October 15, 2015.
- Department of Toxic Substances Control (ENVIROSTOR). 2015. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. Available: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public>. Accessed: September 23, 2015.
- Erler & Kalinowski, Inc., 2011. *City of Burlingame Urban Water Management Plan*.

Illingworth and Rodkin. September 2015. *988 Howard Avenue Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment*.

Jay Kiely, Lieutenant; Burlingame Police Department; Personal communication; September 24, 2015.

Nelson/Nygaard. 2015. *Vehicle Trip Generation and parking Demand Analysis*.

Northwest Information Center. 2015. California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search.

PBS&J. 2010. *Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration*. San Francisco, California. Prepared for City of Burlingame, California.

San Mateo County. 2013. *The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County 2013 Congestion Management Program*. Available: <http://ccag.ca.gov/programs/transportation-plans/congestion-management>. Accessed: September 7, 2015.

State Water Resources Control Board . 2015. GeoTracker, 215 California Drive, Burlingame, CA. Available: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=215+California+drive+burlingame+CA>. Accessed: September 23, 2015.



Legend

-  Project Site
-  Existing Site Access

Figure

Project Site



1 | 3D Perspective: Corner of East Lane & Howard Avenue



2 | 3D Perspective: Corner of Howard Avenue & Myrtle Road