



**City of Brisbane**  
 50 Park Place  
 Brisbane, CA 94005-1310  
 415-508-2100  
 415-467-4989 Fax

ATTACHMENT H

FILED ENDORSED  
 IN THE OFFICE OF THE  
 COUNTY CLERK RECORDER OF  
 SAN MATEO COUNTY CALIF

DEC 19 2014

By MARK CHURCH County Clerk  
VERONICA MADRID  
 DEPUTY CLERK

## Notice of Intent to Adopt Negative Declaration

**To:** San Mateo County Clerk, 555 County Center, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063

**Document Type:** Proposed Negative Declaration

**Date:** December 18, 2014

**Project Title:** 2015-2022 Housing Element (General Plan Amendment GPA-1-14)

**Project Location - Specific:** Citywide

**Project Location - City:** Brisbane **Project Location - County:** San Mateo Co.

**Description of Project:** Update of Housing Element for 2015-2022 planning period per Government Code Sections 65580-65583.2 & 65589.5-65589.8.

**Lead Agency:** City of Brisbane Community Development Department

**Lead Agency Contact Person:** Tim Tune, Special Assistant, 415-508-2120

**Address where document may be obtained:**

City of Brisbane Community Development Department  
 50 Park Place  
 Brisbane, CA 94005

[www.brisbaneca.org/planning/2015-2022-housing-element](http://www.brisbaneca.org/planning/2015-2022-housing-element)

**Public Review Period:** *Begins* December 19, 2014 *Ends* January 19, 2015

**Public Meetings:**

Planning Commission and City Council public hearing dates and times have yet to be set. Agendas are posted in advance at [www.brisbaneca.org/city-government](http://www.brisbaneca.org/city-government) under "All Meetings." Public hearings are held in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA

Anyone interested in this matter is invited to comment on the document by written response or by personal appearance at the hearing.

Signature:

Name:  
 Title:

John Swiecki  
 Community Development Director

*Providing Quality Services*

# *City of Brisbane*

## *Environmental Initial Study*

**Project title:** 2015-2022 Housing Element (General Plan Amendment GPA-1-14)

**Contact person/Lead agency:** John Swiecki, Director, Brisbane Community Development Department, 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA 94005, 415-508-2120, FAX 415-467-5547

**Project location:** City of Brisbane, San Mateo County, California; APN 005-190-100, 005-202-150, -160 & -200, 005-212-100 & -130, 007-350-010, -020 & -030, 007-553-01 & -020, among others

**Project applicant:** City of Brisbane

**General Plan designation:** Trade Commercial and Subregional Commercial/Retail/Office, among others

**Zoning:** TC-1 Trade Commercial District and SCRO-1 Southwest Bayshore Commercial District, among others

**Project description:** The proposed 2015-2022 Housing Element is an update of the 2007-2014 Housing Element (see attached comparison). Of the 81 proposed programs, only two would change existing development regulations so as to increase the current potential dwelling unit count.

Program H.B.1.a would require rezoning to add at least 210 residential units to meet the 2007-2014 Regional Housing Needs Allocation shortfall (2015-2022 Housing Element Appendix C). Program H.B.1.b would require rezoning to provide at least an additional 83 units to meet the 2015-2022 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (2015-2022 Housing Element Table 35). The Housing Element would meet these requirements by applying affordable housing overlays (AHO) to 25 Park Place and 41-43 Park Place (totaling approximately 2.37 acres) to allow a minimum of 48 units (20 units per acre) and maximum of 70 units (30 units per acre) as part of a new Park Place Mixed Use AHO (the commercial component under mixed-use zoning has been estimated at between approximately 14,000 to 24,000 sq. ft.) and to 91-99, 105-115 and 145 Park Lane (totaling approximately 6.87 acres) to allow a minimum of 180 units (26 units per acre) and a maximum of 205 units (30 units per acre) as a new Park Lane Residential AHO. These two affordable housing overlays would provide a total of from 228 to 275 new dwelling units (see attached table). Both areas are currently zoned for trade commercial uses and are developed with a total of 223,543 sq. ft. of office/warehouse buildings. Note that 125-199 units and 40,000-70,000 sq. ft. of commercial space in a larger mixed use district proposal were included in the Negative Declaration adopted by the City Council on January 18, 2011; although, the implementing rezoning was not subsequently adopted.

Although Program H.B.1.i would create a new R-MHP zoning district within the existing SCRO-1 District, it would apply only to the existing mobilehome park at 3800 Bayshore Boulevard, so as to protect the existing use, and would not result in any additional development potential.

In addition, Program H.B.1.e (e) would explore reducing or eliminating the lot size minimum for secondary dwelling units, which would increase the potential for more secondary dwelling units. The ministerial approval of secondary dwelling units is statutorily exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15268 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Secondary dwelling units are also categorically exempt per Section 15303(a). Also note that although Program H.I.1.c would potentially reduce the parking requirement for smaller secondary dwelling units, this would not change the number of such units that could be theoretically produced in the R-1 and R-BA Districts, based upon building site areas in conformance with existing standards.

Per State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15151 and 15064(d)(3), the analysis of the environmental impact of the Housing Ordinance is limited to what is “reasonably feasible” and “reasonably foreseeable.” Given how speculative it would be to do otherwise (see State CEQA Guidelines Section 15145), this analysis assumes that the various programs addressing the availability, affordability and quality of units permitted under current zoning will not in and of themselves have an environmental impact.

**Surrounding land uses and setting:** The properties subject to the proposed affordable housing overlays under the Housing Element are located in the southeastern portion of the Crocker Park subarea of the city. The subarea (currently zoned under the TC-1 District) occupies the Guadalupe Valley west of Bayshore Boulevard. It is developed with office/warehouse buildings. Adjoining the southeastern boundary of the subarea are the Brisbane Village Shopping Center, the Community Park, residential uses in the NCRO-2 and R-2 Districts along western San Francisco Avenue, the Community Garden and Lipman Intermediate School.

**Other public agencies whose approval is required:** The Housing Element is subject to review by the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

**Other environmental reviews referenced herein:** Environmental Impact Report for the City of Brisbane General Plan Update (certified by the City Council on June 21, 1994); One Quarry Road Residential Project Draft Environmental Impact Report Volume 1 (certified by the City Council on February 27, 2006); Sierra Point Biotech Project Environmental Impact Report (certified by the City Council on March 3, 2008); Negative Declaration for Ordinance No. 537, Zoning Text Amendment RZ-3-08, Regarding Inclusionary Housing Requirements and Density Bonus Provisions (approved by the City Council on February 17, 2009); Opus Office Center Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (approved by the City Council on May 4, 2009); 2009 Northeast Ridge Unit II EIR Addendum (certified by the City Council on February 1, 2010); 2007-2014 Housing Element Initial Study/Negative Declaration (adopted by the City Council on January 18, 2011); 2013 Brisbane Baylands Draft Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)

**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 type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics               | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning        | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and 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: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)**

On the basis of this initial evaluation which reflects the independent judgment of the Community Development Department:

- 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 mitigation measures have been added to the project (see attached). 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 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.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 John Swiecki, Director, Community Development Department, City of Brisbane

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:</b>				
<p><b>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts upon scenic vistas resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Public views of San Francisco Bay, the Brisbane Lagoon and San Bruno Mountain State and County Park from City parklands or from extended lengths of City arterial or collector streets (including Valley Drive, Visitacion Avenue and San Bruno Avenue) would be unlikely to be affected by new development in the Crocker Park subarea that did not exceed the height of the surrounding tree canopy. Proposed Housing Element Program H.D.1.c would require adoption of appropriate zoning regulations [consistent with Government Code Section 65583.2(i)] to address preservation of significant public views of San Francisco Bay, the Brisbane Lagoon and San Bruno Mountain State and County (cf. Brisbane Municipal Code Section 17.42.040.E), consistent with General Plan Policy 19.</p>	□	□	■	□
<p><b>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> No specific scenic resources have been designated per General Plan Program 19a [although the Open Space Plan considered scenic values in its analysis, it did not include them among the most significant criteria in evaluating open space resources (page vi)]. The nearest State Scenic Highway is Interstate 280, which is on the opposite side of San Bruno Mountain from Brisbane.</p>	□	□	□	■
<p><b>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts upon visual character/quality resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Proposed Housing Element Program H.D.1.c would require adoption of appropriate zoning regulations [consistent with Government Code Section 65583.2(i)] to address the visual character of development (cf. BMC Sections 17.42.040.A, B, C &amp; H), consistent with General Plan Policies 283 &amp; 284.</p>	□	□	■	□
<p><b>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or</b></p>	□	□	■	□

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><b>nighttime views in the area?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts upon visual character/quality resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Proposed Housing Element Program H.D.1.c would require adoption of appropriate zoning regulations [consistent with Government Code Section 65583.2(i)] to address excessive off-site glare from lighting and reflective building materials, as well as night sky protection (cf. BMC Sections 17.42.040.J), consistent with General Plan Program 22e. The 2013 California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11, Section 5.106.8 requires light pollution reduction for the nonresidential component of mixed-use projects.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: Would the project:</b></p>				
<p><b>a) Convert farmland to non-agricultural use or otherwise impact agricultural operations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There is no prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, unique farmland or farmland of local importance within Brisbane, according to the California Department of Conservation (2008).</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There is no forest land within the City of Brisbane identified in the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection’s inventory, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>III. AIR QUALITY: Would the project:</b></p>				
<p><b>a) Conflict with the Bay Area Clean Air Plan?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> The primary goals of the 2010 Bay Area Air Clean Plan (CAP) are to attain air quality standards, to reduce population exposure and protect public health in the Bay Area, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect the climate. To support these goals, the CAP includes a number of control measures, including TCM D-3, “Promote land use patterns, policies and infrastructure investments that support mixed-use, transit-oriented development that reduce motor vehicle dependence and facilitate walking, bicycling and transit use” (page 4-9), and LUM 3, “Develop revised CEQA guidelines and thresholds of significance” (page 4-10). As part of the CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (page 9-17) updated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District in 2012, the following Housing Element mitigation measures or policies are proposed: “Ensure a portion of future residential development is affordable to low and very low income households. Target local funds, including redevelopment and Community Development or Energy Efficiency Block Grant resources, to assist affordable housing developers in incorporating energy efficient designs and features. Adopt minimum residential densities in areas designated for transit-oriented, mixed use development to ensure higher density in these areas. Consult with the Housing</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Authority, transit providers, and developers to facilitate construction of low-income housing developments that employ transit-oriented and pedestrian-oriented design principles. Offer density-bonus incentives for projects that provide for infill, mixed use, and higher density residential development.”</p> <p>The proposed Housing Element contains a number of policies and programs consistent with these measures supporting the CAP’s primary goals. Programs H.B.1.a &amp; H.B.1.b would create a new mixed-use AHO and a new higher-density residential AHO with minimum densities within approximately ¼ mile of the Bayshore Boulevard transit corridor, per Policy H.E.1. Policies H.B.5 &amp; H.B.9 and Programs H.B.3.g &amp; H.B.9.k would encourage housing affordable to lower income households. Energy efficiency would be promoted per Programs H.F.1.a, H.F.2.a , H.F.2.c (with a reference to Program H.B.9.k) &amp; H.F.4.a. Transit oriented development would be promoted per Program H.E.1.d. Density bonus incentives would be expanded per Program H.B.5.a. Thus, all air quality plan control measures that can be feasibly be incorporated have been included in the Housing Element, so as not to disrupt or hinder implementation of the CAP (2012 BAAQMD Guidelines, page 9-2).</p> <p>Also see III.c and VII.a, below.</p>				
<p><b>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</b></p> <p>•<i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> The Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s 2009 Revised Draft Options and Justification Report: California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance (pages 6 &amp; 70), recommended that the potential impact of criteria air pollutants and precursors not be considered significant at the plan level, if the plan is consistent with the current regional plans and policies affecting air quality and if the increase in forecasted rate of vehicle-miles travelled or vehicle trips is less than the forecasted rate of population increase.</p> <p>As noted above (III.a), the proposed Housing Element supports the CAP’s primary goals through its policies and programs, incorporating all feasible air quality plan control measures, so as not to disrupt or hinder implementation of the CAP (2012 BAAQMD Guidelines, page 9-2).</p> <p>According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ Trip Generation Manual (7<sup>th</sup> Edition), single-family detached units would generate 9.57 average daily trips (ADT) per unit and multifamily apartment units would have an ADT rate of 6.72 trips per unit. General office would generate 11.01 average daily trips per 1,000 sq. ft. A shopping center would generate 42.49 ADT per 1,000 sq. ft. General light industrial uses would generate 6.97 ADT per 1,000 sq. ft. Research and development centers would have an 8.11 ADT rate per 1,000 sq. ft. Hotels generate 8.17 ADT per room.</p> <p>According to the Housing Element’s Table 21, there are approximately 1,117 detached single-family units and 832 multifamily and mobilehome units in Brisbane. According to the draft General Plan Update, there are 644,251 sq. ft. of general office and 387 hotel rooms in the Sierra Point subarea. Central Brisbane has 105,657 sq. ft. of commercial, including the Brisbane Village Shopping Center. The 4,610,567 sq. ft. total floor area in the Northeast Bayshore, Southwest Bayshore, Southeast Bayshore, Baylands, Beatty and Crocker Park subareas is assumed to be general light industrial. The</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

255,891 sq. ft. in the Northwest Bayshore subarea is assumed to the research and development.

Land Use	Average Daily Trips (Vehicle Trips)	
SFR:	1,117 x 9.57 =	10,690
MFR:	832 x 6.72 =	5,591
Office:	644.251 x 11.01 =	7,093
Shopping:	105.657K x 42.49 =	4,489
Lt. Industrial:	4,610.567K x 6.97 =	32,136
R&D:	255.891K sq. ft. x 8.11 =	2,075
Hotels:	387 x 8.17 =	3,162
TOTAL:	65,236	

Under the proposed residential and mixed use affordable housing overlays, 168,151 sq. ft. of light industrial use in the existing TC-1 District would be replaced with up to 275 multi-family dwelling units and approximately 24,000 sq. ft. of commercial use.

Land Use	Average Daily Trips (Vehicle Trips)	
MFR:	275 x 6.72 =	1,848
Shopping:	24 x 42.49 =	1,020
Lt. Industrial:	- [168.151 x 6.97 =	- 1,172 ]
TOTAL:	1,696	

This would increase vehicle trips by 2.6% (1,696/65,236). According to the California Department of Finance, Brisbane's estimated population was 4,431 with an average of 2.41 persons per household as of January 1, 2014. Accordingly, 275 additional units would increase the population by 15% (663/4,431). Thus, the projected rate of increase in vehicle trips due to the proposed overlays is less than the projected population increase rate.

Also see III.a, above, and III.c & d, below.

**c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?**                       

• *Explanation/Information Source:* The San Francisco Bay Area air basin is a nonattainment area for state and national ozone standards and particulate matter ambient air quality standards (Brisbane Baylands DEIR, page 4.B-6, Table 4.2-B). Applying the Urban Land Use Emission Model (URBEMIS) default assumptions to the thresholds based on substantial evidence identified in BAAQMD's 2009 Draft Options and Justification Report for California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance (page 32), a low-rise apartment/condominium complex of 451 dwelling units (at a density of 16 units per acre), a mid-rise apartment/condominium complex of 494 dwelling



ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>units (at a density of 38 units per acre) or a 99,000 sq. ft. strip mall would result in less-than-significant cumulative operational air pollutant and precursor impacts [cf. Table 3-1, BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, 2010 (since superseded by the 2012 Guidelines)]. The maximum 275 multi-family dwelling units (at a density of 30 units per acre) and 24,000 sq. ft. of commercial use possible within the proposed affordable housing overlays would not exceed these thresholds and thus would not be expected to generate cumulatively significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Also see III.a &amp; III.b, above, and III.d, below.</p>				
<p><b>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• <b>Explanation/Information Source:</b> The 2012 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (pages 9-4 &amp; 9-5) note that the California Air Resources Board’s 2005 Air Quality and Land Use Handbook includes advisory recommendations for locating sensitive receptors near uses associated with toxic air contaminants (TAC) and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). To reduce such exposure to a less than significant impact at the plan level, special overlay zones should be identified around existing and planned sources of TACs and PM<sub>2.5</sub> such as truck distribution centers, quarries, manufacturing facilities and large retail centers. Special overlay zones of at least 500 feet (or BAAQMD-approved modeled distance) on each side of all freeways and high-volume roadways should also be identified. The plan must also identify goals, policies, and objectives to minimize potential impacts from TAC and PM hazards.</p> <p>The ARB Handbook (page 4, Table 1-1) recommends that land use agencies avoid siting new sensitive land uses (including residential) within 1,000 feet of a distribution center that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week. The ARB Handbook (page 11) notes that “A distribution center can be comprised of multiple centers of warehouses within an area. The size can range from several to hundreds of acres, involving a number of different transfer operations and long waiting periods.” The Handbook (page 12) notes that, “Because ARB regulations will restrict truck idling at distribution centers, the largest continuing onsite diesel PM emission source is the operation of TRUs. Truck travel in and out of distribution centers also contributes to localized exposures, but specific travel patterns and truck volumes would be needed to identify the exact locations of the highest concentrations.”</p> <p>According to the 2008 traffic studies by Kimley-Horn and Associates for a proposal at 325 Valley Drive, freight forwarders are projected to generate 7.65 average daily trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of floor area, 41% of which would be medium-to-large size vehicles (trucks). Note that each truck would generate 2 trips. Thus, 63,766 sq. ft. of freight forwarder floor area would be projected to accommodate 100 trucks, per the ADT rate developed by Kimley-Horn. In comparison, warehousing uses generate 4.96 average daily trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of floor area, according to the ITE. The 2003 City of Fontana Truck Trip Generation Study found that 20% of these were truck trips (excluding passenger vehicles). Thus, it would take 201,612 sq. ft. of warehousing to accommodate 100 trucks. There are no freight forwarders occupying more than 63,766 sq. ft. of floor area within 1,000 ft. of the proposed affordable housing overlays. There are no warehouses more than 201,612 sq. ft. within</p>				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>1,000 ft. of the proposed affordable housing overlays. The total floor area occupied by freight forwarder and warehouse uses within 1,000 ft. of the affordable housing overlays (excluding those within the overlays themselves) is just over 1,000,000 sq. ft. The proposed overlays within the current TC-1 District would eventually eliminate 168,151 sq. ft. of existing floor area.</p> <p>The Guadalupe Valley Quarry is more than 1,000 ft. from the proposed overlays, and there are no significant manufacturing facilities or large retail centers within 1,000 ft. of the new overlays.</p> <p>The proposed overlays are located at least 500 ft. from the southbound lanes of the 101 Freeway. BAAQMD's Highway Screening Analysis Tool estimates that annual average emissions are less than the 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> PM<sub>2.5</sub> threshold for projects 10 ft. west of Freeway 101 within Brisbane, less than the 10 in a million lifetime cancer risk threshold 200 ft. west of the freeway, less than the chronic non-cancer Hazard Index of 1.0 within 10 ft. west of the freeway. As for Bayshore Boulevard, its level of traffic is approximately 23,000 average daily trips (ADT) according to the latest counts, which is less than the 40,000 ADT cited in BAAQMD's Surface Streets Screening Tables for San Mateo County (May 2011) in regards to annual average emissions less than the 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> PM<sub>2.5</sub> threshold and the 10 in a million lifetime cancer risk threshold for projects within 10 ft. of north-south roadways.</p> <p>To minimize potential TAC and PM<sub>2.5</sub> hazard impacts at the plan level, the 2012 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (page 9-17) recommended a number of Housing Element mitigation measures or policies that are addressed in Section III.a, above. In addition, per the 2005 ARB Handbook, the proposed Housing Element includes Program H.D.2.a, through which special overlay zones and similar regulations would be considered to regulate non-residential uses generating substantial pollutants within the vicinity of the proposed overlays.</p> <p>The BAAQMD's May 2012 Draft Guidelines/Plan Approach for Reducing Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) and Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) (pages 20-26) suggested, among others, the following exposure reduction measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Set physical buffers around receptors, i.e., parking lots, vegetation, sound walls</li> <li>○ Install and maintain air filtration systems such as passive electrostatic filtering systems with low air velocities in new development near sources</li> <li>○ Locate HVAC intakes away from emission sources</li> </ul> <p>BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (page 5-16) further recommended "tiered plantings of trees such as redwood, deodar cedar, live oak and oleander to reduce TAC and PM exposure" and more detailed specifications for air filtration systems. These measures could be incorporated as appropriate into the zoning regulations for the new affordable housing overlays per proposed Housing Element Program H.D.1.c.</p> <p>Also see III.a, III.b and III.c, above.</p>				
<p>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> Table 3-3 (page 3-4) of the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (since eliminated in the superseding 2012 Guidelines) identified distances between odor sources and receptors beyond which no significant odor impact would result. For asphalt batch plants, the screening distance was 2 miles; for transfer stations, green waste and recycling operations,</p>				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>and painting/coating operations, the screening distance was 1 mile. BAAQMD advised that these distances were not absolute screening criteria and should be considered along with other odor parameters and complaint history. The 2012 BAAQMD Guidelines (page 9-5) simply state that "Plans should identify the location of existing and planned odor sources in the plan area and policies to reduce potential odor impacts in the plan area."</p> <p>The proposed overlays would be located at least 3/4 mile from the Guadalupe Valley Quarry's asphalt batch plant. Although the overlays would be located less than 2 miles from the plant, prevailing winds appear to sufficiently disperse any odors before they become a nuisance to existing residents located farther upwind (Correspondence from Jack P. Broadbent, Executive Officer/APCO, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, to Community Development Director William Prince, City of Brisbane, dated November 1, 2007). The quarry operates under a surface mining permit approved by the County of San Mateo in 1995 subject to Conditions 55 &amp; 56 to mitigate the air quality impacts of the quarry and its concrete/asphalt recycling operations. The overlays would be at least 1.5 miles from the Recology San Francisco transfer station and approximately 1 mile from the Industrial Way auto repair shops.</p>				
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts upon protected species resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The proposed R-MHP District would be located within the boundaries of the San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), but no endangered species habitat has been identified within the proposed district, which would apply only to the existing mobilehome park at 3800 Bayshore Boulevard, so as to protect the existing use, and would not result in any additional development potential. The proposed affordable housing overlays are located in the southeastern section of the Crocker Park subarea, over 1,000 ft. from known endangered species habitat within Buckeye Canyon and the Brisbane Acres (San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan, Vol. II, Chapter VII).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><b>•Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts upon sensitive natural communities resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. There are no riverine intermittent streams, sensitive canyons or oak woodlands identified in the proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays (General Plan, page 152).</p>				
<p><b>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</b></p> <p><b>• Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts upon wetlands resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Although there are no wetlands or other water-related features identified in the proposed affordable housing overlays (General Plan, pages 142 &amp; 152), the western portion of the property at 145 Park Lane in the proposed Park Lane Residential Affordable Housing Overlay should be inspected by a qualified professional to confirm this prior to submittal of development plans. Any development that might result in the loss of wetlands would be subject to mitigation per General Plan Policies/Programs 81, 130c, 130.1, 134.c &amp; 134.d.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>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?</b></p> <p><b>• Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts upon wildlife movement resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Any development that might result in substantial interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory animal species or established wildlife corridors would be subject to mitigation per the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Removal of any trees which may be inhabited by nesting raptors or other birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act should be prohibited between February 15 and August 31 unless determined by a biological survey that the trees are not inhabited by nesting raptors or other protected birds. Around any nest found, a no-work buffer of 50 ft. for passerine birds and 250 ft. for raptors should be provided. Also see IV.e below.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>e) Conflict with the City of Brisbane Tree Regulations protecting biological resources?</b></p> <p><b>• Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts upon protected trees resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Any development that might result in the loss of protected trees would be subject to mitigation per Brisbane Municipal Code Chapter 12.12 and General Plan Policy 125. Also see IV.d, above.				
<b>f) Conflict with the provisions of the San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>•Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct conflicts with the HCP resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The proposed R-MHP District would be located within the HCP's boundaries, but it would apply only to the existing mobilehome park at 3800 Bayshore Boulevard, so as to protect the existing use, and would not result in any additional development potential (San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan, Vol. II, Chapter VII). The proposed affordable housing overlays are outside the jurisdiction of the HCP (General Plan, page 147).</p>				
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>• Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts upon historical resources resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. While structures more than 50 years old might have to be demolished to accommodate the higher density housing foreseen in the Housing Element, there are no designated historical structures/sites or any historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1.(j) or 21084.1 meeting the criteria listed in PRC Section 5024.1.(c) within the proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays (General Plan page 158; General Plan Background Report on Existing and Planned Parks, Recreation, Historic and Cultural Resources). Any development that might result in such impacts would be subject to mitigation per General Plan Policy 23 and Program 23c, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.</p>				
<b>b.) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>• Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts upon archaeological resources resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays consist of recently filled land, unlikely to contain cultural resources. Any development that might result in such impacts would be subject to mitigation per Public Resources Code Section 21083.2.(b)-(f) &amp; (i), State CEQA Guidelines Sections</p>				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15064.5.(d), (e) & (f) and 15126.4(b), and General Plan Policy 137.				
<p><b>c) Impact a unique paleontological resource or site?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> No unique paleontological resources or sites are known to exist in Brisbane (General Plan, page 156).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts upon human remains resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The proposed affordable housing overlays consist of recently filled land, unlikely to contain human remains (General Plan, page 158). Any development that might result in such impacts would be subject to mitigation per Public Resources Code Section 21083.2.(i), State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5.(d), (e) &amp; (f), and General Plan Policy 137.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</b>				
<p><b>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> Brisbane is located outside of the Alquist-Priolo Seismic Special Studies Zone boundaries (Brisbane General Plan Technical Studies, page II-15).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> The proposed Park Place AHO and a portion of the proposed Park Lane AHO are within an area projected to experience extremely violent shock during a severe seismic event, with the remainder of the proposed Park Lane AHO projected to experience strong to very strong shock (General Plan, page 170; also see ABAG's 1995 "On Shaky Ground" map). 2013 California Building Code Chapter 16 establishes minimum standards for construction with the intent of significantly reducing the likelihood of collapse of structures and limiting destruction to nonstructural damage, such as broken windows, doors, piping, ducts and light fixtures, and damage to building contents (appliances, furniture, etc.). Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 15.01.095-096, 15.01.240.C.2-3, and 15.01.250.B and California Building Code Section 1803.6 require that the recommendations of the soils engineering report and engineering geology report shall be incorporated</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
into the project. BMC Section 15.01.250.B requires that grading shall be overseen by a licensed civil engineer, soils engineer, engineering geologist or testing agency to assure that the recommendations have been properly implemented (General Plan Programs 149a & 149e). Compliance is mandatory, so there will be no significant impacts.				
<p><b>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> The proposed Park Place AHO and a portion of the proposed Park Lane AHO are in an area of moderate to locally high susceptibility to liquefaction, with the remainder of the proposed Park Lane AHO in an area of moderately low susceptibility (General Plan, page 174; also see ABAG's 2001 Liquefaction Hazard Map). General Plan Program 149e requires that a geotechnical study/soils engineering report/engineering geology report be prepared for development projects on sites prone to subsidence in seismic events (also see 2013 California Building Code Chapter 16 and Section 1803.6, and Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 15.01.095-096, 15.01.240.C.2-3, and 15.01.250.B). The report's recommendations for mitigation of potential liquefaction impacts are then required to be incorporated into the project, with inspection/certification of foundation grading by the licensed geotechnical engineer, civil engineer, soils engineer, engineering geologist or test agency to assure that the geotechnical investigation's recommendations have been properly implemented.</p>	□	□	■	□
<p><b>iv) Seismic-related landslides?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> The proposed Park Lane AHO adjoins an area of moderate susceptibility to seismically-induced landsliding (General Plan, page 173). General Plan Program 149e requires that a geotechnical study/soils engineering report/engineering geology report be prepared for development projects on sites prone landsliding in seismic events (also see 2013 California Building Code Chapter 16 and Section 1803.6, and Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 15.01.095-096, 15.01.240.C.2-3, and 15.01.250.B). The report's recommendations for mitigation of potential seismic-related landslide impacts are then required to be incorporated into the project, with inspection/certification of foundation grading by the licensed geotechnical engineer, civil engineer, soils engineer, engineering geologist or test agency to assure that the geotechnical investigation's recommendations have been properly implemented.</p>	□	□	■	□
<p><b>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> The proposed overlays are not located in any area with a high or very high erosion rating according to the USDA Soil Conservation Service (General Plan Technical Studies, pages II-8 &amp; 9).</p>	□	□	□	■
<p><b>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,</b></p>	□	□	■	□

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</b>				
<p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> According to page 171 of the General Plan, the proposed overlays are located in areas least susceptible to landsliding. The proposed Park Place AHO and much of the Park Lane AHO are in an area of moderate to locally high susceptibility to liquefaction (General Plan, page 174; also see ABAG's 2001 Liquefaction Hazard Map and USGS's 2000 &amp; 2006 liquefaction susceptibility maps). Any development that might result in such impacts would be subject to mitigation per a soils engineering report and engineering geology report (General Plan Programs 152a, 152b &amp; 152e; Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 15.01.095-096, 15.01.250.B &amp; 16.16.050.D; and 2013 California Building Code Section 1803.6). Also see VI.a.iii &amp; iv, above.</p>				
<b>d) Be located on expansive soil?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> Portions of the proposed overlays may be located on expansive soils, according to the San Mateo County General Plan "General Soil Types" Map. Expansive soils typically consist of fine-grained clay generally found in historic flood plains but can also be found on hillsides. Any development that might result in such impacts would be subject to mitigation per General Plan Programs 152a &amp; 152c, Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 15.01.095-096, 15.01.250.B &amp; 16.16.050.D Sections and California Building Code Sections 1803.5.3 &amp; 1803.6 (also see General Plan Programs 152b &amp; 152e).</p>				
<b>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> Per Section 15064.4(a)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the city may rely upon a qualitative analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission resulting from a project, using performance based standards. In doing so, the following factors should be considered when assessing the significance of GHG emissions upon the environment per Section 15064.4(b):</p> <p>(1) The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;</p> <p>(2) Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project;</p> <p>(3) The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted by a relevant public agency through a public review process to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions, including the project's incremental contribution of greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>According to the City of Brisbane 2010 Community Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report (updated in 2014), the residential sector generated a total of 5,847 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year and the commercial/industrial sector generated a total of 19,976 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year (Table 1, page 6). With a residential population of 4,282 (Table 3, page 9) and 6,090 jobs ("On the Map," U.S. Census, 2011), this translates to 2.5 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year per service population.</p>				



ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The maximum total net development potential proposed in the new affordable housing overlays is 275 multi-family units which would add 644 persons to the population assuming an average of 2.34 persons per household (2010 U.S. Census), amounting to a 15.10% residential population increase. The Housing Element also proposes to replace 168,151 sq. ft. of office/warehouse floor area with a maximum of approximately 24,000 sq. ft. of commercial floor area, resulting in a 144,151 sq. ft. reduction of commercial/industrial floor area. Assuming an existing total of 5,616,366 sq. ft. of commercial/industrial floor area (see III.b, above), this would amount to a 0.26% decrease. Increasing the GHG generated by the residential sector by 15.10% and decreasing the GHG generated by the commercial/industrial sector by 0.26% would produce a total of 26,654 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year. Applying these same factors to the service population results in 2.4 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year per service population.</p> <p>The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's 2009 Revised Draft Options and Justification Report: California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance (pages 6 &amp; 7), the potential impact of operational-related greenhouse gases at the plan level is not considered significant if the Housing Element would generate less than 4.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub> per service population (residents + employees) per year for mixed use (Brisbane Baylands DEIR, pag 4.F-13). Accordingly, the GHG emissions resulting from the Housing Element project would not exceed this threshold of significance.</p> <p>To mitigate plan-level impacts from greenhouse gas emissions, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's 2012 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (page 9-17) proposed the following Housing Element mitigation measures or policies: "Ensure a portion of future residential development is affordable to low and very low income households. Target local funds, including redevelopment and Community Development or Energy Efficiency Block Grant resources, to assist affordable housing developers in incorporating energy efficient designs and features. Adopt minimum residential densities in areas designated for transit-oriented, mixed use development to ensure higher density in these areas. Consult with the Housing Authority, transit providers, and developers to facilitate construction of low-income housing developments that employ transit-oriented and pedestrian-oriented design principles. Offer density-bonus incentives for projects that provide for infill, mixed use, and higher density residential development."</p> <p>The proposed Housing Element contains a number of policies and programs consistent with these measures. Programs H.B.1.a &amp; H.B.1.b would create a new Park Place Mixed Use Affordable Housing Overlay and a new Park Lane Residential Affordable Housing Overlay with minimum densities within approximately ¼ mile of the Bayshore Boulevard transit corridor, per Policy H.E.1. Policies H.B.5 &amp; H.B.9 and Programs H.B.3.g, H.B.4.b &amp; H.B.9.k would encourage housing affordable to lower income households. Energy efficiency would be promoted per Programs H.F.1.a, H.F.2.a , H.F.2.c &amp; H.F.4.a. Transit oriented development would be promoted per Program H.E.1.d. Density bonus incentives would be expanded per Program H.B.5.a.</p> <p>Additional Housing Element measures to mitigate plan-level impacts from greenhouse gas emissions identified in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's 2009 Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans (page 55) include: "Establish or support programs to assist in the energy-efficient retrofitting of older affordable housing units; and Balance additional upfront costs for</p>				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>energy efficiency and affordable housing economic considerations by providing or supporting programs to finance energy-efficient housing.” These are addressed in proposed Program H.F.2.c, in coordination with proposed Programs H.B.9.e, H.B.9.j &amp; H.B.9.k.</p> <p>Reducing operational-related emissions of greenhouse gases even further, the proposed Housing Element would incorporate a number of additional measures described on pages 9-6 through 9-17 of the 2012 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. These include proposed Policy H.I.1 to reduce constraints upon infill development; Policy H.H.1 to ensure that new development finances the full cost of expanding public infrastructure and services; Program H.H.1.a, requiring payment of transportation impact fees and/or roadway as a condition of approval for new development; and Programs H.B.3.b, H.B.3.c, H.I.1.b &amp; H.I.1.c to reduce parking for private vehicles.</p> <p>The proposed Housing Element also includes a number of programs that would mitigate operational-related emissions of greenhouse gases from mobile, area and stationary sources at the project level, as described on pages 4-12 through 4-18 of the 2012 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. The proposed Park Place AHO would provide a mix of uses, reducing operational mobile source emissions by up to 9%. This AHO would also locate residential uses within ½ mile of local serving retail, reducing emissions an additional 2%. Both of the proposed overlays would provide for housing at densities high enough to be potentially affordable, reducing emissions by as much as 4%. Both overlays are on transit routes for SamTrans buses and the BART/MuniMetro/Caltrain shuttles, reducing emissions by as much as 15%. An additional reduction of up to 9% could be achieved by incorporating requirements for bike and pedestrian facilities into the development regulations for the new overlays through Program H.D.1.c.</p> <p>Further reducing expected GHG emissions (2012 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, page 4-1), the City’s “Green Building Ordinance” (Brisbane Municipal Code Chapter 15.80) requires that residential projects of 20 or more units achieve a “green home” rating on the Multifamily GreenPoint Checklist, per General Plan Policy 143.1 (see proposed Housing Element Policy H.F.1). In addition, State measures implementing AB 32, including energy efficiency updates to Title 24 and improved fuel standards, further reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Given these various factors, it is anticipated that the proposed zoning changes to provide housing at a minimum density sufficient to accommodate affordability as part of a mixed use development at the center of the city near a transit corridor would not result in significant emissions of greenhouse gases. Also see III.a, above, and XVI.e, below.</p>				
<p><b>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> See III.a, &amp; VII.a, above.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:</b></p>				
<p><b>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>materials?</p> <p>• <b>Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts regarding hazardous materials resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. No significant amount of hazardous materials would be associated with residential or mixed-use development addressed in the Housing Element.</p>				
<p>b) <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?</b></p> <p>• <b>Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts regarding accidental hazards resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. No significant amount of hazardous materials would be associated with residential or mixed-use development addressed in the Housing Element.</p> <p>Locating new sensitive receptors such as residential uses near facilities where acutely hazardous materials are stored or used would be considered a significant impact. According to the Air Resources Board the only source of toxics pollutant emissions within 1,000 ft. of the proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays is the propane-fueled emergency generator for the City's sewage lift station at 111 Valley Drive. This is not considered a major source of emissions according to EPA and BAAQMD standards. A mercury waste transport facility (Quicksilver Products) was formerly located at 200 Valley Drive, and the site was brought into compliance with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control in 1998 after the use was discontinued. According to the California Water Resources Control Board, groundwater contamination is currently being remediated at 355 Valley Drive; this would not be expected to impact the proposed Park Lane Residential Affordable Housing Overlay, at least 500 feet away. The proposed overlays are more than 1,000 ft. from Kinder Morgan's Brisbane Terminal (tank farm).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) <b>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</b></p> <p>• <b>Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts regarding exposure of schools to hazardous materials resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Although the proposed overlays would be located within ¼ mile of Lipman Intermediate School, no significant amount of hazardous materials would be associated with the residential or mixed-use development addressed in the Housing Element. Also see III.d, above.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><b>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5?</b></p> <p><i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> No portion of the proposed overlays is listed as a hazardous materials site by the State Department of Toxic Substances Control, State Water Resources Control Board or San Mateo County Environmental Health Division. A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment would be prepared for sites that may be considered contaminated.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</b></p> <p><i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> No portion of the City of Brisbane is located within an airport land use plan area or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</b></p> <p><i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts regarding emergency evacuation resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays are located within the immediate vicinity of primary (Bayshore Boulevard) or feeder (Valley Drive, Old County Road and San Bruno Avenue) emergency evacuation routes, according to the City's Emergency Management Plan (Safety Element—Background Report, page 13). The proposed Housing Element will not conflict with the City's Emergency Management Plan (General Plan Policies 44 &amp; 69 and Program 148b).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</b></p> <p><i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts regarding wildland fires resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas" map for San Mateo County (November 2008) shows the proposed overlays, as well as existing residential districts, to be within the Non-Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Based upon this, new buildings would not be subject to 2013 California Building Code Chapter 7A's requirements for Wildland-Urban Interface Areas. Brisbane Municipal Code Section 15.44.080 requires automatic fire sprinklers in all new buildings.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Substantially degrade water quality and/or violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no water quality impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Federal Clean Water Act, Regional Water Quality Control Board and/or San Mateo County Department of Environmental Health, and/or Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 13.06.130 and 13.06.230, ABAG's "Manual of Standards for Erosion &amp; Sediment Control Measures" and the California Stormwater Quality Association's "Construction Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook" protect water quality (General Plan Programs 134a and 228d). The CRWQCB's amended Order No. 99-59 and 2009 San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit require that all municipalities under the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program specifically analyze whether individual projects will cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Projects that create, add and/or replace 10,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface on the project site are specifically subject to NPDES permit reporting requirements. BMC Section 16.16.060 requires that drainage studies be prepared for subdivision projects. 2013 California Plumbing Code Chapter 11 and 2013 California Green Building Standards Code Section 4.106.2 specify storm drainage requirements for construction projects. Compliance is mandatory, so there will be no significant impacts.</p>				
<b>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies, adversely impact groundwater quality, or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> Groundwater is not used as a source within the City of Brisbane; thus, adoption of the Housing Element will not deplete any groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with any groundwater recharge.</p>				
<b>c) Alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no erosion impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Compliance with the with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program and Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 13.06.170 &amp; 13.06.180 (General Plan Policies 133, 262 &amp; 319 and Programs 134a, 228d &amp; 245d) is mandatory for individual projects,</p>				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
so there will be no significant impacts. Also see VI.b, above.				
<p>d) Alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no drainage impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board's amended Order No. 99-59 requires that all municipalities under the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program specifically analyze whether individual projects will result in significant adverse environmental impact to drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes. Of particular concern would be increased runoff associated with increased impervious surfaces. Projects that create, add and/or replace 10,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface on the project site are specifically subject to NPDES permit reporting requirements. SM STOPPP requires that such projects identify stormwater treatment, source control and/or site design measures to serve as Best Management Practices for stormwater pollution prevention and/or treatment under the Municipal Stormwater NPDES Permit. BMC Section 16.16.060 requires that drainage studies be prepared for subdivision projects. 2013 California Plumbing Code Chapter 11 and 2013 California Green Building Standards Code Section 4.106.2 specify storm drainage requirements for construction projects. Compliance is mandatory, so there will be no significant impacts.</p>	□	□	■	□
<p>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no drainage capacity impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board's amended Order No. 99-59 requires that all municipalities under the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program specifically analyze whether the project will result in significant adverse environmental impact to drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes. Of particular concern would be increased runoff associated with increased impervious surfaces. Projects that create, add and/or replace 10,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface on the project site are specifically subject to NPDES permit reporting requirements. SM STOPPP requires that such projects identify stormwater treatment, source control and/or site design measures to serve as Best Management Practices for stormwater pollution prevention and/or treatment under the Municipal Stormwater NPDES Permit. BMC Section 16.16.060 requires that drainage studies be prepared for subdivision projects. 2013 California Plumbing Code Chapter 11 and 2013 California Green Building Standards Code Section 4.106.2 specify storm drainage requirements for construction projects. The Storm Drainage Master Plan prepared for the City by RBF Consulting (November 2003) identified a number of deficiencies in the existing system that, if exacerbated by a proposed</p>	□	□	■	□

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
specific project, would have to be satisfactorily addressed.				
<p><b>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no water temperature/turbidity impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board’s amended Order No. 99-59 requires that all municipalities under the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program specifically analyze whether individual projects will result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters, in terms of such parameters as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances and trash. It must also be determined whether a project will result in significant alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction. Of particular concern would be pollutant impacts to an already impaired water body [see Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list]. Projects that create, add and/or replace 10,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface on the project site are specifically subject to NPDES permit reporting requirements. Compliance with the water quality requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Federal Clean Water Act, Regional Water Quality Control Board and/or San Mateo County Department of Environmental Health, and/or Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 13.06.130 &amp; 13.06.230 (General Plan Programs 133a, 134a &amp; 228d) is mandatory.</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no water contamination impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review. The San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program’s Pesticide Management Program seeks to minimize the effects of pesticide use on municipal stormwater quality through pest-resistant landscaping techniques and design features. Per City Council Resolution No. 2003-47, the City of Brisbane encourages projects that demonstrate landscape and structural pest control alternatives that use the least toxic methods for pest control.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> A portion of the proposed Park Place AHO is within the 100-year flood zone as identified on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (Community Panel No. 060311 0025 B) for which base flood elevations and flood hazard factors were not determined by FEMA at the time of mapping. The City’s 2003 Storm Drainage Master Plan (page 29-30) assumes the maximum 100 year design water surface in this flood area to be 9.8 ft., given completed storm drainage improvements downstream. Past development projects at 425 Valley Drive and 50 Park Place demonstrated that construction is feasible above calculated base flood elevations. Compliance with Brisbane Municipal Code Section 15.56.081 is mandatory (see proposed Housing Element Program</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
H.H.2.a), so there will be no significant impacts.				
<b>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</b> <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> See IX.g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?</b> <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> See IX.g & IX.j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</b> <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no seiche/tsunami impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they exposed to such impacts. ABAG's 2007 Tsunami Evacuation Planning Map for San Francisco and San Mateo Counties does not show any Tsunami Evacuation Areas in Brisbane. The 100-year high tide is estimated to be 6.9 ft. m.s.l., a 100-year tsunami's wave runup would be estimated at 4.4 ft. m.s.l., and expected sea level rise would be less than 1 ft. (Sierra Point Biotech Project EIR, page 167). The proposed overlays are at a minimum approximate elevation of 11 ft. above mean sea level; thus, inundation during a tsunami is unlikely. <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no sea level rise flooding impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they are exposed to such impacts. The Bay Conservation and Development Commission has estimated a sea level rise of 16 inches in the Bay Area by the middle of this century and 55 inches by the end of the century (2013 Brisbane Baylands Draft Environmental Impact Report, page 4.H-37). Sea level rise would compound the impacts of a 100-year storm surge at high tide, but it is not projected to impact the proposed overlays within this century (ClimateCentral.org). <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no mudflow impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they are exposed to such impacts. The proposed overlays are in an area least susceptible to landsliding and have experienced no debris flows (General Plan, pages 171 & 172).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Physically divide an established community?</b> <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> No physical division of an established community is proposed that would result in adverse impacts on existing and proposed land uses nearby (General Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Program 12a). The proposed Park Place Mixed Use Affordable Housing Overlay would extend the mixed-use development already allowed in the NCRO-2 District on the opposite side of the Community Park. The proposed Park Lane Residential Affordable Housing Overlay would extend the residential development already allowed in the R-1 and R-2 Districts above the adjoining Quarry Road.				
<p><b>b) Conflict with the General Plan or other applicable City land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Proposed Housing Element Programs H.B.1.c &amp; H.E.1.c require revision of the General Plan to maintain consistency with the Housing Element concurrently with the adoption of the proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays and the proposed R-MHP District. Also see proposed Housing Element Programs H.D.1.c &amp; H.H.2.c.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>c) Conflict with any applicable regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Regarding the Congestion Management Program adopted by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, refer to XVI.b, below.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>d) Conflict with the San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> See IV.f, above.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</b>				
<p><b>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be either locally important or of value to residents of the state and region?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> No portion of the proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays is located within a State Designated Mineral Resources Area (General Plan, pages 31, 155-157).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:</b>				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan and/or noise ordinance?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no noise impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Although the proposed Park Lane Residential Affordable Housing Overlay is located outside the traffic noise corridors, the proposed Park Place Mixed Use Affordable Housing Overlay is located within traffic noise corridors (60-75 dB) along Bayshore Boulevard and Valley Drive (General Plan, page 193). 2013 California Building Code Section 1207 and 2013 California Residential Code Appendix K require that attached residential units have walls and floor/ceiling assemblies with a sound transmission class of not less than 50 for airborne noise. Figure 2 in Appendix C of the State of California General Plan Guidelines 2003 requires “a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements” and inclusion of noise insulation features, such as “conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning” for single-family homes, duplexes and mobile homes with Community Noise Exposure Levels of 60-75 dB and for multi-family residential units with CNEL of 65-75 dB (General Plan Policy 184 and Programs 184b &amp; 184d). Thus, individual projects in such traffic noise corridors are required to submit a professionally-prepared acoustical analysis report prior to issuance of the building permit.</p>	☐	☐	■	☐
<p>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no groundborne vibration impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The proposed overlays are located on filled land (General Plan, page 190), development of which might require pile driving, the main source of groundborne vibration within Brisbane. Ground vibration impacts would not be expected to be significant. A pre- and post-construction survey of adjacent buildings could be required to document any resulting damage.</p>	☐	☐	■	☐
<p>c) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no temporary noise impacts directly resulting from adoption of the affordable housing ordinance, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Brisbane Municipal Code Section 8.28.060 establishes a noise level standard for construction activities (which are allowed only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays) of no more than 83 dBA at a distance of 25 feet from the source thereof, or no more than 86 dBA at any point outside of the property plane of the project (General Plan Program 184a). Compliance is mandatory, so there will be no significant impacts.</p>	☐	☐	■	☐

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> No portion of the City of Brisbane is located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The intent of the Housing Element is to accommodate the regionally-determined fair share of housing need; thus, the Housing Element is growth accommodating, not growth inducing.</p> <p>At an average household size of 2.34 person per household for Brisbane per the 2010 U.S. Census, the 228 to 275 units in the proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays would increase the population by approximately 534 to 644 persons (using the Department of Finance's 2014 estimated average household size of 2.41, that would increase to 663).</p> <p>As an indicator of significant population growth, Condition of Approval A.I.j adopted for the Northeast Ridge Project in 1989 limited the issuance of building permits for the project to no more than 115 dwelling units (20% of the total for the project) per year, with any unused allotment being allowed to be carried over to a subsequent year, in which case the combined limit would be 144 units (25% of the total). One hundred fifteen units was equivalent to 8.3% of the total housing stock counted in the 1990 U.S. Census. That percentage applied to the 2010 U.S. Census count would be 161 units per year. The Housing Element (Tables 35 &amp; 36) proposes to provide the potential for 228 to 275 units in the overlays for the 2015-2022 planning period, which would average 29 to 34 units per year.</p> <p>Should a significant number of new units ever be proposed within one year, the City could require fiscal impact studies and development impact fees to cover the costs of the development to the community per proposed Housing Element Programs H.H.1.a &amp; H.H.1.b to mitigate the impacts of substantial population growth.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or persons, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. There are no existing housing units in the proposed overlays to</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>be displaced. Note that the impact of replacing existing units with denser development taking advantage of the City's density bonus provisions elsewhere in the City would be offset by the greater availability and potential affordability of the new housing provided (see proposed Housing Element Program H.B.5.a, in addition to Programs H.B.2.a &amp; H.B.4.a).</p>				
<p><b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following:</b></p>				
<p><b>a) Fire protection?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no impacts upon fire protection directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays are less than the 1.5 mile maximum distance from a fire station (North County Fire Authority Fire Station No. 81) recommended by the Insurance Services Office, Inc. and the National Fire Protection Association. Compliance with the fire access, hydrant, sprinkler and other requirements of the Fire Prevention Code (Brisbane Municipal Code Chapter 15.44) is mandatory (also see General Plan Policies 146, 158, 208 &amp; 210 and Programs 158a &amp; 208a regarding adequate fire protection infrastructure). Also see proposed Housing Element Programs H.H.1.a &amp; H.H.1.b.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>b) Police protection?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no impacts upon police protection directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. If a specific project were to substantially impact average response time or exceed the current Brisbane Police Department standard staffing requirement of 1 officer per 1,000 residents and workers, development impact fees and exactions could be adopted to mitigate the impact per General Plan Policies 160 &amp; 163 and Program 160a and proposed Housing Element Programs H.H.1.a &amp; H.H.1.b.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>c) Schools?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no impacts upon schools directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. According to the State Legislature, payment of school impact fees completely mitigates a project's impacts regarding school facilities. The Jefferson Union High School District and Brisbane Elementary School District collect fees of \$3.36 per square foot (effective September 14, 2014) for residential projects to mitigate school impacts.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>d) Parks?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no impacts upon parks directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Per BMC Sections 16.24.020, 16.24.030 &amp;</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>16.24.060 and California Government Code Section 66477, residential subdivisions and condominium projects with 50 or more lots/units must dedicate land for public recreational facilities, and smaller residential subdivisions and condominium projects are required to pay a parks and recreation in-lieu fee to be used by the City to develop new or rehabilitate existing neighborhood or community park or recreational facilities to serve the development (with certain exemptions).</p>				
<p><b>e) Other public facilities?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Although the proposed overlays would generate a projected population increase of 534 to 644 persons, the increased demand for library services would not be considered significant, given the inter-library loan programs available, connecting the Brisbane Library to other branch libraries in the north county area.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>XV. RECREATION: Does the project:</b></p>				
<p><b>a) Increase the demand for existing parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no impacts upon existing parks and recreational facilities directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Currently, the City has 10.89 acres of existing neighborhood and community park area for a total population of 4,282 (2010 U.S. Census), amounting to 2.54 acres per 1,000 population. Consistent with General Plan Polices 95 &amp; 95 and Program 88c, the City can require the dedication of land for park and recreational purposes to meet the standard of 3 acres per 1,000 persons per California Government Code Section 66477. Per Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 16.24.020 &amp; 16.24.030, an in-lieu fee will be paid for residential subdivisions and condominiums that do not include new park and recreational facilities, and this fee may be used for rehabilitating existing park and recreational facilities per California Government Code Section 66477(a)(3).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. For potential significant environmental effects from the construction/expansion of recreational facilities that might be proposed in a specific project, please see I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII and XIII, above, and XV, XVI and XVII, below.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:</b>				
<p>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no traffic capacity impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts.</p> <p>The adopted minimum levels of service for traffic in Brisbane are Level of Service "D" for all arterials, except LOS "C" for the intersections of Bayshore Boulevard at Old County Road and San Bruno Avenue (General Plan Policy 38.1) and LOS "E" for Bayshore Boulevard at Geneva Avenue and for U.S. 101 within Brisbane (City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Congestion Management Program and General Plan Program 55a). In 2007, prior to the recession, all of the major intersections in Brisbane were operating at or better than the adopted levels, excluding Bayshore Boulevard at San Bruno Avenue. Subsequent traffic counts taken in 2012 for the Brisbane Baylands Draft EIR actually found decreased traffic volumes.</p> <p>Using the maximum number of apartment units (at 30 units per acre) that would be allowed for both the proposed Park Lane and Park Place Affordable Housing Overlays and an estimate of a total of 24,000 sq. ft. of shopping center use in the commercial component of the mixed use in the proposed Park Place Mixed Use Affordable Housing Overlay, the total traffic projected to be generated by the proposed overlays would be 116.6 net p.m. peak hour trips. This includes a deduction for the trips expected to be generated by existing industrial park uses on the properties (see attached tables).</p> <p>Mitigation measures may be required based on future traffic studies to maintain the adopted minimum levels of services, including under cumulative conditions (Sierra Point Biotech Project EIR, pages 88, 92, 100, 102-106). For example, it was found that, under cumulative conditions for the year 2030, the approved Sierra Point Biotech Project would unacceptably reduce the level of service during the PM peak hour from C to D at the intersection of Bayshore Boulevard and Old County Road, as well as degrading significantly further the unacceptable LOS D during the AM peak hour (Sierra Point Biotech Project EIR, pages 102-106). Three potential mitigation measures were identified for this intersection, only two of which would be necessary to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Furthermore, the Sierra Point Biotech Project would significantly contribute to the unacceptable LOS F on 3 segments of US 101 (Sierra Point Biotech Project EIR, pages 107-108;</p>				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>C/CAG's Policy on Traffic Impact Analysis). A Traffic Reduction Plan identifying specific Travel Demand Management measures was required to help mitigate these impacts, which would remain significant and unavoidable. The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations in approving the Sierra Point Biotech Project. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(f)(1) states, "Where a lead agency determines that a cumulative effect has been adequately addressed in the prior EIR, that effect is not treated as significant for purposes of the later...negative declaration..."</p> <p>The cumulative traffic impacts of residential development in the vicinity of the intersection of Bayshore Boulevard and San Bruno Avenue could be significant, for example, if they were to contribute to traffic making the critical left turn movement at the intersection. Fehr &amp; Peers Transportation Consultants found the intersection to be operating at LOS D on the eastbound approach in 2007. The required mitigation for any project contributing a significant percentage of trips to the critical movement would be signalization of the intersection. Proposed projects generating less than significant traffic that would impact this intersection would be required to contribute their fair share toward the cost of mitigation, per proposed Housing Element Program H.H.1.a. Traffic from Park Lane would have 3 alternative routes to travel south on Bayshore Boulevard via Valley Drive, Old County Road or San Bruno Avenue. Although the San Bruno Avenue route might be 0.05 mile shorter than the Old County Road route, it is unlikely that Park Lane traffic would use this route if delays are to be expected at its intersection with Bayshore Boulevard (in addition to the lower speed limit, additional stop signs and steeper topography). A project-specific traffic study would be required to make the final determination.</p> <p>Also see XVI.b, below.</p>				
<p><b>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the City or county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no impacts on levels of service directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts.</p> <p>The C/CAG Congestion Management Program characterizes the cumulative traffic impacts from individual projects generating a net increase of 100 or more peak hour trips as significant. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual (9<sup>th</sup> Edition), apartments generate 0.62 peak hour trips per unit. Thus, it would take an apartment complex containing 161 units on a vacant site to generate a sufficient number of trips to be considered significant. Such projects would be required to incorporate trip reduction measures per the Congestion Management Program to mitigate this impact. None of the individual sites in the new overlays would have that capacity (see Housing Element Appendix F, Table F.1, page 5).</p> <p>The largest maximum number of multi-family units for any site in the proposed overlays is 86 (145</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Park Lane in the Park Lane Residential AHO), which would be expected to generate 53.32 peak hour trips, from which the peak hour trips generated by the existing industrial park use on the site (58,000 sq. ft. x 0.85 peak hour trips per 1,000 sq. ft. = 49.3) would be deducted to derive the net peak hour trips (4.02). The commercial component of the mixed uses in the proposed Park Place Mixed Use AHO would generate a higher rate of peak hour trips. Assuming 12,000 sq. ft. of shopping center uses, in addition to 37 apartment units, at 25 Park Place, a net increase of 58.47 p.m. peak trips would be projected (see attached tables). Also see XVI.a, above, and XVI.e, below.</p>				
<p><b>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no traffic hazard impacts directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Compliance with adopted street design standards (Brisbane Municipal Code Section 12.24.010) and construction traffic regulations (2013 California Building Code Chapter 33 and Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 8.28.060) to avoid substantial traffic hazards is mandatory.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no impacts on emergency access directly resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Compliance with fire apparatus access road standards (2013 California Fire Code Section 503 and Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 12.24.010 &amp; 15.44.100-120) to provide adequate emergency access is mandatory.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>e) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. General Plan Policies 66 &amp; 198, General Plan Programs 55c, 60b, 62b, 100c, 194c, 198a, 198b &amp; 198c, Brisbane Municipal Code Chapters 10.52 &amp; 15.80, and BMC Section 17.42.040.G encourage alternatives to travel by automobile where appropriate. In addition, trip reduction measures that may be required by the C/CAG Congestion Management Program include bicycle parking facilities, employee shower and locker room facilities, preferential carpool/vanpool parking, amenities for pedestrians and participation in the BART/Caltrain shuttle service. These policies, programs and requirements would be addressed in the zoning regulations (Housing Element Program H.D.1.c) for the new overlays. Also see Programs H.G.1.a and H.G.1.b. Also see III.a, VII.a and XV.b, above.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board?</b> <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> & Explanation/Information Source: See XVII.e, below.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>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?</b> <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. No new/expanded wastewater treatment facilities are proposed as part of the Housing Element (General Plan Policies 146 & 215). Any construction of new/expanded water/wastewater treatment facilities might or might not result in significant environmental effects-- see I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII and XV, above, and XVII, below.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</b> <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. No storm water drainage facilities are proposed as part of the Housing Element, but the 2003 City of Brisbane Storm Drainage Master Plan (Enclosure 2, pages 2, 9 & 11) identifies needed pipeline replacements east of 41-43 Park Place, north of 25 Park Place and northeast of 3832 Bayshore Boulevard (General Plan Policies 146 & 221). The construction of new/expanded water/wastewater treatment facilities might or might not result in significant environmental effects--see I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII and XV, above, and XVII, below. Also see IX.a, above.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>d) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources?</b> <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> The City of Brisbane through contracts with the City and County of San Francisco receives its water supply from the San Francisco Public Utilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact				
<p>Commission’s Regional Water System pursuant to the 1984 Water Settlement Agreement, which was extended by the 2009 Water Supply Agreement. This Agreement is subject to SFPUC’s Interim Supply Limitation and system-wide reductions under drought conditions. A portion of the City of Brisbane’s overall water allotments from San Francisco benefits from reduced pricing through earlier agreements dating from 1884 and 1908. The City’s total entitlement (including the Guadalupe Valley Municipal Improvement District) is 0.981 million gallons of water per day (mgd). According to the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency’s 2013 Water Demand Modeling for Brisbane, sufficient supply will be available for a residential population of 5,056 and an employment population of 7,675, using existing average per capita (resident/employee) demand. The model was based upon the ABAG Sustainable Communities Strategy Final Preferred Scenario v20 (May 24, 2013) and ABAG Projections 2013, with which the Regional Housing Needs Allocations for Bay Area jurisdictions were coordinated. Thus, the model’s population projections are consistent with the 2007-1014 and 2015-2022 RHNA’s for Brisbane (Housing Element Table 35).</p>								
	Year	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2045	
	Population	4,394	4,509	4,632	4,761	4,906	5,056	
	Jobs	7,316	7,892	7,788	7,695	7,680	7,674	
<p>To meet these allocations, the Housing Element proposes adoption of Affordable Housing Overlays that would allow replacement of 5 office/warehouse/manufacturing buildings on Park Place and Park Lane (totaling 168,933 sq. ft. of floor area) with a maximum of 275 new multi-family units. This proposal has the potential to reduce projected water demand, which is based upon assumptions derived from past usage, in that the proposed residential uses’ water consumption would be partially offset by replacing the existing commercial uses. For Fiscal Year 2012/13, single-family dwellings on average consumed 51.5 gallons per capita per day [176,027 ccf (hundred cubic feet)/3,418 population], multi-family units on average consumed 41.0 gpcd (38,171 ccf/931 population), and combined commercial/landscape uses consumed 47.4 gpcd (336,635 ccf/7,102 population). Using these rates as a rough gauge, one employee generates water demand equivalent to 1.156 multi-family unit occupants. In addition, the model assumes that the past ratio of single-family dwellings to multi-family units, which was skewed toward the higher water consuming single-family dwellings (Housing Element Table 21), will remain constant. The potential construction of up to 275 multi-family units would shift this ratio closer to 50:50, reducing the average per capita consumption rate. The rate could be further reduced if the units are predominantly studio and one-bedroom units, as might be expected given the maximum density allowed (Housing Element Table 38).</p>								
<p>•Note that proposed Housing Element Program H.F.3.c would require incorporation of the appropriate water savings programs into new multi-family or mixed-use development (also see Program H.D.1.c). Program H.B.3.j would provide that water service priority be given to housing units affordable to lower-income households per State law.</p>								
<p>•Government Code Section 66473.7, Public Resources Code Section 21151.9 and Water Code Sections 10910-10912 require an analysis of the public water system’s urban water management plan to determine if there is sufficient water supply available in a 20-year project for the demand generated</p>								

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>by the following projects:</p> <p>(1) A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units.</p> <p>(2) A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space.</p> <p>(3) A proposed commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space.</p> <p>(4) A proposed hotel or motel, or both, having more than 500 rooms.</p> <p>(5) A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.</p> <p>(6) A mixed-use project that includes one or more of the projects specified in this subdivision.</p> <p>(7) A project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to, or greater than, the amount of water required by a 500 dwelling unit project.</p> <p>The proposed zoning changes would result in the additional net maximum total of from 228 to 275 dwelling units, and the commercial component under the proposed mixed-use zoning is estimated at between approximately 14,000 to 24,000 sq. ft., well below the applicable thresholds.</p>				
<p>e) <b>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to its existing commitments?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The City and County of San Francisco is committed to provide the City of Brisbane with wastewater treatment at the Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant for 6.0 million gallons per day total daily dry weather flow. The treatment plant has a design capacity of 85.4 mgd. It is currently projected that Brisbane's base sanitary dry weather flows through 2020 are 0.45 mgd (Brisbane Baylands DEIR, page 4.O-13). The City's Sewer Master Plan projects that dwelling units in medium density apartment complexes, multiple use residential projects, and planned developments generate 90 gallons per day. The City's Sewer Master Plan projects that flow rates for commercial and industrial uses range from 500 gallons per acre per day for the NCRO, TC and SCRO Districts to 2,380 gpad for the SP-CRO District.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Park Place Mixed Use AHO: <math>(48 \text{ MFDU} \times 90 \text{ gpd}) + (2.37 \text{ NCRO ac} \times 500 \text{ gpd} \times 0.8^*) - (2.37 \text{ TC ac.} \times 500 \text{ gpd}) = 4,083 \text{ net gpd}</math></p> <p>*Existing TC floor area = 29,676 sq. ft., proposed NCRO floor area = 24,000 sq. ft.; therefore, the proposed NCRO water consumption would be <math>24,000/29,676 = 80\%</math> of the existing TC.</p> <p>Park Lane Residential AHO: <math>(205 \text{ MFDU} \times 90 \text{ gpd}) - (6.87 \text{ TC-1 ac.} \times 500 \text{ gpd}) = 15,015 \text{ gpd}</math></p> <p>NET TOTAL: 19,098 gpd</p>				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Wastewater generated by the maximum number of units that would be permitted in the proposed overlays would not exceed the City’s contractual capacity for wastewater treatment by the Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant (Brisbane Baylands DEIR, page 4.O-47). The City of Brisbane’s sewer connection and installation fees for the project will mitigate impact to existing sewer pump capacity. Also see proposed Housing Element Program H.B.3.j.</p> <p>The chemical makeup of wastewater generated by the commercial component of the Park Place Mixed Use AHO would depend upon the types of uses which might be allowed under Programs H.B.1.a &amp; H.D.2.a. The SFPUC requires a waste discharge permit for all commercial and industrial sewer system users, addressing the volume and content of wastewater generated to ensure that the sewage discharge does not impact the ability of the Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant to meet its wastewater treatment objectives and requirements.</p>				
<p><b>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. The South San Francisco Scavenger Company provides collection and disposal services for the City of Brisbane. Solid waste is processed through the Blue Line Transfer Facility for disposal to Corindas Los Trancos Ox Mountain Landfill, which has estimated capacity to 2027. Impacts on landfills are reduced through the Source Reduction and Recycling Element adopted by the City per General Plan Policy 143 and Programs 143a, 143b, 143e &amp; 143f and, more specifically, the Recycling &amp; Diversion of Debris from Construction &amp; Demolition Ordinance (Brisbane Municipal Code Chapter 15.75), in addition to the construction waste reduction, disposal and recycling provisions of the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code.</p>	□	□	■	□
<p><b>g) Create a demand for energy that exceeds regional or local capacity, either on a peak or cumulative basis?</b></p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Co. provides electricity to Brisbane, via transmission lines between the Martin and San Mateo substations, with connections to the Western United States power grid via the Trans Bay Cable (Brisbane Baylands DEIR, page 4P-1). The construction and occupancy of the residential units and commercial space foreseen under the proposed zoning changes would not result in a substantial consumption of energy, given applicable energy efficiency standards; see XVII.h, below.</p>	□	□	■	□
<p><b>h) Comply with adopted resource efficiency standards?</b></p>	□	□	■	□

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>• <b>Explanation/Information Source:</b> There are no direct physical impacts resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent environmental review to determine if they cause such impacts. Such projects shall be subject to compliance with California Code of Regulations, Title 24 energy conservation standards and Green Building Standards (General Plan Programs 140a &amp; H14a). Those projects with 20 or more dwelling units or 10,000 sq. ft. or more of commercial floor area will be subject to compliance with the City of Brisbane’s Green Building Requirements (Brisbane Municipal Code Chapter 15.80).</p>				
<p><b>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b></p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• <b>Explanation/Information Source:</b> See I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XV, XVI and XVII, above.</p>				
<p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• <b>Explanation/Information Source:</b> State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355(b) explains that cumulative impact is “...the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects.” According to Section 15064(i)(3), “...a project’s incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program which provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem (e.g. water quality control plan, air quality plan, integrated waste management plan)...” Thus, a project’s cumulative air quality impacts are not significant, if the project is consistent with the Clean Air Plan (see III.a, above). A project’s cumulative water quality impacts are not significant, if the project is consistent with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Order No. 99-59 and the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (see VIII.a, c, d, e &amp; f, above). A project’s cumulative traffic impacts are not significant, if the project is consistent with the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County’s</p>				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Congestion Management Program (see XV.b, above). A project's other cumulative impacts are not significant, if the project is subject to General Plan policies and programs and implementing provisions of the Brisbane Municipal Code adopted to avoid significant environmental impacts. If a project's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(i)(1), the in-depth cumulative impact analysis required for EIRs per Section 15130 is not applicable [also see Section 15064(i)(2)].                      See I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XV, XVI and XVII, above.</p>				
<p><b>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</b>                      • <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> See I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XV, XVI and XVII, above.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Attachments:**

- Evaluation of Environmental Impacts
- Comparison of Policies and Programs for 2015-2022 Housing Element vs. 2007-2014 Housing Element
- Proposed Project: Number of Units
- Number of Units Generating Peak Trips Equal to Existing Uses
- Number of Units Generating 100 Peak Trips Above Trips Generated by Existing Uses
- Housing Element Figures HE.1 & HE.2
- Housing Element Appendix F

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) *A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the Explanation/Information Sources cited. A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.*
- 2) *All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.*
- 3) *The explanation of each issue should identify the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance*
- 4) *An answer of "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.*
- 5) *An answer of "Less than Significant Impact" is appropriate only in the event there is no substantial evidence that an effect is significant.*
- 6) *An answer of "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." A description of the mitigation measures is required, along with an explanation of how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from a previous analysis may be cross-referenced).*
- 7) *Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. When an earlier analysis is used, the initial study shall:*
  - a) ***Reference earlier analyses used.*** *Identify earlier analyses. Unless noted otherwise, all previous environmental documents are available at the City of Brisbane Community Development Department.*
  - b) ***Note impacts adequately addressed.*** *Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.*
  - c) ***Identify mitigation measures.*** *For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.*

COMPARISON OF POLICIES AND PROGRAMS  
FROM THE 2015-2022 HOUSING ELEMENT VS. THE 2007-2014 HOUSING ELEMENT

Policy H.A.1 : No change.

Program H.A.1.a: Language refined.

Program H.A.1.b: No change.

Policy H.B.1: No change.

Program H.B.1.a: New program requiring zoning changes to accommodate the 2007-2014 Regional Housing Needs Allocation shortfall.

Program H.B.1.b: Updated previous Program H.B.1.a.

Program H.B.1.c: No change from previous Program H.B.1.d.

Program H.B.1.d: Minor change from the previous Program H.B.1.e to include consideration of reduced or eliminated administrative Secondary Dwelling Permit fee in exchange for rent restrictions.

Program H.B.1.e: New program to encourage development of secondary dwelling units, which would not specifically change the number of such units currently possible. Subprogram (e) would explore the potential of reducing or eliminating the lot size minimum for development of secondary dwelling units.

Program H.B.1.f: Updated to reflect previously adopted zoning ordinance amendment.

Program H.B.1.g: Updated to reflect previously adopted zoning ordinance amendment.

Program H.B.1.h: Updated to reflect proposed zoning overlays for which an outreach program to encourage private redevelopment of existing developed sites is to be developed.

Program H.B.1.i: Added to rezone the mobilehome park in the SCRO-1 District as the R-MHP District to designate it for mobilehome uses only. This program was implied in the 2007-2014 Housing Element's Programs H.B.1.b & H.E.1.c.

Policy H.B.2: No change.

Program H.B.2.a: No change.

Policy H.B.3 Updated to include the developmentally disabled.

Program H.B.3.a: No change.

Program H.B.3.b: No change.

Program H.B.3.c: No change.

Program H.B.3.d: Updated to reflect previously adopted zoning ordinance amendment.

Program H.B.3.e: Updated to reflect previously adopted zoning ordinance amendment.

Program H.B.3.f: No change.

Program H.B.3.g: No change.

Program H.B.3.h: No change.

Program H.B.3.i: Updated to reflect previously adopted zoning ordinance amendment.

Program H.B.3.j: Updated to reflect previously adopted Public Works Department policy.

Policy H.B.4: Expanded to minimize constraints on construction of new multi-family rental housing.

Program H.B.4.a: Updated to reflect previously adopted zoning ordinance amendment.

Program H.B.4.b: No change.

Policy H.B.5: No change.

Program H.B.5.a: Expanded to include development of an outreach program to ensure successful implementation of the program.

Policy H.B.6: No change.

Program H.B.6.a: No change.

Policy H.B.7: No change.

Program H.B.7.a: No change.

Program H.B.7.b: No change.

Program H.B.7.c: Updated to refer to Project Sentinel.



- Policy H.B.8: No change.  
 Program H.B.8.a: No change.
- Policy H.B.9: Updated to reflect changes in redevelopment law.  
 Program H.B.9.a: Updated to reflect changes in redevelopment law.  
 Program H.B.9.b: Language refined.  
 Program H.B.9.c: No change.  
 Program H.B.9.d: No change.  
 Program H.B.9.e: Updated to reflect changes in redevelopment law.  
 Program H.B.9.f: Updated to refer to HEART's first-time homebuyers program.  
 Program H.B.9.g: No change.  
 Program H.B.9.h: No change.  
 Program H.B.9.i: Updated to reflect changes in redevelopment law.  
 Program H.B.9.j: No change.  
 Program H.B.9.k: No change.  
 Program H.B.9.l: No change.  
 Program H.B.9.m: Deleted.
- Policy H.C.1: No change.  
 Program H.C.1.a: Updated to reflect current practice.  
 Program H.C.1.b: Updated to reflect current practice.  
 Program H.C.1.c: Updated to include cross reference to Program H.I.1.e.  
 Program H.C.1.d: No change.
- Policy H.D.1: No change.  
 Program H.D.1.a: No change.  
 Program H.D.1.b: Updated to reflect previously adopted zoning ordinance amendment and proposed zoning changes.  
 Program H.D.1.c Deleted and replaced with previous Program H.D.1.d, revised to replace reference to form-based codes with references to a number of specific Government Code Sections, incorporating a portion of previous Program H.B.1.b. Amended to include appropriate measures to mitigate any potentially significant environmental impacts, as well as requirement for "connectivity" improvements.
- Policy H.D.2: New policy calling for use of zoning to establish suitable residential environments while maintaining the long-term viability of surrounding commercial and industrial uses.  
 Program H.D.2.a: New program to review zoning ordinance regulations for TC-1, NCRO-1 & NCRO-2 Districts to determine if amendments are necessary.
- Policy H.E.1: No change.  
 Program H.E.1.a: No change.  
 Program H.E.1.b: No change.  
 Program H.E.1.c: Revised to coordinate with Program H.B.1.i.  
 Program H.E.1.d: Revised to refer to a height limit allowing at least 3 stories of development
- Policy H.F.1: No change.  
 Program H.F.1.a: No change.
- Policy H.F.2: No change.  
 Program H.F.2.a: No change.  
 Program H.F.2.b: No change.  
 Program H.F.2.c: Expanded to include assistance to affordable housing development, added references to Programs H.B.9.e & H.B.9.k.
- Policy H.F.3: No change.  
 Program H.F.3.a: No change.  
 Program H.F.3.b: No change.  
 Program H.F.3.c: New program to require water conserving measures for new multi-family and/or mixed-use development.

Policy H.F.4: No change.

Program H.F.4.a: No change.

Policy H.G.1: Broadened in scope to require participation in regional smart growth planning efforts, so as to coordinate City efforts with those of regional agencies.

Program H.G.1.a: Completely revised to require cooperation with the MTC and ABAG.

Program H.G.1.b: Completely revised to require cooperation with C/CAG.

Policy H.H.1: No change.

Program H.H.1.a: Expanded to include possible adoption of housing impact fees and commercial linkage fees.

Program H.H.1.b: No change.

Policy H.H.2: No change.

Program H.H.2.a: No change.

Program H.H.2.b: Updated to reflect previously adopted zoning ordinance amendment.

Program H.H.2.c: No change from previous Program H.H.2.e. Previous Programs H.H.2.c & H.H.2.d deleted.

Policy H.I.1: No change.

Program H.I.1.a: No change.

Program H.I.1.b: No change.

Program H.I.1.c: Language refined and expanded to include development of an outreach program.

Program H.I.1.d: Replaced previous Program H.I.1.d with an edited version of previous Program H.B.1.c.

Program H.I.1.e: Revised to reflect Program H.C.1.c.

Program H.I.1.f: No change.

Program H.I.1.g: No change.

Program H.I.1.h: Expanded to include monitoring of development capacity.

Policy H.I.2: No change.

Program H.I.2.a: No change.

Program H.I.2.b: No change.

**PROPOSED OVERLAYS: NUMBER OF UNITS**

<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ACRES</u>	<u>MINIMUM NO. OF UNITS*</u>	<u>MAXIMUM NO. OF UNITS**</u>
25 Park Place	1.25	25	37
41-43 Park Place	1.12	23	33
Park Place AHO TOTAL***	2.37	48	70
91-99 Park Lane	1.85	49	55
105-115 Park Lane	2.13	56	64
145 Park Lane	2.87	75	86
Park Lane AHO TOTAL	6.85	180	205
TOTAL	9.22	228	275

\*at 20 units per acre in the Park Lane Mixed Use Affordable Housing Overlay and 26 units per acre in the Park Lane Residential Affordable Housing Overlay

\*\*at 30 units per acre

\*\*\*plus a commercial component under the mixed-use overlay of approximately 14,000 to 24,000 sq. ft.

**PROPOSED OVERLAYS: TRIP GENERATION**

<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>EXIST. BLDG. SQ. FT.</u>	<u>EXIST. P.M. PEAK TRIPS*</u>	<u>MAX. NO. OF UNITS</u>	<u>RESID. P.M. TRIPS**</u>	<u>NET P.M. TRIPS</u>
25 Park Place***	10,576	8.99	37	22.94+44.52	58.47***
41-43 Park Place***	19,100	16.24	33	20.46+44.52	48.74***
Park Place TOTAL ***	29,676	25.23	70	43.4+89.04	107.21***
91-99 Park Lane	36,975	31.43	55	34.1	2.67
105-115 Park Lane	43,500	36.98	64	39.68	2.7
145 Park Lane	58,000	49.30	86	53.32	4.02
Park Lane TOTAL	138,475	117.71	188	127.1	9.39
TOTAL	168,151	142.94	228	259.54	116.6

**NUMBER OF UNITS GENERATING PEAK TRIPS EQUAL TO EXISTING USES**

<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ACRES</u>	<u>EXIST. BLDG. SQ. FT.</u>	<u>EXIST. P.M. PEAK TRIPS*</u>	<u>EQUIV. RESID. UNITS**</u>	<u>UNITS PER ACRE**</u>
25 Park Place	1.25	10,576	8.99	14	11.2
41-43 Park Place	1.12	19,100	16.24	26	23.2
Park Place TOTAL ****	2.37	29,676	25.23	40	16.9
91-99 Park Lane	1.85	36,975	31.43	50	27.4
105-115 Park Lane	2.13	43,500	36.98	59	28.0
145 Park Lane	2.87	58,000	49.30	79	27.7
Park Lane TOTAL	6.85	138,475	117.71	188	27.4
TOTAL	9.22	168,151	142.94	228	24.7

**NUMBER OF UNITS GENERATING 100 PEAK TRIPS  
ABOVE TRIPS GENERATED BY EXISTING USES**

<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ACRES</u>	<u>EXIST. BLDG. SQ. FT.</u>	<u>100 TRIPS THRESH- OLD*****</u>	<u>EQUIV. RESID. UNITS**</u>	<u>UNITS PER ACRE**</u>
25 Park Place	1.25	10,576	108.99	175	140.0
41-43 Park Place	1.12	19,100	116.24	187	167.0
Park Place TOTAL ****	2.37	29,676	255.23	362	152.7
91-99 Park Lane	1.85	36,975	131.43	211	114.1
105-115 Park Lane	2.13	43,500	136.98	220	103.3
145 Park Lane	2.87	58,000	149.30	240	83.6
Park Lane TOTAL	6.85	138,475	217.71	671	98.0
TOTAL	9.22	223,543	290.02	1,033	112.0

\*0.85 per 1,000 sq. ft. of Industrial Park [cf. 0.32/1,000 sq. ft. of Warehousing, 0.97/1,000 sq. ft. of General Light Industrial (ITE Manual, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition)]

\*\*0.62 per unit in Apartments [cf. 0.58/unit in Low-Rise Apartments, 0.52/unit in Residential Condominiums/Townhouses (ITE Manual 9<sup>th</sup> Edition), 0.35/unit in High Rise Apartments (ITE Manual, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition), 0.62/unit in Mixed-Use Residential/Retail Development (ITE Manual, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition)].

\*\*\*Adjusted to include 3.71 trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of Shopping Center [cf. 3.57/1,000 sq. ft. of Medical-Dental Office Building (ITE Manual, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition)] for 12,000 sq. ft. of commercial mixed use (44.52 trips) per site

\*\*\*\*This does not provide for any commercial floor area as part of a mixed-use development.

\*\*\*\*\*Given credit for existing trips