

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 (c) calls for consideration of amending the Northeast Ridge PD Permit to potentially allow secondary dwelling units under limited circumstances among the 108 single-family residences at Landmark at the Ridge. 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); 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
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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>				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<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>				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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 & H), consistent with General Plan Policies 283 & 284.</p>				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or	<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
nighttime views in the area?				
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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.</p>				
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Convert farmland to non-agricultural use or otherwise impact agricultural operations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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).</p>				
b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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.</p>				
III. AIR QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with the Bay Area Clean Air Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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</p>				

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 & 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 & H.B.9 and Programs H.B.3.g & 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) & 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) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>•Explanation/Information Source: The Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s 2009 Revised Draft Options and Justification Report: California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance (pages 6 & 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 (7th 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>				

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.

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Average Daily Trips (Vehicle Trips)</u>	
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.

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Average Daily Trips (Vehicle Trips)</u>	
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
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 & III.b, above, and III.d, below.				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: The 2012 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (pages 9-4 & 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_{2.5}). 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_{2.5} 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 $0.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ 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 $0.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ 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 $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ 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.b, 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 ($\text{PM}_{2.5}$) (pages 20-26) suggested, among others, the following exposure reduction measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Set physical buffers around receptors, i.e., parking lots, vegetation, sound walls ○ Install and maintain air filtration systems such as passive electrostatic filtering systems with low air velocities in new development near sources ○ Locate HVAC intakes away from emission sources <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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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 & 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>				
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
<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>•Explanation/Information Source: 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>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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 & 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 & 134.d.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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>				
<p>e) Conflict with the City of Brisbane Tree Regulations protecting biological resources?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: There are no direct physical impacts upon protected trees resulting from adoption of the Housing Element, and all ensuing projects will require subsequent</p>				

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.				
f) Conflict with the provisions of the San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan? • Explanation/Information Source: 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).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource? • Explanation/Information Source: 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource? • Explanation/Information Source: 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) & (i), State CEQA Guidelines Sections	<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
15064.5.(d), (e) & (f) and 15126.4(b), and General Plan Policy 137.				
c) Impact a unique paleontological resource or site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> No unique paleontological resources or sites are known to exist in Brisbane (General Plan, page 156).				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• <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) & (f), and General Plan Policy 137.				
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• <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).				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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				

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.				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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>				
iv) Seismic-related landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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>				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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 & 9).</p>				
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,	<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>subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</p> <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 & 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 & 152e; Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 15.01.095-096, 15.01.250.B & 16.16.050.D; and 2013 California Building Code Section 1803.6). Also see VI.a.iii & iv, above.</p>				
<p>d) Be located on expansive soil? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <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 & 152c, Brisbane Municipal Code Sections 15.01.095-096, 15.01.250.B & 16.16.050.D Sections and California Building Code Sections 1803.5.3 & 1803.6 (also see General Plan Programs 152b & 152e).</p>				
<p>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <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 CO₂e/year and the commercial/industrial sector generated a total of 19,976 MT CO₂e/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 CO₂e/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 CO₂e/year. Applying these same factors to the service population results in 2.4 MT CO₂e/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 & 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 CO₂ 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 & 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 & H.B.9 and Programs H.B.3.g, H.B.4.b & 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 & 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 & 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 & 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) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</p> <p>• <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> See III.a, & VII.a, above.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:				
<p>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous</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
materials?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> 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. 				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> 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>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>				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> 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. 				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5?</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>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?</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>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</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 & 69 and Program 148b).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</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
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Substantially degrade water quality and/or violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<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 & 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) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies, adversely impact groundwater quality, or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge?	<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>				
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?	<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 & 13.06.180 (General Plan Policies 133, 262 & 319 and Programs 134a, 228d & 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.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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>				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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.				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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 & 13.06.230 (General Plan Programs 133a, 134a & 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>				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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>				

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.				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? • <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> See IX.g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding? • <i>Explanation/Information Source:</i> See IX.g & IX.j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? • <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"/>
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community? • <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.				
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? <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 & 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 & H.H.2.c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? <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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Conflict with the San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan? <i>• Explanation/Information Source:</i> See IV.f, above.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
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? <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).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:				

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan and/or noise ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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 & 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>				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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>				
c) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>• Explanation/Information Source: 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>				