

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

- 1. Project Title:** Case GP-1-19
- 2. Lead Agency:** City of Brisbane  
50 Park Place  
Brisbane, CA 94005
- 3. Contact Person:** John Swiecki, Community Development Director  
(415) 508-2120  
[jswiecki@ci.brisbane.ca.us](mailto:jswiecki@ci.brisbane.ca.us)
- 4. Project Location:** Baylands Subarea, Bayshore Boulevard
- 5. Project Sponsor:** City of Brisbane
- 6. General Plan Designation:** Baylands Planned Development (Baylands Subarea),  
Principal Arterial (Bayshore Boulevard)
- 7. Zoning:** Commercial Mixed-Use (C-1), Marsh Lagoon Bayfront  
(MLB), Manufacturing (M-1)
- 8. Project Description:** Amend General Plan text and graphics to implement General Plan Amendment GP-1-18 (GP-1-18) by: (1) incorporating GP-1-18, which was approved by the Brisbane City Council in July 2018 and approved by Brisbane voters as Measure JJ in November 2018 into the General Plan; (2) revising roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards in compliance with Brisbane Baylands Program Environmental Impact Report Mitigation Measure 4.I-1; and (3) update factual information and clarify existing General Plan provisions.  
  
These proposed General Plan revisions are summarized in the Project Description, below.
- 9. Previous Environmental Reviews:** Brisbane Baylands Program EIR (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)

## ADDENDUM TO THE BRISBANE BAYLANDS PROGRAM EIR

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Brisbane City Council certified the Final Brisbane Baylands Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR or Final Program EIR) (State Clearinghouse #2006022136) for General Plan Amendment GP-1-18 (GP-1-18), which was approved on July 19, 2018 and subsequently also approved by Brisbane voters as Measure JJ in November 2018. GP-1-18 and Measure JJ permit development of 1,800 to 2,200 dwelling units and up to 6.5 million square feet of non-residential use, along with an additional 500,000 square feet of hotel use (total of 7.0 million square feet of non-residential development) within the Baylands General Plan Subarea.

Resolution 2018-62, which includes the Brisbane City Council's adoption of GP-1-18 directs City staff to "prepare for Council's consideration any other amendments to the General Plan or zoning ordinance as may be needed" to implement GP-1-18. In response, City staff drafted a set of revisions to Chapters II, V, VI, and XII of the Brisbane General Plan (The Planning Area, Land Use, Circulation, and Policies and Programs by Subarea, respectively), implementing GP-1-18 by:

- (1) Making revisions that clarify existing General Plan provisions and updating factual information in the General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1994.
- (2) Incorporating GP-1-18 and Measure JJ into the General Plan and ensuring the General Plan's consistency with GP-1-18;
- (3) Revising roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards within the City in compliance with EIR Mitigation Measure 4.I-1; and

The environmental effects of the proposed General Plan revisions are within the scope of analysis of the Program EIR as evidenced by the following.

- Among the components of the project analyzed in the EIR are "Amendments to the Brisbane General Plan as needed to ensure consistency of the Project Site development with the provisions of the General Plan." (Draft EIR page 3-2)
- The EIR Project Description (Section 3.6) and Mitigation Measure 4.I-1 specifically include modifying the City's roadway level of service (LOS) standards to:
  - Recognize that the City's LOS standards will be exceeded due to future development in other cities even if no development within the Baylands occurs; and
  - Provide level of service standards that accommodate the level of development approved for Baylands.

- Section 3.15 of the Draft EIR states that the EIR evaluates the environmental effects of, among other project development components, “Amendments to the Brisbane General Plan as needed to ensure consistency of the ultimately selected Concept Plan<sup>1</sup> with the provisions of the General Plan.”
- On page 3-79, the Draft EIR lists “Adoption of a General Plan amendment, as needed, to ensure consistency between the Concept Plan and the Brisbane General Plan” among the approvals required from the City of Brisbane.
- EIR Mitigation Measure 4.N-3a requires preparation of a corridor plan for Bayshore Boulevard to “determine the suite of improvements necessary to resolve long-term cumulative traffic issues along the corridor” caused by increases in traffic generated by development within Daly City and San Francisco.

Because proposed revisions to the General Plan were previously described and analyzed in the EIR certified for GP-1-18, no additional environmental documentation in the form of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR is required. This addendum to the Baylands Final Program EIR (State Clearinghouse #2006022136) has been prepared pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15162 and §15164 to aid in the review of General Plan revisions needed to implement GP-1-18 and incorporate it into the Brisbane General Plan.

## 2.0 APPLICABLE CEQA REQUIREMENTS

Revisions to the General Plan needed to implement GP-1-18 require the City Council to take a discretionary action (approval of a General Plan Amendment) and therefore constitutes a “project” that is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Because a Final Program EIR was certified for GP-1-18 and the proposed General Plan Amendment implements GP-1-18, the provisions of CEQA Guidelines §15162 and §15164 provide guidance for the environmental review of the proposed General Plan Amendment. CEQA Guidelines §15162 identifies the following requirements for subsequent environmental review following certification of an EIR:

- (a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> The land use program and policies embodied in GP-1-18 set forth the equivalent of the Concept Plan cited in the EIR.

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
  - (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
  - (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
    - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
    - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
    - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
    - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.
- (b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.

CEQA Guidelines §15164 requires the Lead Agency to “prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.” Should an addendum be determined to be required, the Lead Agency is required to provide a brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to §15162 that is supported by substantial evidence in the addendum, the lead agency’s findings on the project, or elsewhere in the

record<sup>2</sup>. As is demonstrated in this Addendum and the attached findings, none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines §15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred, and preparation of an addendum to the previously certified Brisbane Baylands Program EIR is therefore required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15164.

---

## 2.1 DOCUMENTS REFERENCED

The following documents were used during preparation of this Addendum. These documents are available for review at the City of Brisbane Community Development Department located at 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA 94005 or on the City of Brisbane's website.

- The **City of Brisbane General Plan** identifies the community's vision for its future and establishes the framework to guide decision-making about development, resource management, public safety, public services, and general community well-being. Each chapter of the General Plan identifies and describes goals, policies, and programs that specify direction for decision-making and formulation of public policy. The Brisbane General Plan includes the following chapters:
  - I. Introduction
  - II. The Planning Area
  - III. Community Character
  - IV. Local Economic Development
  - V. Land Use
  - VI. Circulation
  - VII. Open Space
  - VIII. Recreation and Community Services
  - IX. Conservation
  - X. Community Health and Safety
  - XI. 2015-2022 Housing Element
  - XII. Policies and Programs by Subarea

The General Plan can be found on the City's website at:

<https://brisbaneca.org/general-plan>

---

<sup>2</sup> The substantial evidence supporting the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR is summarized in Section 4.0 of this Addendum and provided in detail in Attachment A.

- The **Brisbane Baylands Program Environmental Impact Report**, which was originally prepared to address four Concept Plans for the development of the Baylands, provided the CEQA documentation required to support the City's approval of General Plan Amendment GP-1-18. The EIR also sets forth measures to mitigate the significant environmental effect of proposed development.

The Draft Brisbane Baylands Program EIR can be found on the City's website at:  
<https://www.brisbaneca.org/baylands-deir>

The Final Brisbane Baylands Program EIR can be found on the City's website at:  
<https://www.brisbaneca.org/feir-documents>

The City Council's findings that the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR adequately addressed the impacts of GP-1-18 can be found at:  
<http://brisbaneca.org/sites/default/files/Reso201861CEQAFindingsAttach1.pdf>

### 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project consists of text and graphic, revisions to Chapters II, V, VI, and XII of the Brisbane General Plan (The Planning Area, Land Use, Circulation, and Policies and Programs by Subarea, respectively) needed to implement General Plan Amendment GP-1-18 and Measure JJ, incorporating GP-1-18 and Measure JJ into the General Plan. Also included are General Plan revisions that address General Plan Level of Service (LOS) standards to ensure internal consistency following incorporation of GP-1-18 into the General Plan<sup>3</sup>. Lastly, the proposed project includes General Plan revisions to reflect current conditions or clarify existing provisions.

#### 3.1 REVISIONS THAT CLARIFY GENERAL PLAN PROVISIONS AND UPDATE FACTUAL INFORMATION IN THE GENERAL PLAN

A number of the proposed revisions to the General Plan update factual information or clarify existing provisions of the General Plan and include General Plan text revisions. These proposed revisions are needed to correctly reflect the current name of landowners and describe current land uses and land use trends. Proposed General Plan revisions also reflect changes in State law that occurred subsequent to adoption of the General Plan in 1994, including deleting references to the Brisbane Redevelopment Agency. Historical discussion of the alternatives that were considered when the General Plan was adopted in 1994 are proposed to be deleted from the General Plan, along with historical discussion of the differences in land use designations

<sup>3</sup> The EIR certified for GP-1-18 recognizes that traffic generated by development outside of Brisbane would exceed the City's LOS standards. EIR Mitigation Measure 4.I-1 requires resolution of the potential inconsistency between the Land Use and Circulation elements.

between the previously adopted 1980 General Plan and the 1994 General Plan. In addition, proposed General Plan revisions include renumbering of General Plan policies and programs, as well as non-substantive reformatting to achieve consistency between the various chapters of the General Plan.

Because these revisions update background facts and reflect current state law, they would not modify the type or intensity of development permitted by General Plan policies or programs and would not result in any physical changes to the environment.

### 3.2 GENERAL PLAN REVISIONS THAT INCORPORATE GP-1-18 AND MEASURE JJ INTO THE GENERAL PLAN

City Council Resolution 2018-62, which approved GP-1-18, directed City staff to “prepare for Council’s consideration any other amendments to the General Plan or zoning ordinance as may be needed” to implement General Plan Amendment GP-1-18. Thus, revisions to General Plan Chapter V (Land Use) are proposed to reflect adoption of General Plan Amendment GP-1-2018 and Measure JJ by including the specific text and graphic revisions necessary to incorporate General Plan Amendment GP-1-18 and Measure JJ into the General Plan and ensure the consistency of the General Plan with GP-1-18 and Measure JJ. These include deletion of policies that were superseded by GP-1-18 and Measure JJ, revisions to policies for the Baylands Subarea needed to reflect the requirements of GP-1-18 and Measure JJ, and text and graphic revisions needed to merge the Northeast Bayshore Subarea into the Baylands Subarea per the requirements of GP-1-18 and Measure JJ.

Proposed amendments to the General Plan that incorporate GP-1-18 into the General Plan would not change any of the provisions of GP-1-18, and would result in the same physical changes to the environment as were previously analyzed in the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR as described in the findings of the City Council for adoption of GP-1-18.

### 3.2 REVISIONS TO GENERAL PLAN LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) STANDARDS FOR BAYSHORE BOULEVARD AND FREEWAY OFF-RAMP INTERSECTIONS

Revisions to General Plan Chapter VI (Circulation) are proposed to modify General Plan Policy C.1 (*roadway level of service standards*) and thereby resolve a potential inconsistency between the Land Use and Circulation Elements as required by Brisbane Baylands Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.I-1, which states:

**Mitigation Measure 4.I-1:** Recognizing that General Plan roadway level of service standards will be exceeded due to development in other cities even if no development within the Baylands occurs, General Plan Policy C.1 (*roadway level of service standards*) shall be amended to reflect current traffic conditions; developments approved by the

cities of San Francisco, Daly City, and South San Francisco that exceed long-term traffic projections set forth in the 1994 Brisbane General Plan; and the land use program approved in the Baylands General Plan Amendment.

Proposed revisions to General Plan Policy C.1 (*roadway level of service standards*) would:

- Create a new category of roadways, Regional Routes<sup>4</sup>, designate Bayshore Boulevard as a Regional Arterial Route, and set forth the rationale for distinguishing Bayshore Boulevard from other principal and minor arterial roadways within the City.
- Replace existing LOS standards for intersections along Bayshore Boulevard with:
  - Preparation and implementation of a multi-modal mobility plan for Bayshore Boulevard providing for a combination of roadway, intersection, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facility improvements to address regional through traffic and enhance mobility for Brisbane residents and businesses.
  - A requirement for new development within the City generating more than 50 peak hour trips on Bayshore Boulevard or Geneva Avenue to comply with the applicable multi-modal mobility plan(s) by either providing physical improvements consistent with the plan(s) or making a fair share payment for plan improvements pursuant to a citywide traffic impact fee program to be adopted by the City Councils, rather than undertaking multiple traffic impact analyses for individual development projects to evaluate LOS at intersections along Bayshore Boulevard, Geneva Avenue, and along U.S. Highway 101. As part of the multi-modal mobility plan for Bayshore Boulevard, the City would develop citywide traffic impact fees based on a nexus study.
- Replace existing LOS standards at intersections with freeway offramps along U.S. Highway 101 with a new Policy C.3 addressing queueing of vehicles along freeway off-ramps and at intersections to prevent traffic on a freeway off-ramp from backing up onto the freeway mainline or traffic at an intersection from backing up into another intersection.
- Maintain the current standard of LOS D at all other intersections along principal and minor arterials (i.e., all existing arterial roadways within Brisbane other than those along Bayshore Boulevard, Geneva Avenue, and at freeway interchanges).
- Reorganize Chapter VI (Circulation) and modify or add policies and programs to put greater emphasis on multi-modal mobility for Brisbane residents and businesses, accommodation of bicycles and pedestrians in addition to vehicular movement, and provisions for comfortable and safe travel from within the community to shopping, employment, recreation, transit, and U.S. Highway 101.

---

<sup>4</sup> "Regional Routes," as used in proposed revisions to the General Plan, refers to U.S. Highway 101 (Freeway) and Bayshore Boulevard (Regional Arterial).



- Establish criteria defining when traffic impact analyses would be required to confirm compliance of proposed development projects with the City's LOS standard.

#### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS SUPPORTING ADDENDUM

##### 4.1 FINDINGS REGARDING REVISIONS THAT CLARIFY CURRENT GENERAL PLAN PROVISIONS AND UPDATE FACTUAL INFORMATION IN THE GENERAL PLAN

Proposed revisions to the General Plan that update factual information or clarify existing provisions of the General Plan do not involve substantive changes to any General Plan policies or programs, are factual in nature, reflect current State law, and do not modify the type or intensity of development permitted by General Plan policies or programs. As a result, proposed revisions to the General Plan that update factual information or clarify existing provisions of the General Plan **would not** involve any:

- Substantial changes in the project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared that would require major revisions of the certified Program EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- Substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared would be undertaken that would require major revisions of the certified Program EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Program EIR was certified that shows:
  - The project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the Program EIR;
  - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the Program EIR;
  - Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the Program EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant

effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

#### 4.2 FINDINGS REGARDING GENERAL PLAN REVISIONS THAT INCORPORATE GP-1-18 AND MEASURE JJ INTO THE GENERAL PLAN

The proposed General Plan amendment also sets forth additional General Plan text revisions needed to incorporate General Plan Amendment GP-1-18 and Measure JJ into the General Plan and ensure the consistency of the General Plan with GP-1-18 and Measure JJ. These include deletion of policies that were superseded by GP-1-18 and Measure JJ, as well as revisions to policies for the Baylands Subarea needed to reflect the requirements of GP-1-18 and Measure JJ.

Incorporating General Plan Amendment GP-1-2018 and Measure JJ into the General Plan would have the same physical environmental effects as those previously analyzed in the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR. As a result, incorporating GP-1-18 and Measure JJ into the General Plan **would not** involve any:

- Substantial changes in the project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared that would require major revisions of the certified Program EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- Substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared would be undertaken that would require major revisions of the certified Program EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Program EIR was certified that shows:
  - The project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the Program EIR;
  - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the Program EIR;
  - Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the Program EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects

on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

---

#### **4.2 FINDINGS REGARDING REVISIONS TO GENERAL PLAN LOS STANDARDS**

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards are necessary to address a potential inconsistency between the General Plan's Land Use Element and Circulation Element and allow implementation of the adopted GP-1-18 in the manner it was approved. Traffic analyses undertaken for the Program EIR indicated that future development outside Brisbane would cause the City's LOS standards to be exceeded at six intersections along Bayshore Boulevard and adjacent to the 101 freeway even in the absence of any development within the Baylands. Thus, traffic generated by development projects consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element, including development associated with GP-1-18 and Measure JJ would be inconsistent with General Plan Policy C.1 (LOS standards). Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.I-1 therefore required General Plan LOS standards to be revised to permit the level of development approved in GP-1-18 in a manner consistent with the General Plan.

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not, however, result in the widening of Bayshore Boulevard. In evaluating the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures addressing impacts at the intersection of Geneva Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard (Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.N-3a), the Program EIR addressed the potential for widening Bayshore Boulevard to provide three travel lanes in each direction, providing sidewalk improvements and turn pockets at each intersection, and re-coordinating signal timing settings to provide more green time to the westbound and eastbound split phases and reduce green time for the northbound and southbound approaches in order to increase capacity on Bayshore Boulevard.

The Program EIR determined that widening Bayshore Boulevard to accommodate three travel lanes in each direction would require major right-of-way acquisition and result in secondary impacts pertaining to transit operations, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and safety due to longer crossing distances. The Program EIR also noted that widening of Bayshore Boulevard would result in major construction costs as well as potential displacement of existing businesses. In addition, widening of Bayshore Boulevard north of Geneva Avenue into San Francisco would be prevented by right-of-way constraints associated with the T-Third light rail line that terminates at the station just south of Sunnydale Avenue.

While the Program EIR acknowledged that secondary impacts might be partially mitigated<sup>5</sup>, it concluded that widening of Bayshore Boulevard through Brisbane was infeasible and that a

---

<sup>5</sup> The Program EIR identified provision of pedestrian enhancements such as separated sidewalks along the length of Bayshore Boulevard; incorporating design elements that would reduce speeds to less than 30 miles per hour, such

corridor plan for the Bayshore Boulevard corridor was needed. Mitigation Measure 4.N-3a was therefore included in the Program EIR requiring preparation of a corridor plan for Bayshore Boulevard to “determine the suite of improvements necessary to resolve long-term cumulative traffic issues along the corridor.” Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards include requirements for preparation of a corridor plan for Bayshore Boulevard as a replacement for the General Plan’s existing LOS standards. Such a corridor plan could potentially result in modifications to lane striping, existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and/or roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The corridor plan could also include one or more of the design elements identified in the Program EIR as partial mitigation measures<sup>6</sup>.

Because the Program EIR did not address potential physical modifications associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards and a corridor plan for Bayshore Boulevard that might occur outside of the Baylands, an analysis of whether such physical modifications might require a subsequent or supplemental EIR pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Guidelines CEQA Guidelines §15162 was prepared to address each of the potentially significant environmental issues identified in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G. The findings of this analysis, which is presented in Attachment A to this Addendum, concluded that proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards **would not** involve any:

- Substantial changes in the project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared that would require major revisions of the certified Program EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- Substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared would be undertaken that would require major revisions of the certified Program EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Program EIR was certified that shows:
  - The project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the Program EIR;
  - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the Program EIR;
  - Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of

---

as narrower travel lanes, landscape features, and more frequent signalization; and providing frequent (every 500 to 750 feet) safe crossing treatments for pedestrians as potential mitigation measures.

- the project for which the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR was prepared, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the Program EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

---

#### 4.4 CONCLUSION

Proposed General Plan revisions to implement General Plan Amendment GP-1-18 and Measure JJ would not result in any of the conditions set forth in CEQA Guidelines §15162(a) that would require preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR for the reasons summarized below.

- The physical changes to the environment that might result from General Plan revisions to incorporate GP-1-18 into the General Plan and ensure the General Plan's consistency with GP-1-18 would be the same as those previously analyzed pursuant to the requirements of CEQA as part of the Brisbane Baylands Program Environmental Impact Report.
  - The types and intensity of land uses permitted within the Baylands Subarea remain unchanged from those approved in GP-1-88, for which the Baylands Final Program EIR was certified.
  - The requirements of GP-1-18 regarding the timing of site remediation and Title 27 landfill closure in relation to land development are unchanged, as are requirements for the provision of a water potable water supply to the Baylands.
  - All mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted for GP-1-18 remain requirements of site development.
  - GP-1-18 represents a substantial reduction in development intensity from that originally proposed by the applicant for development of the Baylands as set forth in the findings for that General Plan Amendment's adoption. The whole of the record for adoption of the GP-1-18 and currently proposed General Plan revisions does not indicate the availability of any additional mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different from those in the EIR that would substantially reduce significant effects to a greater degree.
  - Preparation of a corridor plan to improve mobility along Bayshore Boulevard to address the effects of future development outside of Brisbane exceeding the City's LOS standards at six intersections along Bayshore Boulevard and adjacent to the 101 freeway was contemplated in the EIR and required by mitigation measure 4.N-3a.

- By resolving a potential inconsistency between the General Plan's Land Use Element and Circulation Element, the proposed General Plan amendment would allow implementation of the adopted GP-1-18 in the manner it was approved.
- The physical improvements that would result from proposed General Plan revisions would occur in the same locations within the Baylands, along Bayshore Boulevard, and adjacent to the freeway as those which were analyzed for GP-1-18.
- Proposed General Plan revisions that are factual in nature or reflect current State law would not result in any physical changes to the environment other than those already disclosed in the Final Program EIR.

As summarized above and documented in the detailed findings set forth in Attachment A, proposed revisions to the General Plan will require only minor revisions to the certified Final Program EIR for the Baylands -- addition of the project description set forth in this Addendum into the project description of the Final Program EIR and none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines §15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR would occur. Therefore, preparation of an addendum to the previously certified Brisbane Baylands Program EIR (State Clearinghouse #2006022136) is required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15164.

**ATTACHMENT A****ADDITIONAL FINDINGS REGARDING PROPOSED REVISIONS TO  
GENERAL PLAN LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) STANDARDS**

Analysis of the impacts that would result from proposed revisions to Brisbane's roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards are presented based on the environmental issues identified in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G to determine whether such proposed revisions would require preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15162. The analysis presented below focuses on the following:

- Would proposed amendments to the General Plan revising Brisbane's level of service standards require major revisions of the Baylands Program EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects?
- Would proposed amendments to the General Plan revising Brisbane's level of service standards require major revisions of the Baylands Program EIR due to substantial changes that have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which GP-1-18 would be undertaken due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects?
- Is there new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Baylands Program EIR was certified as complete that shows any of the following:
  - The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
  - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative?

The answers to these questions encompass all of the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) and are used to evaluate proposed amendments to the General Plan revising Brisbane's level of service standards. If any of the boxes in column (1), (2), or (3) are checked, a

Subsequent or supplemental EIR would be required. If only the boxes in Column 4 are checked, none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines §15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR would occur and preparation of an addendum to the certified Brisbane Baylands EIR would be required.

**A.1 AESTHETICS**

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:</i>			
	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Except as provided in Public Resources Code §21099, would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**a) Substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

Visual simulations undertaken for Baylands development demonstrated that structures with a height of 80 feet or more located within 300 feet of the freeway would have the potential to block views of the Bay. The Program EIR also concluded that structures in close proximity to the US 101 freeway could block motorists' views of San Bruno Mountain and the adjacent ridgeline.



Even though the total amount of development that would be permitted under the Baylands General Plan Amendment would be less than the scenarios addressed in the Program EIR, the potential for development to block or partially obscure bluewater views of the San Francisco Bay and views of San Bruno Mountain from US Highway 101 and the Bay Trail would remain, depending on the ultimate height, location, and massing of buildings.

The City Council found that Baylands development consistent with the provisions of GP-1-18 and Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.A-1a and 4.A-1b would preserve bluewater views of the Bay and views of San Bruno Mountain. As a result, the City Council found that impacts on scenic vistas would be reduced to less than significant.

#### *Evaluation of Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would result in modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension. These physical improvements would be at grade and not involve vertical structures that could intrude into either (1) bluewater views of the Bay as seen from Central Brisbane or nearby communities within San Francisco or Daly City or (2) view of San Bruno Mountain and the ridgeline defining Central Brisbane as seen from the US 101 freeway and other areas east of Bayshore Boulevard.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result.

#### *b) Would the proposed project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings?*

##### *Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

The City Council found that GP-1-18 would preserve scenic resources within the Baylands, since new development would be required to be designed consistent with Biological Resources mitigation measures preserving open space and General Plan policies requiring that development in the Baylands be complementary to existing topographic features, including Brisbane Lagoon, San Bruno Mountain, and San Francisco Bay. Other identified scenic resources such as the historic Roundhouse would be preserved and restored due to implementation of General Plan policies and Program EIR Cultural Resources mitigation measures. The Visitation Creek corridor, Icehouse Hill, and the edges of Brisbane Lagoon would be improved and used for habitat conservation and passive recreation; existing wetland and habitat areas would be improved and expanded. The San Francisco Bay Trail would be extended to provide additional views of the Bay from the Baylands and although some development could occur

between the trail and the Bay, it would adhere to applicable *San Francisco Bay Plan* policies and findings intended to ensure that new development maintains public access to the Bay.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Physical improvements resulting from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would occur within and immediately adjacent to the Bayshore Boulevard right-of-way and existing freeway interchanges, as well as within the Baylands. These improvements would not involve vertical structures and would be required to be designed consistent with Biological Resources mitigation measures and General Plan policies requiring that development in the Baylands be complementary to existing topographic features, including Brisbane Lagoon, San Bruno Mountain, and San Francisco Bay.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result.

*c) Would the proposed project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: None*

---

Because CEQA Guidelines Appendix G was modified to include this threshold as of January 2019, this specific threshold was not specifically addressed in the Program EIR. In its various impact evaluations, the Program EIR did not identify any instance where Baylands development would conflict with any applicable zoning or other regulation governing scenic quality.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Transportation improvements resulting from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not involve vertical structures that would be subject to the City's zoning or design review requirements. Thus, the proposed General Plan Amendment would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result.

*d) Would the proposed project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (Nighttime Lighting); Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures (Daytime Glare)*

---

**Nighttime Lighting.** The Program EIR concluded that addition of nighttime lighting from the development permitted by GP-1-18 over as broad an area as the Baylands, which is now largely dark at night, would affect nighttime views currently available to existing residents of Central Brisbane, adversely affecting nighttime views across the Bay and toward downtown San Francisco city lights from residential areas north, west, and south of the Baylands by placing a large-scale source of light in the foreground of those views. To the extent that nighttime lighting might not be fully shielded and directed downward, views of stars in the night sky could be affected. Light spillage from Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 could also adversely affect the Little Hollywood neighborhood and nearby habitat areas.

Although development intensity would be less and there would be fewer sources of light than would result from the proposed development analyzed in the Program EIR, development permitted by GP-1-18 would still generate substantial new sources of light that would be visible from other areas of Brisbane, from US Highway 101, and from adjacent scenic vistas. Even with implementation of EIR mitigation measures, the City Council found implementation of all feasible mitigation measures would not reduce impact of night lighting to a less-than-significant level. Given the nighttime lighting levels typical of proposed uses as compared to the minimal nighttime lighting that exists within Baylands, the Council found that the amount of development permitted by GP-1-18, the large size of the Baylands, and the existence of nearby surrounding nighttime light-sensitive uses (residences) that would be affected, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Daytime Glare.** The City Council found that a substantial amount of new building area would be introduced over a large portion of the Baylands that is now essentially devoid of sources of glare from development permitted by GP-1-18. Such sources of glare would be visible from other areas of Brisbane, from US Highway 101, and from adjacent scenic vistas. Thus, although GP-1-18 would reduce the number and size of sources of glare compared to the proposed development analyzed in the Program EIR, glare impacts would be significant, and mitigation was required. The City Council found that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.A-4b, which would require positioning reflective materials on building exteriors that have a light reflectivity factor greater than 30 percent so as to not reflect daytime glare onto the 101 freeway or onto existing residential communities in Brisbane and Visitacion Valley, would reduce daytime glare impacts to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

**Nighttime Lighting.** Transportation improvements resulting from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would include street lighting along Bayshore Boulevard, the Geneva Avenue extension, and freeway interchanges. Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not increase the overall intensity of street lighting along Bayshore Boulevard, nor would street lighting along Geneva Avenue or at freeway interchanges be different than

was analyzed for the Baylands in the Program EIR. In addition, the standard design for modern street lighting directs light downward so as not to adversely affect nighttime views.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not substantially increase the severity of the significant unavoidable night lighting impact disclosed in the Program EIR.

**Daytime Glare.** Roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements would be constructed with non-reflective paving and light poles that would not create sources of glare that could adversely affect daytime views.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result.

### *References*

---

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

**A.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4256), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

***Program EIR Findings: Less than Significant***

An Initial Study Checklist was prepared as part of the original 2006 Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Program EIR. The NOP determined that all impacts in relation to Agricultural and Forestry Resources would be less than significant. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

were not, therefore, addressed in detail in the Program EIR prepared for Baylands development.

### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

There are no lands within the City of Brisbane included on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Neither are there any lands within the City that are zoned for agricultural use or subject to a Williamson Act contract.

There are no lands within the City of Brisbane zoned for forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code §12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code §4256), or Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code §51104(g)).

Because there are no agricultural or forest lands within or adjacent to the City of Brisbane, revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not involve any changes to the existing environment that could result in (1) either conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or (2) otherwise adversely affect agricultural or forestry resources.

### *References*

---

California Department of Conservation, Important Farmland in California. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, San Mateo County Important Farmland 2014, available online: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2014/smt14.pdf>, Accessed May 6, 2019.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire), Fire and Resource Assessment Program, Land Cover: Multi-Source Data Compiled for Forest and Range 2006 Assessment, available online: [http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/frapgismaps/pdfs/fvegwhr13b\\_map.pdf](http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/frapgismaps/pdfs/fvegwhr13b_map.pdf), Accessed May 6, 2019.

**A.3 AIR QUALITY**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Bay Area Clean Air Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the proposed project conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan?*

*Program EIR Finding: Significant and Unavoidable*

The City Council included a mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure 4.B-9) in the Program EIR to implement additional control strategies and thereby achieve consistency with the Control Strategies contained in the Clean Air Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The City Council concluded, however, that even with reduced development intensity and Mitigation Measure 4.B-9, impacts of GP-1-18 would remain significant and unavoidable in relation to emissions of criteria pollutants during both construction and operations. Thus, while GP-1-18 would be consistent with the Control Strategies contained in the Clean Air Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and would not disrupt or hinder implementation of any Clean Air Plan control measures implementation of mitigation, impacts would still be significant and unavoidable due to significant unavoidable emissions of criteria pollutants during construction and operations.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Because proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards implement Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.N-3a, resulting construction activities and ongoing operations would implement all relevant Control Strategies contained in the Clean Air Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and would not disrupt or hinder implementation of any Clean Air Plan control measures implementation of mitigation.

**Construction Emissions.** The primary source of construction emissions leading to the significant and unavoidable air pollutant emissions impact disclosed in the Program EIR is site grading, when heavy, diesel-fueled construction equipment would be used in large numbers and fugitive dust would be generated from large-scale earthmoving activities (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>).

Site grading and excavation activities for improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS policies would be a temporary source of fugitive dust (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) emissions, as well as emissions from construction equipment. The short-term construction impacts of transportation improvements that might occur along the Geneva Avenue extension and at freeway interchanges were included in the construction emissions analyzed in the Program EIR and are subject to the mitigation measures set forth in that EIR.

Short-term construction impacts for transportation improvements along Bayshore Boulevard would be much less than for GP-1-18 and would not cause the significant construction impacts associated with GP-1-18 to be substantially more severe than previously disclosed in the Program EIR for the following reasons:

- The area along Bayshore Boulevard that may be subject to as grading, paving, and other construction activities would be very small relative to the overall Brisbane Baylands, resulting in substantially fewer construction emissions on a daily basis than would occur for grading of the overall Baylands site.
- Whereas large numbers of heavy-duty equipment would be needed to grade the overall Baylands site for GP-1-18, transportation improvements along Bayshore Boulevard associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not require large-scale heavy-duty earth moving equipment and would be graded using smaller-scale equipment (e.g., bobcats and back hoes), resulting in lower daily emissions.
- Fewer construction workers would be employed for construction of transportation improvements along Bayshore Boulevard than for development of the Baylands project site, reducing daily emissions from construction worker travel.
- Construction of transportation improvements along Bayshore Boulevard would not overlap the major grading operations for the overall Brisbane Baylands. To take advantage of economies of scale, transportation improvements along Bayshore Boulevard would most likely be programmed to occur simultaneously with Baylands roadway construction activities, which would be undertaken after completion of site



grading. Daily construction-related air pollutant emissions would therefore not add to the peak construction emissions resulting from GP-1-18.

- Construction of transportation improvements along Bayshore Boulevard would be required to implement relevant mitigation measures set forth in the Program EIR to reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions, including:
  - Mitigation Measure 4.B-1, addressing Fugitive Dust Emissions
  - Mitigation Measure 4.B-2a, addressing Construction Emissions of Criteria Pollutants and Precursors for which the Air Basin is in Nonattainment

**Operational Emissions.** As stated in Finding A.14 (a), proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would provide for some increases in roadway capacity along Bayshore Boulevard and at freeway interchanges; however, this additional capacity would not remove a barrier to growth nor would it or induce additional unplanned development to the north or south of Brisbane. In addition, Geneva Avenue extension would accommodate the same traffic volumes as were analyzed for GP-1-18. Addendum Finding A.17 (c) concludes that proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not involve the construction of any homes, businesses, or other uses that would generate or induce population or employment growth that would increase vehicular travel or vehicle miles traveled. While revisions to General Plan LOS standards will result in some increased in roadway capacity along Bayshore Boulevard and at freeway interchanges, this additional capacity would be minor in relation to overall roadway capacity and would not remove a barrier to growth or induce growth. Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would encourage increased use of non-vehicular travel, which would tend to reduce the traffic-generating effects of any increased roadway capacity.

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would provide multi-modal mobility improvements along Bayshore Boulevard and the Geneva Avenue extension within the City by reducing delay at intersections, providing for enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities, improving traffic flow along Bayshore Boulevard, and improving access to transit. Together, these improvements would reduce fuel consumption and associated vehicular emissions of criteria air pollutants by reducing the idling time of vehicles waiting to pass through intersections and shifting some vehicular travel to transit and non-motorized transportation modes.

**Conclusion:** Because proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in substantially more severe emissions of criteria air pollutants, the proposed General Plan revisions would not result in substantially more severe impacts in relation to consistency with the applicant Bay Air Quality Management Plan.

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

*Program EIR Finding: Significant and Unavoidable*

Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would result in an increase in criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions, including ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> from a variety of emissions sources, including onsite area sources (e.g., natural gas combustion for space and water heating, landscape maintenance, use of consumer products such as hairsprays, deodorants, cleaning products, etc.) and mobile on-road sources. Baylands development-related operational emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> would exceed the BAAQMD significance threshold and impacts would be significant.

The City Council found that GP-1-18 would result in more than a 40 percent reduction in development intensity compared to the DSP scenario evaluated in the Program EIR with a similar reduction in traffic generation, air pollutant emissions, and total GHG emissions. Even with a more than 40 percent reduction in air pollutant emissions, GP-1-18, along with implementation of EIR mitigation measures, including Mitigation Measure 4.B-4, would not result in the 86 to 92 percent reductions necessary (for PM<sub>10</sub>) or the 60 to 86 percent reductions necessary (for NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG) to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Consequently, even with implementation of Program EIR mitigation measures, emissions of ROG NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> resulting from GP-1-18 would remain significant and unavoidable.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

**Construction Emissions.** Activities such as grading and excavation, paving, utility relocation, and bridge overcrossing construction associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would result in emissions of ROG, CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions would occur from fugitive dust (due to earthwork and excavation) and from construction equipment exhaust. The majority of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions would be generated by fugitive dust from grading and excavation operations. Exhaust emissions from construction activities include emissions associated with the transport of machinery and supplies to and from the project site, emissions produced on-site as the equipment is used, and emissions from trucks transporting materials to and from the site.

Because the specific transportation improvements that would result from revisions to General Plan LOS standards cannot be known at this time, nor can their timing or the extent to which one or more such projects might concurrently generate air pollutant emissions be known, a quantitative analysis of air pollutant emissions cannot be undertaken.

To address fugitive dust emissions during construction, the BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* recommends a Best Management Practices (BMP) approach. Consistent with

BAAQMD recommendations, BMPs for controlling fugitive dust will be applied to all construction projects associated with General Plan revisions implementing Mitigation Measure 4.I-1 including, but are not limited to:

*Measures to Reduce Fugitive Dust Emissions*

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered as needed, but no less than two times per day on days with no precipitation.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
8. A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
9. Construction foreman and crew shall receive training from contractors on implementation of the above emission reduction techniques prior to each development phase.

*Measures to Reduce Construction Vehicle Emissions*

1. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting diesel-powered or gasoline-powered equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time of diesel-powered equipment to five minutes (as required by the California airborne

- toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
2. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. It shall be the contractor's responsibility to ensure that all equipment has been checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
  3. All construction contract specifications shall include a requirement that on-road diesel trucks used to transport spoils consist of 2007 or newer model-year trucks with factory-built engines. All on-road diesel trucks shall be required to have emission control labels as specified in 13 CCR 2183(c) or any subsequent updates to this CARB regulation, whichever is more stringent. The construction contract specifications shall require that the contractor submit to the City a comprehensive inventory of all on-road trucks used to haul spoils. The inventory shall include each vehicle's license plate number, the engine production year, and a notation of whether the truck is in possession of an emission control label as defined in 13 CCR. The contractor shall update the inventory and submit it monthly to the City throughout the duration of the project.
  4. All off-road construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower used for site improvements shall meet EPA Tier 4 emissions standards with the following exception. Equipment with an engine compliant with Tier 3 emissions standards may be allowed on a case-by-case basis when the applicant (1) demonstrates a good faith effort to procure Tier 4 equipment, and (2) documents that no Tier 4 equipment is available for a particular equipment type within San Mateo County within the scheduled construction period. Each case shall be documented with signed written or emailed correspondence by the appropriate construction contractor, along with documented correspondence from at least two construction equipment rental firms representing a good faith effort to locate engines that meet Tier 4 requirements, as applicable. Documentation shall be submitted to City staff for review before Tier 3 equipment is used on the project.

**Operational Emissions.** Operational emissions associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would result from increases, if any, in vehicular traffic. As stated in Finding 2.3.14 (a), proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would provide for some increases in roadway capacity along Bayshore Boulevard and at freeway interchanges<sup>1</sup>; however, this additional capacity would not remove a barrier to growth nor would it or induce additional unplanned development to the north or south of Brisbane. In addition, Addendum Finding 2.3.17 (c) concludes that proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not involve the construction of any homes, businesses, or other uses that would generate or induce

---

<sup>1</sup> Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not increase roadway capacity or traffic along the Geneva Avenue extension above that analyzed in the Program EIR.

population or employment growth that would increase vehicular travel or vehicle miles traveled. While these General Plan revisions will provide for some increases in roadway capacity along Bayshore Boulevard and at freeway interchanges, this additional capacity would not remove a barrier to growth or induce growth but would encourage increased use of non-vehicular travel.

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would (1) provide for improvements to multi-modal mobility along Bayshore Boulevard by reducing delay at intersections, (2) provide for enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities along Bayshore Boulevard and the Geneva Avenue extension, and (3) improve access to transit. Together, these improvements would reduce fuel consumption and associated vehicular emissions of criteria air pollutants by reducing the idling time of vehicles waiting to pass through intersections and shifting some vehicular travel to transit and non-motorized transportation modes.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in substantially more severe emissions of criteria air pollutants than were disclosed in the Program EIR and would therefore not result in substantially more severe impacts.

*c) Would the proposed project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

---

Construction activities associated with GP-1-18 would produce diesel particulate emissions and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions due to combustion from equipment such as loaders, backhoes, and cranes, as well as haul truck trips, resulting in elevated concentrations at nearby receptors (both new and existing residences). Because these elevated concentrations could lead to an increase in the risk of cancer or other health impacts, a health risk assessment was performed, which determined that proposed Baylands development would have a less-than-significant impact. Because construction activities associated with GP-1-18 would be similar on a daily basis to those analyzed in the Program EIR, the City Council found that GP-1-18 would also have a less than significant impact.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Construction of transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would produce diesel particulate emissions and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions due to combustion from equipment such as pavers, loaders, and backhoes, as well as haul truck trips, resulting in elevated concentrations at nearby receptors. These construction activities would be much less intensive than the construction activities that would be associated with Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18, for which impacts were previously determined to be less than significant in the Program EIR.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*d) Would the proposed project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

The types of residential, commercial, and open space uses permitted by GP-1-18 are not associated with emissions of odors that could adversely affect a substantial number of people. The only use permitted by GP-1-18 that would have the potential for such emissions is an onsite recycled water plant. The Program EIR determined that construction of an onsite recycled water plant would employ odor control measures. Depending on its ultimate location within the Baylands, the recycled water plant could be as close as 400 feet to proposed residential units and about one-half mile from the nearest existing residential receptor. Because of the potential for an onsite recycled water plant to generate odors that may affect a substantial number of people, Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.B-8 requires implementation of a Recycled Water Plant Odor Control Plan to reduce odor impacts.

Due to decreased sewage flows under GP-1-18 in comparison with those analyzed in the Program EIR, The City Council found that, with implementation of Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.B-8, GP-1-18 would not have a substantial adverse effect in relation to odors and impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Offensive odors rarely cause physical harm; however, they can be unpleasant, leading to stress among members of the public and generating citizen complaints. Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards do not propose uses identified by the BAAQMD as sources of odors, such as wastewater treatment facilities, chemical manufacturing, painting/coating operations, feed lots/dairies, composting facilities, landfills, and solid waste transfer stations.

Construction related to transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would generate airborne odors, such as from diesel equipment and during paving operations. However, the potential for emission of odors generated during construction would be short-term and intermittent. Also, since prevailing winds in Brisbane are from the northwest and west and the predominant location of construction operations associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be downwind of Brisbane's residential neighborhoods, odors generated during construction would not adversely affect a substantial number of people.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*References*

---

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. *2017 Clean Air Plan, Spare the Air – Cool the Climate*, Available: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/air-quality-plans/current-plans>  
Accessed: May 1, 2019.

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

**A.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
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 Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, costal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with the City of Brisbane Tree Regulations protecting biological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of the San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



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

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

Direct mortality or harm to special-status plants or animals within the Baylands and/or loss or degradation of habitat for special-status plants and animals would occur as a result of proposed Baylands development. The Program EIR concluded that remediation and site grading activities would displace sensitive natural communities including freshwater emergent wetlands that have formed on the existing fill material that is the current substrate at the site, and the Visitation Creek channel. Title 27 landfill closure activities including cleanup within and along the Visitation Creek channel would impact sensitive natural communities including tidally influenced banks of Visitation Creek either by temporary removal of tidal habitats during remediation, or through indirect effects such as increase in storm water runoff into sensitive habitats while work is occurring within or adjacent to the creek channel. These impacts were determined to be significant, requiring mitigation.

The Program EIR concluded that remediation and grading activities would result in substantial adverse effects on wetlands and waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and Waters of the State, as defined by the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act, overseen by the RWQCB pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. These activities would occur within the landfill and railyard footprints prior to Baylands development build out.

As a result of these significant impacts, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-1a through 4.C-1h and Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a through 4.C-2c was required. The City Council determined that these mitigation measures, including performance standards in Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a, 4.C-2b, and 4.C-2c, would ensure no net loss of either the total area/amount or the functions and values of sensitive natural communities. As a result, the City Council determined that GP-1-18 would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitats, and impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension could result in adverse effects on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species due to habitat loss or degradation should such activities occur within or adjacent to undeveloped areas or habitat features with the potential to support

special status species. Examples of such habitats or features include, but are not limited to the seasonal wetlands adjacent to Bayshore Boulevard (e.g., Levinson marsh), the host plants for special status butterflies that occur at Icehouse Hill, the tidal marsh and open water habitats at Brisbane Lagoon, or existing habitat features such as trees and infrastructure such as buildings that could support special status birds and special status bats. However, compliance with General Plan Policy 85<sup>2</sup>, Program EIR Mitigation Measures Mitigation Measures 4.C-1a through 4.C-1h, and Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a through 4.C-2c, and compliance with state and federal policy for no net loss of wetland prior to issuance of City grading permits will ensure impacts remain less than significant.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in any new significant impacts.

- b) *Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

The Program EIR concluded that remediation and site grading activities would displace sensitive natural communities including freshwater emergent wetlands that have formed on the existing fill material that is the current substrate at the site, and the Visitation Creek channel. Title 27 landfill closure activities, including cleanup within and along the Visitation Creek channel would impact sensitive natural communities such as tidally influenced banks of Visitation Creek either by temporary removal of tidal habitats during remediation, or through indirect effects such as increase in storm water runoff into sensitive habitats while work is occurring within or adjacent to the creek channel. These actions would impact and displace sensitive natural communities including freshwater emergent wetlands that have formed on the existing fill material that is the current substrate at the site, and the Visitation Creek channel. The resulting impact would be significant, requiring mitigation.

The City Council found that the performance standards set forth in Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a, 4.C-2b, and 4.C-2c would ensure no overall net loss of either the total area/ amount or the functions and values of sensitive natural communities. Implementation of these mitigation measures, as well as compliance with regulatory requirements, might also result in a greater quantity and higher overall habitat quality than what currently exists within the Baylands.

---

<sup>2</sup> General Plan Policy 85 states “Encourage the preservation and conservation of aquatic resources in Brisbane: the Lagoon, the Bayfront and the Marsh.”

Thus, the City Council found that GP-1-18 would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitats, and impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards could result in adverse effects to riparian and other sensitive natural communities within Brisbane if construction or operation encroaches upon sensitive habitats or degrades the quality of sensitive habitats during construction or operation. Sensitive habitats adjacent to Bayshore Boulevard include seasonal wetlands and riparian habitats, tidal wetlands and tidal marsh habitat at the Brisbane Lagoon. However, compliance with General Plan Policy 85, Program EIR Mitigation Measures Mitigation Measures 4.C-1a through 4.C-1h and Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a through 4.C-2c, and compliance with state and federal policy for no net loss of wetland prior to issuance of City grading permits will ensure impacts remain less than significant.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in any new significant impacts.

- c) Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, costal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

Remediation and grading activities would result in substantial adverse effects on wetlands and waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and Waters of the State, as defined by the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act, overseen by the RWQCB pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. These activities would occur within the landfill and railyard footprints prior to Baylands development build out.

Significant impacts identified in the Program EIR include permanent fill of freshwater emergent wetlands and manmade drainages occurring on the former railyard; permanent fill of un-vegetated manmade drainage ditches, freshwater emergent wetlands, and tidally influenced wetlands at Visitation Creek within the landfill footprint. The fill of jurisdictional waters as a result of remediation and grading activities would result in loss of wetland area to create appropriate soil elevations for the purpose of containment of contaminants required prior to Baylands development.

The City Council concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a, 4.C-2b, and 4.C-2c would reduce impacts on wetlands to less than significant since the performance standards for remediation and grading activities set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2c ensure

that the total area and/or overall functions and values of jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. would be maintained and that impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension could result in adverse effects to riparian and other sensitive natural communities due to habitat loss or degradation should such activities occur within or adjacent to such areas. Examples of such locations include but are not limited to wetland areas adjacent to Bayshore Boulevard (e.g., Levinson marsh) and the Brisbane Lagoon. However, compliance with Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a, 4.C-2b, and 4.C-2c; General Plan Policy 85; and state and federal policy for no net loss of wetland will ensure impacts remain less than significant.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in any new significant impacts.

*d) Would the proposed project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

Development permitted by GP-1-18 would result in establishment and maintenance of contiguous open areas and linear habitat features that could facilitate animal movement onsite, including Visitation Creek, and thereby maintain connectivity within the Baylands and increase habitat quality onsite compared to existing conditions.

The City Council found that GP-1-18 could permit some buildings in excess of 100 feet in height, which might pose collision hazards to migratory birds since tall buildings and the reflection from window surfaces of those buildings could alter the flight patterns of migratory birds and substantially increase the potential for bird strike collisions with the structures. Due to the potential for individuals of special status bird species to collide with windows and reflective surfaces on tall buildings associated with development of the site, the City Council determined that a significant impact would result, requiring mitigation.

The performance standards and actions set forth in Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.C-4a through 4.C-4g would ensure the ability of wildlife species to move through the Baylands in appropriate locations by creating and maintaining active wildlife corridors. These performance

standards and actions would also protect wildlife nursery sites supporting breeding. As a result, the City Council determined the development permitted by GP-1-18 would be less than significant. no new significant impact would result.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

No transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would occur within or across established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or in locations supporting movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species or fish. No impacts would therefore result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in any new significant impacts.

*d) Would the proposed project conflict with the City of Brisbane Tree Regulations protecting biological resources?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

---

GP-1-18 would have the potential to result in removal of trees protected under the City's Tree Ordinance. However, Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would be required to comply with the City's Tree Ordinance, which requires specific approval for removal of protected trees. Removal permits may be granted subject to conditions including, but not limited to, requiring planting one or more replacement trees (Municipal Code Section 12.12.050 F). Thus, impacts were determined to be less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards will comply with Brisbane Municipal Code Title 12, Chapter 12.12, which requires a permit for removal of protected trees, or any other tree having a trunk that is greater than 30 inches in diameter at a height of 24 inches above grade. The Municipal Code states that removal permits may be granted subject to conditions including, but not limited to, requiring planting one or more replacement trees (Section 12.12.050 F). Projects conducted by the City are not, however, subject to requirements for City permits.

In the case of transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards undertaken by the City, Brisbane is not required to apply to or issue itself a permit to remove trees. The City Manager will, nevertheless, require planting one or more replacement trees for City-sponsored project in the same manner as would have been required had the tree removal been proposed by a private party. Impacts will therefore remain less than significant.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in any new significant impacts.

*e) Would the proposed project conflict with the provisions of the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: No Impact*

---

The Program EIR found there are no adopted habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that apply to the Baylands. The San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan (SBMHCP) extends from San Bruno Mountain to Bayshore Boulevard and does not extend east of Bayshore Boulevard into the Baylands. Icehouse Hill is east of Bayshore Boulevard and thus is not included in the SBMHCP. Because Icehouse Hill would be retained as open land under the Baylands General Plan Amendment, conflicts with the SBMHCP would not occur. While Baylands development is not required to comply with the SBMHCP, Icehouse Hill would remain as open space, and therefore development would not conflict with the SBMHCP. This impact was therefore determined to be less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would occur within the Baylands as well as within and immediately adjacent to the existing right-of-way of Bayshore Boulevard, which are not subject to the HCP's requirements or conditions.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in any new significant impacts.

*References*

---

California Natural Diversity Database 2016. CNDDDB search included City of Brisbane.

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

City of Brisbane Municipal Code Title 12, Chapter 12.12

**A.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

The 1907 Roundhouse located within the Baylands is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Resources and is identified by the Brisbane General Plan as an important cultural resource to the City. This building is thus a “historical resource” as defined by CEQA. While the Roundhouse would be renovated for adaptive reuse, the Program EIR determined that restoration and reuse plans might not be completed until the Baylands is built out, permitting the Roundhouse to continue deteriorating and resulting in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. In addition, since detailed plans for the restoration and reuse of the Roundhouse would be included as part of the required specific plan for the Baylands and were therefore not available during preparation of the Program EIR, the City Council found that the integrity of the structure could be damaged if restoration plans would not be completed in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Thus, the Program EIR concluded that Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the historic Roundhouse, a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5, requiring mitigation.

The Program EIR also concluded that new development in the immediate vicinity of the Roundhouse could cause a substantial adverse change in its significance by adversely affecting the building's historic setting if the development were completed in a manner incompatible with the historic structure. Incompatible new development (e.g., buildings significantly taller than or out of character with the Roundhouse) could overwhelm or unnecessarily contrast with this historic building, which would reduce the integrity of the building's historic setting. The result would be a significant impact, requiring mitigation.

Because Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.D-1a would arrest continued deterioration of the Roundhouse and required its restoration and adaptive reuse, the City Council found that direct impacts on the historic Roundhouse would be reduced to less than significant. The City Council also found that because Mitigation Measure 4.D-1b requires new development to be compatible with historic buildings, Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Roundhouse or the Machinery & Equipment building. Impacts would therefore be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

No modifications to historic structures or their surroundings would occur as the result of proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards; therefore, no substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 would occur. Impacts would remain less than significant.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*b) Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

One known historic-period archaeological site, an artifact scatter from the late 19th and early 20th centuries, is located within the Baylands, but was determined not to be a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource. Additionally, the Baylands contains artificial fill associated with the 1906 earthquake, but this artificial fill would not likely yield important information in history or contain information needed to answer important scientific research questions and is therefore not a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource.

Development permitted by GP-1-18 would involve ground disturbance that could result in direct impacts or otherwise damage or destroy undiscovered significant archaeological resources within the Baylands. While disturbance of archaeological resources is not anticipated



during site grading or construction, the potential for impacting previously unknown resources nevertheless remains, resulting in a significant impact that requires mitigation.

The City Council found that implementation of Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.D-2 would reduce impacts of Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards could result in a change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 should construction of such facilities uncover previously unidentified archaeological resources.

Compliance with Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.D-2 will be a standard requirement for transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards. Thus, all work within 100 feet of any resource that might be discovered during construction will be halted. The City, in consultation with a City-approved qualified consulting archaeologist, will assess the significance of the find according to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. Prehistoric materials subject to this measure might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil ("midden") containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones.

If any find is determined to be a unique archaeological resource, the City and the consulting archaeologist will determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation with the City making the final determination. All archaeological resources recovered will be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documentation according to current professional standards.

Impacts would remain less than significant with implementation of required mitigation measures.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*c) Would the proposed project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

The Program EIR stated that there is no indication that the Baylands has been used for human burial purposes. It would therefore be unlikely for human remains to be encountered during

construction. However, given the relatively shallow depths of existing artificial and proposed fill in the area along Bayshore Boulevard, this area's proximity to the original Bay shoreline, and the substantial amount of construction and grading proposed for this area, human remains could be encountered and inadvertently damaged, causing a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 4.D-4 was therefore included in the Program to address the actions to be taken in the event that human skeletal remains are uncovered during construction. The City Council concluded that implementation of Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.D-4 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Because there is no indication that any portion of the Baylands or the City has been used for human burial purposes, it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered as the result of construction activities associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards. However, it remains possible that human remains could be encountered and inadvertently damaged during construction activities.

Section 7052 of the California Health and Safety Code makes the willful mutilation, disinterment, or removal of human remains a felony. Section 7050.5 requires that the construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the California Native American Heritage Commission.

All construction associated with General Plan revisions to LOS standards will be subject to the provisions of Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.D-4 and the provisions of state law. Thus, should human skeletal remains be uncovered during construction activities, the following actions will be taken:

- Work will immediately be halted within 100 feet of the find and the San Mateo County Coroner will be contacted to evaluate the remains as required by the protocols set forth in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(e)(1) of the.
- If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), in accordance with Health and Safety Code §7050.5 (c), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 (as amended by Assembly Bill 2641).
- The NAHC will identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) of the deceased Native American, who will help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains.
- In accordance with Public Resources Code §5097.98, the specific entity responsible for the transportation improvement will ensure that, according to generally accepted

cultural or archaeological standards or practices, the immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not damaged or disturbed by further construction activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in Public Resources Code §5097.98, with the MLD regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

**A.6 ENERGY RESOURCES**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) <i>Would the proposed project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</i>				

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

**Construction Impacts.** The Program EIR determined that Baylands-related construction activities would not be expected to result in demand for fuel greater on a per-unit-of-development basis than other development projects in the region, with the exception that remediation of hazardous materials needs to be undertaken within the Baylands along with Title 27 landfill closure. Because Baylands remediation and Title 27 landfill closure are required and not optional, the energy consumed to return the Baylands to a safe and healthy condition was determined in the Program EIR not to be wasteful.

Although the extent of Baylands development is large, construction and development would occur over a 20-year period, and demand for construction-related electricity and fuels would be spread out over that time frame.

The Program EIR concluded that construction activities would result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy if construction equipment would be old or not well maintained, if equipment would be left to idle when not in use, if travel routes were not planned to minimize vehicle miles traveled, or if excess lighting or water is used during construction activities. Energy would also be used in a wasteful manner if alternative energy sources, such as solar energy, are not used where feasible, in place of more traditional sources. Thus, a significant impact would occur, requiring mitigation.

The City Council determined that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.B-2a and 4.B-2b (construction air emissions) and Mitigation Measure 4.N-12 (construction circulation patterns) would have the effect of reducing construction-related quality fuel consumption. In addition, City Council determined that these measures, along with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.P-1 which sets forth specific construction energy reduction measures to be implemented would reduce ensure development permitted by GP-1-18 would not have a substantial adverse effect, and impacts related to energy use during construction would be reduced to less than significant.

**Operational Impacts.** Operational use of energy, including the heating, cooling, and lighting of buildings; water heating; operation of electrical systems and plug-in appliances within buildings; parking lot and outdoor lighting; the transport of electricity, natural gas, and water to the areas where they would be consumed; and operation of the proposed onsite recycled water plant would be substantial given the level of development that would be permitted by GP-1-18 within the Baylands. While Baylands-related energy consumption would be less for than was originally analyzed in the Program EIR due to the reduced amount of development, the Program EIR determined that total increase in energy consumption would nevertheless remain substantial and therefore significant, requiring mitigation.

The City Council found that a number of Baylands development features and EIR mitigation measures would reduce the significant increase in energy consumption to a less-than-significant level. Incorporation of sustainability concepts from the Sustainability Framework for the Brisbane Baylands would reduce energy consumption as would green building standards for new developments to meet LEED® “Gold” rating on all new commercial projects over 10,000 square feet and achieving a “green home” rating on the MultiFamily GreenPoint Checklist for any residential developments with 20 or more units. These features, along with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.P-2a through 4.P-2c would ensure efficient use of energy resources. As a result, the City Council concluded that the energy use of development permitted by GP-1-18 Baylands would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards place a greater emphasis on reducing vehicle miles travelled and enhancing multi-modal mobility than existing General Plan policies. These proposed General Plan revisions would improve the fuel efficiency of Brisbane's transportation system by enhancing access to transit, shifting travel to transit and non-motorized transportation modes, and reducing the idling time of vehicles waiting to pass through intersections along Bayshore Boulevard.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

*b) Would the proposed project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

Because CEQA Guidelines Appendix G was modified to include this threshold as of January 2019, this specific threshold was not specifically addressed in the Program EIR. In its various impact evaluations of energy resources, the Program EIR did not identify any instance where Baylands development would conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards provide for a balanced, connected, safe and convenient multi-modal network, accommodating bicycle and pedestrian in addition to vehicular movement, and enhancing access to transit. These proposed revisions recognize that "by prioritizing the movement of automotive vehicles over other modes travel, the use of LOS has... tended to constrain the use of alternative modes of transportation (transit/bicycles/walking) that reduce transportation-related GHG emissions. Many of the measures that improve LOS, such as wider roadways, increase the number of cars on the road and discourage biking and walking. In addition, reducing roadway and freeway congestion encourages automobile travel while making use of transit less desirable."

By placing a greater emphasis on reducing vehicle miles travelled and enhancing multi-modal mobility, proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards will improve the fuel efficiency of Brisbane's transportation system. This will be accomplished by reducing the idling time of vehicles waiting to pass through intersections and shifting some travel to transit and non-motorized transportation modes. Such improvements are consistent with and would not conflict with or obstruct state and local plans for energy efficiency.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

### *References*

---

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

**A.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>a) Would the proposed project directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</i>				
<i>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?</i>				

**Program EIR Finding: No Impact**

Because there are no known active fault traces cross through or adjacent to the Baylands, and the site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, the Program EIR concluded that no impacts would result from GP-1-18.

**Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane’s Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards**

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act requires the delineation of zones by the California Department of Conservation, Geological Survey (CGS, formerly known as the California Division of Mines and Geology [CDMG]) along sufficiently active and well-defined faults. The active faults nearest to the City of Brisbane are the San Andreas fault, located approximately six miles southwest of the project site, and the Hayward fault, located approximately 14 miles northeast. Because there are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within the City of Brisbane, no impacts related to fault rupture hazards would result.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

*ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?*

---

**Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures**

The Program EIR stated that the Baylands would likely experience at least one major earthquake (M 6.7 or higher) within the next 20 years, which could produce considerable ground accelerations and violent to very violent groundshaking within the Baylands. The Program EIR also noted that geotechnical studies prepared for Baylands development provided recommendations to minimize adverse effects from seismic groundshaking and that impacts would be significant, requiring mitigation. Mitigation Measures 4.E-2a requires implementation of site-specific construction methods and grading based on the recommendations of a final design-level geotechnical report prepared by a licensed geotechnical or soil engineer experienced in construction methods on fill materials in an active seismic area. The design-level geotechnical report would also set forth requirements addressing fill placement; soil corrosivity/expansion/erosion potential; compaction; foundation construction; drainage control (both surface and subsurface); and avoidance of settlement, liquefaction, differential settlement, spread of leachate outside of the former landfill, and seismic hazards in accordance with current California Building Code requirements including Chapter 16, Section 1613.

Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.E-2b addresses recovery from damage to future structures and to the landfill itself that may be caused by future earthquakes. This measure requires preparation and implementation of a Post-Earthquake Inspection and Corrective Action Plan (Plan) for site-specific development projects within the former landfill portion of the Baylands in accordance with Title 27 landfill closure requirements as approved by the RWQCB and the San Mateo County Environmental Health Services Division prior to issuance of a building permit. The plan would be implemented in the event of a magnitude 7.0 or greater earthquake centered within 30 miles of the former Brisbane Landfill.

**Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane’s Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards**

Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be subject to strong groundshaking in the event of a major earthquake, resulting in damage to pavement surfaces.

While substantial loss, injury, or death due to groundshaking on an at-grade facility would be extremely rare, any proposed grade-separated structure would be subject to substantial structural damage in a major earthquake. Because transportation improvements related to proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be subject to requirements for site-specific geotechnical analysis set forth in Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.E-2a and 4.E-2b, such structures would be designed to withstand a major earthquake without collapse based on site-specific geologic design-level geotechnical analyses and recommendations prepared by a licensed geotechnical or soil engineer. Prior to approval of construction plans, the City Engineer

would review the geotechnical report and the facility's structural design to confirm that it meets current standards and would avoid collapse in the event of a major earthquake.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

*iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

---

**Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation**

According to generalized maps compiled by the USGS and preliminary geotechnical investigations within the Baylands, the Program EIR stated there is a potential risk from liquefaction of saturated sand layers within existing fill, Young Bay Mud, and below Young Bay Mud beneath the Baylands. Liquefaction at the site and along Bayshore Boulevard could result in loss of bearing pressure, lateral spreading, sand boils (liquefied soil exiting at the ground surface), and other potentially damaging effects if not addressed in geotechnical engineering design. Analysis of site-specific soils data determined that liquefaction susceptibility at the former railyard area was relatively high. In contrast, a 2008 Geosyntec report and the Applicant's geotechnical consultant's testimony before the City Council suggested that the liquefaction risk within the Baylands is low because of the depth to the sand and the type of subsurface material (i.e., clayey soils).

As recommended by the Geosyntec report, site-specific investigations to pinpoint site-specific liquefaction risks would be required for all Baylands development to determine appropriate foundation system design. Because the potential for liquefaction is present within the Baylands and would require site-specific analysis, the Program EIR stated this impact would be significant, requiring mitigation. The City Council determined that implementation of Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.E-3 would pinpoint site-specific liquefaction risks and define foundation design requirements to address site-specific potential liquefaction for each structure within the Baylands and ensure compliance with California Building Code requirements for safety from liquefaction hazards. Thus, the City Council found that with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-3, development permitted by GP-1-18 would not have a substantial adverse effect in relation to liquefaction hazards, and impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

**Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards**

At-grade roadways, intersections, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and connections to transit facilities would be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, in areas of undocumented fill and areas with shallow groundwater, resulting in potential damage to pavement surfaces. However, substantial loss, injury, or death on an at-grade facility would be extremely rare.

Grade-separated bicycle/pedestrian crossings could, however, be subject to structural collapse due to seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction depending on site-specific geologic and soil conditions. All such grade-separated structures would be subject to the requirements of Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.E-3 and would therefore be designed to withstand collapse based on site-specific geologic conditions as determined in a design-level geotechnical report prepared by a licensed geotechnical or soil engineer. Prior to approval of construction plans, the City Engineer would review the geotechnical report and the facility's structural design to confirm the ability of such crossings to avoid collapse in the event of a major earthquake.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

#### *iv. Landslides?*

---

#### **Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures**

Baylands development would require substantial re-grading activities including construction of slopes using fill materials. If not engineered appropriately, these constructed slopes could be subject to slope failure which could damage proposed improvements or potentially adversely affect local visitors, residents, or workers. Based on the conceptual grading plan included in the Program EIR, geotechnical studies concluded that placement of engineered fill could cause underlying Bay Mud to fail and recommended that additional subsurface exploration and static/seismic stability of the proposed slopes be analyzed prior to final design and construction once site-specific information on building locations could be known. Given that the soils are potentially unstable under static conditions, the Program EIR stated that soil beneath the Baylands is also likely unstable under dynamic conditions. Thus, a significant impact would result, requiring mitigation.

Because Mitigation Measures 4.E-4a and 4.E-4b established appropriate performance standards for slope stability to reduce the risk from static and dynamic slope instability, the City Council found that GP-1-18 would not have a substantial adverse effect in relation to landslides and slope stability, and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

#### **Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards**

The majority of the roadway, intersection bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access improvements occurring as the result of proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would occur in flat areas that are not subject to landslide hazards. In addition, these transportation facilities would occur within or adjacent existing roadway rights-of-way, which are, in some locations, adjacent to hillside areas but not within areas subject to landslides. Thus, where grading associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards might occur, there would be no increase in potential landslide hazards compared to existing conditions. Where grading would occur within an existing slope area or would create manmade slopes, implementation of Program EIR

Mitigation Measures 4.E-4a and 4.E-4b, along with compliance with California Building Code and standard engineering design parameters would adhere to performance standards that avoid surficial failure and landslides. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, Brisbane's City Engineer will review project designs to confirm they meet current building code standards and engineering practices established to avoid surficial failure and landslides.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

***b) Would the proposed project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?***

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

The Program EIR noted that construction and remediation activities required for Baylands development, such as excavation, backfilling, grading, and placement of fill material for surcharging purposes could expose areas of loose soil. Grading activities alone would require movement of large quantities of soils with preliminary estimates of up to approximately 4,475,000 cubic yards of cut and 3,397,000 cubic yards of fill. If not properly stabilized or protected, these soils and fills could be subjected to soil loss and erosion by wind and storm water runoff. Concentrated water erosion, if not managed or controlled, could eventually result in substantial soil loss. Excessive soil erosion could also eventually lead to damage of building foundations and roadways. Areas within the Baylands that are susceptible to erosion are those that would be exposed during the construction phase and along the shoreline where soil is subjected to wave action.

The Program EIR determined that, once construction activities were completed, the upland portions of the Baylands would incorporate open lands which would be retained in their natural condition or landscaped. As a result, some locations within the Baylands would be exposed to the forces that cause erosion.

The City Council found that implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is required to be prepared and implemented under the NPDES General Construction Permit, and compliance with Brisbane General Plan Policy 152, the Baylands General Plan Amendment would avoid require implementation of best management practices and avoid impacts related to erosion or loss of topsoil. Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.H-1a and 4.H1b incorporate requirements for preparation and implementation of a SWPPP in relation to hydrology impacts of proposed site development. As a result, the City Council found that GP-1-18 would not have a substantial adverse effect related to soil erosion and impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Construction activities associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be required to implement best management practices (BMPs) to minimize the potential for erosion. Such BMPs would be subject to Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.H-1a and 4.H1b which requires BMPs to be specified in a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) in accordance with the NPDES General Construction Permit and the City of Brisbane's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit Order No. 2011-0083 Provision C.3.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

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

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

The Program EIR stated that settlement would occur in the former landfill, as well as in the overlying non-engineered fill and in natural deposits (Young Bay Mud, Old Bay Mud, etc.). Settlement within the Baylands (in both the short and long term) was expected to vary across the site due to variances in thickness of various soil types and differing properties of these soil types. Fill placed within the Baylands as part of site grading and development would increase total surface settlement. Consolidation of Bay Mud and tidal flat deposits and non-engineered artificial fill beneath engineered fills could also be associated with differential settlement across the Baylands, adversely affecting long-term durability and maintenance requirements of roadways and underground utilities.

While existing studies were determined to be adequate for the programmatic level of analysis set forth in the Program EIR, the City Council found that detailed site-specific geotechnical characterization and engineering analysis would be required to determine the composition and thicknesses of undocumented, non-engineered fills and underlying tidal deposits and to evaluate the settlement potential across the entire Baylands. Considering its future development, differential settlement of the landfill surface will require detailed site-specific engineering analysis and design for site-specific development projects within the Baylands. As part of site-specific, design-level geotechnical reports, analyses of the depth, thickness, and liquefaction potential of saturated deposits will be required to provide necessary site-specific information on possible surface effects associated with earthquake-induced settlement. These effects, if calculated to be a potential hazard, would be mitigated as part of the final site design and geotechnical engineering. Engineering design to reduce differential settlement could include pile foundations for structures up to 110 feet deep. The surface of the Baylands, which includes landscaping, roads, structures, and utilities, would continue to settle as the soil

compacts. Such settlement could damage improvements and/or change drainage if not engineered appropriately. Any geotechnical approach to reducing the potential for settlement would be in accordance with building code requirements and subject to review and approval by the City Engineer prior to issuance of a building permit.

Although preliminary ground settlement estimates are provided in the Program EIR, the Program EIR that precise site-specific ground settlement calculations cannot be determined until detailed grading plans and site plans for site-specific development are available. Because it is known that some degree of ground settlement would occur, a significant impact would result, requiring mitigation.

The City Council found that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a, which requires all structures to be designed and constructed in conformance with the most recently adopted California Building Code requirements, including its performance standards for building design in areas undergoing compaction, and that all final site-specific design and engineering plans be prepared by a licensed geotechnical engineer and subject to review and approval by the City Engineer to confirm that site-specific development meets all applicable performance standards, would protect future structures from ground settlement. As a result, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to less than significant.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

All construction associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would implement the requirements of site-specific geologic/soils studies to ensure the safety of such facilities. Compliance with such requirements would avoid direct or indirect risks to life or property should any such facility be located in areas subject to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City Engineer would review the project design and confirm it addresses the recommendations set forth in site-specific geologic/soils analyses.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

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

#### *Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

Soil conditions within the Baylands vary considerably, and expansive soils may exist in some locations, particularly along Bayshore Boulevard, where Bay Mud is present beneath the surface. While it is known that expansive soils are present within the Baylands, site-specific

studies needed to comply with the most recently adopted California Building Code requirements for building design cannot be prepared until site-specific development plans are prepared along with final design and engineering plans. Thus, the Program EIR concluded this impact would be significant, requiring mitigation.

As required by Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a, a final site-specific design-level geotechnical report would address the potential for expansive soils on individual site-specific development sites within the Baylands to ensure that the performance standards set forth in the California Building Code are met. Development would be designed and constructed in accordance with requirements of the final site-specific design-level geotechnical reports including moisture content requirements along with design standards for expansion potential. Such reports would be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits. Characterization of the potential for expansive soil within the Baylands in accordance with contemporary geotechnical practices and building code requirements is required prior to issuance of building permits.

Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a requires site-specific evaluation of the potential for expansive soils and prevention of the placement of expansive fill materials to define the site-specific design solutions needed to address impacts related to expansive soils. The City Council concluded that implementation of these site-specific design solutions would be required as part grading and building permits issued by the City, that GP-1-18 would not have a substantial adverse effect in relation to expansive soils, and that impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

All construction associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be subject to Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a and would implement the requirements of site-specific geologic/soils studies to ensure the safety of such facilities should any such facility be proposed in areas subject to expansive soil. Compliance with the requirements of site-specific geologic/soils studies would avoid direct or indirect risks to life or property.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.



- e) *Would the proposed project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

*Program EIR Finding: No Impact*

Wastewater services within the Baylands are currently provided by the Bayshore Sanitary District (BSD) in the area north of the Lagoon. No development within the Baylands would include the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would therefore result.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not generate the need for wastewater disposal. Therefore, no impact would result.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

- f) *Would the proposed project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

*Program EIR Finding: No Impact*

No known paleontological resources or unique geologic features are located within the Baylands, nor is the site geologically sensitive for paleontological resources. Even with the magnitude (substantial depth, extent, and volume) of proposed earthwork that would occur as part of site grading and building construction, including deep-driven piles into older bay muds, it is unlikely unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features would be encountered. Thus, the City Council found that no impacts would result from GP-1-18.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Because (1) there are no known paleontological resources or unique geologic features within or adjacent to the Baylands, nor is area site geologically sensitive for paleontological resources and (2) previous construction of transportation improvements within existing roadway rights-of-way required substantial disturbance of soils, it is unlikely that a unique paleontological resource would be found within or adjacent to roadway rights-of-way. With the possible exception of footings for any pedestrian/bicycle bridge overcrossing that may be proposed in

the future, transportation improvement associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not require ground-disturbing activities at a sufficient depth so as to disturb any previously unknown paleontological resource.

In the event a previously unknown paleontological resources would be encountered during construction, all construction activities will be halted or redirected to provide for a qualified paleontologist to assess the find for significance and, if necessary, develop a paleontological resources impact mitigation plan (PRIMP) for the review and approval by the City prior to resuming construction activities.

Thus, destruction of a unique paleontological resource would not result.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in new significant impacts.

### *References*

---

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), *Earthquake Hazard Maps for Brisbane*, 2013. [www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/pickcity.html](http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/pickcity.html). Accessed April 26, 2019.

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2016. *Web Soil Survey*: <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>. Accessed April 26, 2019.

**A.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the proposed project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

Annual GHG emissions from the DSP and DSP-V scenarios were determined in the Program EIR to be 3.6 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population, which is below BAAQMD’s “efficiency threshold” of 4.6 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population. Because development permitted by GP-1-18 would have roughly the same proportion of commercial and residential uses as does the DSP scenario, the City Council found that per service population GHG emissions resulting from GP-1-18 would be roughly equivalent, and a less-than-significant impact would result.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane’s Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would result in multi-modal mobility improvements by reducing delay at intersections, providing for enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities, improving access to transit, and improving traffic flow along Bayshore Boulevard. Together, these improvements would reduce fuel consumption and associated vehicular greenhouse gas emissions compared to existing conditions by reducing the idling time of vehicles waiting to pass through intersections and shifting some vehicular travel to transit and non-motorized transportation modes.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*b) Would the proposed project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

---

The Program EIR determined that Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would be consistent with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions since it has roughly the same proportion of commercial and residential uses as does the DSP scenario and would result in less-than-significant impacts related to GHG emissions. The City Council therefore found that GP-1-18 result in less than significant impacts.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

By enhancing multi-modal mobility, proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards will improve the fuel efficiency of Brisbane's transportation system and reduce vehicular greenhouse gas emissions. This will be accomplished by reducing the idling time of vehicles waiting to pass through intersections and shifting some vehicular travel to transit and non-motorized transportation modes. Such improvements are consistent with and would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, and regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*References*

---

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017 *Clean Air Plan, Spare the Air – Cool the Climate*, Available: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/air-quality-plans/current-plans>  
 Accessed: May 1, 2019.

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

**A.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area due to operation of an airport with an airport land use plan or due to operation of a public or public use airport within two miles of the project site that does not have an airport land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) <i>Would the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i>				

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures (Construction), Less than Significant (Operations)*

**Construction.** Per Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.G-2a through 4.G-2d, construction activities would not commence until site remediation and Title 27 landfill closure plans are approved and completed. Because site grading and remediation will be intertwined, only grading required for approved remediation activities would be permitted prior to completion of remediation. Following site remediation, construction activities would require the use and transportation of common hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, cement products, lubricants, paints, adhesives, and solvents).

Construction contractor’s compliance with federal, state and local requirements related to use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction would reduce impacts related to inadvertent release of hazardous materials to less-than-significant levels. In addition to implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.G-2a through 4.G-2d, compliance with applicable federal (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, 29 CFR 1926.65 Appendix C requirements for construction activities), state, and local requirements related to the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials, including preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.H-1a would be required. As a result, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to less than significant.

**Operations.** Nearly all proposed uses permitted by GP-1-18 would involve the presence of hazardous materials (or products containing hazardous materials) to varying degrees,

representing an increase in hazardous materials use and the number of people exposed to potential health and safety risks associated with routine use. Hazardous materials would routinely be transported to, from, and within the Baylands following site development, and small amounts of hazardous waste would be removed and transported off site to licensed disposal facilities. While the types of land uses permitted by GP-1-18 within the Baylands are known, the specific businesses and their particular operations could not be known. The Program EIR concluded, however, that it was reasonable to anticipate Baylands development would include uses that involve some degree of hazardous materials use, and that there would be an increase in transportation relative to current conditions. Such transportation would be provided by vendors licensed for such transport, and appropriate documentation for all hazardous materials and wastes would be required for compliance with the existing hazardous materials regulations.

Buildings where commercial and industrial businesses would use hazardous materials would be required to be constructed in accordance with current laws and regulations, which require storage that minimizes exposure to people or the environment, and the potential for inadvertent releases. In addition, these materials would be labeled to inform users of potential risks and to instruct them in appropriate storage, handling, and disposal procedures. Employers are required by law (Cal/OSHA) to ensure employee safety by properly identifying hazardous materials and adequately training workers. The use of hazardous materials and generation of wastes would continue to be regulated under the authority of the County Environmental Health Services Division, with additional oversight by other agencies (e.g., DTSC, RWQCB). Transporters of hazardous materials and wastes are required to comply with federal laws and regulations that are monitored and enforced by the California Highway Patrol. The San Mateo County Environmental Health Services Division would continue to conduct periodic inspections to ensure that hazardous materials and wastes are being used and stored properly.

With adherence to existing regulatory requirements, the City Council found that the impacts of GP-1-18 related to the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials (including radiological, hazardous and medical wastes) during operations would be less than significant.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

**Construction Impacts.** Construction associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would use toxic substances in the form of asphalt, paints, oils, solvents, and other common materials considered to be toxic or hazardous. In addition, fueling and servicing of construction equipment would introduce toxic substances to construction sites. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and all storage, handling, use, and disposal of these materials is regulated by the San Mateo County Environmental Health Division, which provides regulatory oversight for federal, state, and local laws and regulations related to hazardous materials use and disposal within Brisbane. Thus, no new significant impacts would result.

**Operations Impacts.** Existing conditions along Bayshore Boulevard and at freeway interchanges include some trucks and service vehicles transporting various toxic substances. By reducing delay at intersections, providing for smoother traffic flow, and improving mobility within Brisbane, proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would decrease hazards associated with the routine transport of hazardous materials through the City.

Hazardous materials and toxic substances are highly regulated at the federal, state, and local levels. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal laws that regulate, control, or otherwise address hazardous waste, transport, disposal, or clean-up would ensure that modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would result in a less than significant impact.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*b) Would the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

**Construction Impacts.** Baylands development and construction activities, including demolition and remediation activities, will require disturbance of subsurface soils and groundwater, which could result in an accidental release of toxic materials. Remediation of contamination within the former Southern Pacific railyard and Title 27 closure of the former Brisbane Landfill as ultimately approved by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region (RWQCB) are required by law to be designed to both (1) effectively remediate contaminated soils and groundwater and (2) protect the environment and health of workers during remediation. Additionally, given the age of existing onsite buildings, hazardous materials such as asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint are likely to be encountered during demolition of structures. Hazardous materials may also be encountered during Baylands construction activities following remediation.

While the City of Brisbane does not have the authority to set remediation standards, approve Remedial Action Plans (RAPs) or plans for Title 27 landfill closure, or to impose the specific technologies to be employed for site remediation or landfill closure, the Program EIR explicitly recognized the City's land use authority over the Baylands. In exercising this authority, GP-1-18 requires that any residential development within the Baylands "be designed to accommodate ground level residential uses and residential-supportive uses such as daycare, parks, schools,



and playgrounds.” This land use standard, which is necessary to provide for appropriate design of residential uses and enhance the quality of life for future residents of the Baylands, also ensures that site remediation for residential use will be to residential standards found to be acceptable to the City of Brisbane.

Based on (1) the recognized purposes of characterization studies to date<sup>3</sup>, (2) the programmatic nature of the Baylands EIR, (3) CEQA’s requirements for subsequent environmental review of subsequent discretionary actions following GP-1-18 (including a single specific plan for the Baylands for which an EIR would be prepared), and (4) the planning and remediation review processes that must be undertaken prior to physical development of the Baylands, the Program EIR concluded:

- The characterization studies available for use in the Program EIR were adequate for the purpose of describing existing conditions.
- The studies completed to date have not identified contaminants or concentrations of contamination that would indicate the Baylands is inappropriate for land development subsequent to completion of landfill closure and site remediation under the regulatory authority of the RWQCB and DTSC.
- As part of that review process, the RWQCB and DTSC will review human health risks and risk-based remediation goals.
- San Mateo County Environmental Health and the RWQCB will review and approve Title 27 landfill closure design.

Because (1) neither DTSC nor the RWQCB had completed their review of characterization studies and determined them to be adequate for use in preparation of remedial action and Title 27 landfill closure plans; (2) human health risk assessments had not been prepared; (3) final remedial action and Title 27 landfill closure plans had yet to be prepared; and (4) the remedial action and Title 27 landfill closure plan process had yet to undergo public review, the City Council determined that adequate information regarding site remediation and Title 27 landfill closure did not yet exist to support approval of a specific plan for the Baylands. As a result, Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.G-2a requires preparation, review, and approval of closure and site remediation plans to be completed to the satisfaction of the RWQCB and DTSC *prior to* adoption of a specific plan for the Baylands.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Program EIR noted that the purpose of previous studies to characterize waste in the former landfill were (1) to address the potential for constituents within the landfill to contaminate groundwater or migrate offsite, (2) to identify potential pathways of exposure, and (3) to ultimately provide a basis for designing the required landfill cap, along with a leachate control system to prevent any increases in leachate that would exceed any regulatory thresholds, and a landfill gas collection and control system. The Program EIR also noted that the purpose of previous studies conducted to characterize the contaminants within the former rail yard (OU-1 and OU-2) were to provide a basis for analysis of human health risks for any future land uses that may be approved by the City of Brisbane.

The City Council's finding regarding the adequacy of existing hazardous materials studies for use in the Baylands EIR addressed only their use in the programmatic EIR for General Plan-level land uses. It did not forestall a requirement for additional characterization studies as part of the landfill closure and remediation review and approval process, not did it preclude the City from re-evaluating land uses decisions in any forthcoming specific plan based on finalized risk assessments and approved remedial action plans.

The Program EIR concluded that compliance with federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to the handling and disposal of hazardous waste, including preparation and implementation of a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan and a Master Deconstruction and Demolition Plan, along with confirmation that DTSC, the RWQCB, and the San Mateo County Environmental Health Services Division as the Local Enforcement Agency, as applicable, have completed approved Remedial Action Plans and Title 27 landfill closure plans, hazards to the public through foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The City Council found that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.G-2a, (confirm achievement of remediation goals), 4.G-2b (implement a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan), 4.G-2c (Master Deconstruction and Demolition Plan), and 4.G-2d (prepare a spill pollution prevention plan), along with compliance with federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to the handling and disposal of hazardous waste would reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Operational Impacts.** Businesses locating within the Baylands would use hazardous chemicals that are common in commercial/retail/office settings, such as toners, paints, lubricants, and kitchen and restroom cleaners as well as relatively small quantities of fuels, oils, and other petroleum-based products. Industrial uses could include storage, transport, handling, and disposal of larger quantities of hazardous materials. As required by the San Mateo County Environmental Health Services as the Certified Unified Program Agency, any businesses that would store hazardous materials and/or waste at its business site would be required to submit business information and hazardous materials inventory forms. In addition, the City requires all new commercial and other users to follow applicable regulations and guidelines regarding storage and handling of hazardous waste. All hazardous materials are required to be stored and handled according to manufacturer's directions and local, state and federal regulations, noted above. The North County Fire Authority administers the California Fire Code for the Baylands through regular site inspections to ensure hazardous materials are stored and handled properly.

Implementation of Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.G-2e (preparation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan) is required to avoid the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials in the environment during operational phases of the development scenarios. In addition, the Program EIR concluded that existing regulatory

requirements and hazardous materials management of the Kinder Morgan Bulk Terminal facility reduce the potential for adverse effects from upset and accident conditions to less than significant levels. California Government Code Section 4216 also requires that:

- Delineation of proposed excavation sites be delineated with water soluble or chalk based white paint on paved surfaces or with other suitable markings such as flags or stakes on unpaved areas.
- Dig Alert be called at least 2 full working days prior to digging.
- No excavation may proceed without a Dig Alert ticket number.

*Soil Gas and Vapor Intrusion.* Accumulation of landfill gases within confined spaces such as underground structures, basements, or utility vaults can lead to explosive conditions due to high levels of methane within landfill gases, which are typically composed primarily of methane and carbon dioxide. Depending on the composition of landfill waste, landfill gases may also contain non-methane organic compounds, such as TCE, benzene, and vinyl chloride. Soil gas and vapor intrusion from legacy contamination represent a significant impact. Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.G-2f through 4.G-2h would be required to avoid a significant impact and reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

*Former Police Shooting Range.* The southerly slope of Icehouse Hill was previously used as a police shooting range, and has lead remaining from the leftover shells. Development of trails along the southerly slope of Icehouse Hill could expose the public to health hazards from those spent shells, which represents a significant impact requiring mitigation. Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.G-2i requires implementation of best management practices for lead removal consistent with United States Environmental Protection Agency Circular EPA-902-B-01-001, *Best Management Practices for Lead at Outdoor Shooting Ranges*, Revised June 2005. Thus, the City Council found that lead hazard impacts from remaining spent shells from the former police shooting range would be reduced to less than significant.

*Bayshore Industrial Park.* The Bayshore Industrial Park consists of a series of metal buildings used for various industrial and service commercial purposes, such as warehousing/storage and auto repair.

Based on the age of buildings within the Bayshore Industrial Park, there is a potential for the presence of asbestos and lead-based paint, as well as the potential for ground contamination undetected as part of previous studies within OU-2. GP-1-18. Provides for demolition of the Bayshore Industrial Park to make way for new uses. Such demolition could result in the introduction of asbestos and lead-based paint, as well as potential other contaminants in the soils into the environment which represents a significant impact requiring mitigation.

Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.G-2j sets forth requirements to address hazards from potential contamination within the Bayshore Industrial Park, including testing for and

remediation of tested for asbestos and lead-based paints should either be present. Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.G-2k sets forth requirements for testing of soils within the Bayshore Industrial Park and remediation to risk-based remediation standards for the uses permitted in that area should contamination be present. The City Council found that impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

**Construction Impacts.** While the routine use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials in accordance with applicable regulations during construction activities as discussed in Impact 2.3.9(a), above, would not pose health risks or result in significant impacts, improper use, storage, transportation and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes could result in accidental spills or releases, posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment.

Grading for and construction of transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards may expose construction workers and the public to potentially unknown hazardous substances present in the soil. If any unidentified sources of contamination are encountered during grading or construction, the handling and removal activities required could pose health and safety risks to workers and the public. Soil, water, or air contamination could cause various short-term or long-term adverse health effects in persons exposed to the hazardous substances.

In addition, the potential exists for accidents along arterial roadways to involve trucks hauling hazardous materials or to result in the spill of hazardous materials such as gasoline.

The use of BMPs during construction, implemented as part of a SWPPP as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit, would minimize potential adverse effects on the general public and the environment. Construction contract specifications would include strict on-site handling rules to keep construction and maintenance materials out of groundwater and soils. BMPs include but are not limited to:

- Establishing a dedicated area for fuel storage and refueling activities that includes secondary containment protection measures and spill control supplies;
- Following manufacturers' recommendations on the use, storage, and disposal of chemical products used in construction;
- Avoiding overtopping construction equipment fuel tanks;
- Properly containing and removing grease and oils during routine maintenance of equipment; and
- Properly disposing of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals.

Thus, no new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

**Operations Impacts.** Multi-modal transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan Los standards would not any create new routes for hauling of hazardous materials or expose additional lands to risks associated with risk of upset on roadways. Trucks hauling hazardous materials would continue to be operated in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations regarding hazardous substance transport.

The U.S. Department of Transportation regulates transportation of hazardous materials by truck and governs every aspect of the movement of hazardous materials from packaging, to labeling and shipping. The California Office of Emergency Services administers a statewide Emergency Response Plan to respond to hazardous materials incidents that may occur. Additionally, the North County Fire Authority and San Mateo County Health System maintain capabilities for responding to hazardous materials spill incidents. Overall, the multi-modal transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards will improve road safety, thereby reducing the potential for accidents related to hazardous materials to less than significant.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*c) Would the proposed project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

Because the GP-1-18 would permit 1,800 to 2,200 dwelling units, approximately 365 to 445 elementary and middle school children could be expected to reside within the Baylands at buildout. While it is possible that site development could include an elementary school, such determination was not been made as part of the General Plan Amendment or Program EIR.

Baylands development would entail the storage, handling, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials in association with the research and development (R&D), institutional, and commercial uses. Examples of common hazardous materials could include fuels, oils, lubricants, paints, cleaning chemicals, and other petroleum products.

As discussed under in the Program EIR and required by Mitigation Measure 4.G-2e, all new Baylands development would be required to follow applicable regulations and guidelines regarding storage and handling of hazardous waste. All hazardous materials would be required to be stored and handled according to manufacturer's directions and local, state, and federal regulations. These requirements would include posting of signs, notification of the local fire

department, filing of the Hazardous Materials Business Plan, and use of specialized containment facilities.

In the event a school were constructed in proximity to industrial uses, the potential for accidental spillage or leakage of hazardous materials stored onsite to impact school children would exist, resulting in a significant impact and requiring mitigation.

The City Council found that in addition to mandatory adherence to City and County requirements, compliance with the requirements of CCR Title 5, Section 14010, Standards for School Site Construction and California Department of Education School Facilities Planning Division as overseen by DTSC further ensures that hazardous materials impacts on proposed schools would be less than significant. With implementation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan, as required by Mitigation Measure 4.G-2e, and siting requirements for proposed schools, as specified by Mitigation Measure 4.G-3, the City Council found that GP-1-18 would not have a substantial adverse effect related to hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school, and impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not place any use that emits hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*d) Would the proposed project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

The Baylands includes a number of different sites that are listed on hazardous materials databases pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 including the former Brisbane Landfill, OU-1 (now referred to as OU-SM) and OU-2, and the Schlage Lock facility. These sites have a long history of environmental investigation and cleanup efforts with additional remediation activities to be undertaken prior to site development. These sites are actively overseen by regulatory agencies (DTSC and RWQCB) to ensure that all remediation is completed to levels

that protect human health and the environment. This impact would be significant and require mitigation.

The City Council found that implementation of Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.H-1a and 4.H-1b would reduce the impacts of GP-1-18 to a less-than-significant level in relation to a site located on a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code §65962.5.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

None of the City's existing transportation facilities are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, although the Geneva Avenue extension is within the Baylands, which is listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code §65962.5. Pursuant to the requirements of GP-1-18 and Measure JJ, remediation of OU-1 (now referred to as OU-SM) and OU-2, along with Title 27 closure of the former landfill within the Baylands must occur prior to Baylands development. As a result, remediation and Title 27 landfill closure would be completed prior to construction of the Geneva Avenue extension.

In addition, it is possible that future modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor could extend onto a property included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5.

Prior to final selection of the location for any improvement project, the City will consult known databases of contaminated sites and undertake a standard Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. If contamination is found, the City will either identify an alternative location or design for the improvement or ensure appropriate remediation is completed prior to the start of construction activities.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*e) For a proposed project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the proposed project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

*Program EIR Finding: No Impact*

The Baylands is located more than 2 miles from the nearest public airport, the San Francisco International Airport, or airstrip, and is not located within an airport land use plan. The City Council thus found that GP-1-18 would not conflict with an airport land use plan nor present any other impact related to a public airport use or private airstrip.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

All improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be located more than two miles from the nearest public use airport and the San Francisco International and would not be located within an airport land use plan. No impact would therefore result.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*f) Would the proposed project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

The Program EIR determined that City review of the required Specific Plan and site-specific development and emergency response requirements are sufficient to ensure that the potential significant health and safety effects associated with possible impairment or implementation of any emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant. By reducing overall development intensity within the Baylands, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would remain less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would facilitate implementation of emergency response and energy evacuation plans by enhancing mobility within Brisbane and minimizing congestion along Bayshore Boulevard, facilitating access to and from the freeway, and providing alternatives to vehicular travel during an emergency.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*g) Would the proposed project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

The Baylands is located in an urban setting, has been developed with urban uses in the past, and does not adjoin any wildlands that are at risk for wildfires. All Baylands development would be required to adhere to applicable fire and building codes, which provide appropriate safety measures that would be incorporated into all building designs. The Program EIR therefore concluded that impacts would be less than significant.



*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would occur within urban and suburban settings that are not generally subject to wildland fires. Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not extend the City's transportation system to new areas where woodland, shrub, or grassland vegetative communities might present a wildland fire hazard. Revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not, therefore, directly or indirectly cause a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*References*

---

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2007. ENVIROSTOR Database. Available: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed April 30, 2019.

**A.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) <i>Would the proposed project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?</i>				

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

**Construction Impacts.** Construction and grading within the Baylands would require temporary disturbance of surface soils during which grading, excavation, and remediation activities soil would be exposed to runoff, causing erosion and entrainment of sediment and contaminants in the runoff. Soil stockpiles and excavated areas would be exposed to runoff until grading, excavation, and remediation activities are completed and ground cover (landscaping, hardscape, paving, buildings) is established. The potential for chemical releases is present at most construction sites given the types of materials used, including fuels, oils, paints, and solvents. Because of contaminants within surface soils, erosion could also result in release of those contaminants. Once released, these substances could be transported to the Bay in stormwater runoff, causing an incremental reduction in water quality. The proximity of the Baylands to the Bay reduces the chances that the pollutants in stormwater runoff (e.g., sediment, petroleum hydrocarbons, and lubricants) would be naturally attenuated prior to discharge to the Bay.

Groundwater beneath various portions of the Baylands, including the former landfill and railyards (OU-1 and OU-2) contains certain pollutants at concentrations above regulatory action levels. In addition, the Recology site and Schlage Lock site located north of the Baylands are also undergoing active groundwater remediation. While the groundwater is being actively remediated, the extracted groundwater could contain constituents above action levels that, without proper handling procedures, could expose workers to adverse effects or reach

downstream natural waters. The Program EIR thus concluded that water quality degradation could occur, and construction impacts would be significant, requiring Mitigation.

All dewatering activities would be subject to site-specific NPDES permit requirements that prohibit discharge of contaminated groundwater. In addition, General Construction permit requirements also contain measures to protect water quality. The City Council found that implementation of these mandatory measures as required by Mitigation Measures 4.H-1a and 4.H-1b would be adequate to ensure that construction within the Baylands would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. As a result, the City Council concluded that mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**Operations Impacts.** The Program EIR determined that sedimentation would not be significant during post-construction and ongoing operations within the Baylands because most of the site would be paved or landscaped, which would stabilize soils for the long term. However, the increased amount of impervious surfaces within the Baylands would increase stormwater runoff generation and flows. In addition, Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would result in greater vehicular use of new and existing nearby roadways, which would lead to the accumulation and release of petroleum hydrocarbons, lubricants, sediments, and metals (generated by the wear of automobile parts). The management of landscaped areas would result in runoff containing common urban pollutants such as herbicides and pesticides discharging to the Bay or infiltrating into groundwater. Therefore, after construction and during ongoing operations, nonpoint source pollutants would be washed by rainwater from rooftops and landscaped areas into onsite and local drainage networks. Nonpoint source pollutants in runoff that reaches San Francisco Bay would result in a significant impact, requiring mitigation.

To reduce impacts, the City Council found that stormwater control/Limited Impact Development (LID) measures to reduce runoff and mimic a site's pre-development hydrology by minimizing disturbed areas and impervious cover and then infiltrating, storing, detaining, evapotranspiring, and/or biotreating stormwater runoff close to its source would be required as standard conditions of approval for Tentative Subdivision Map(s) and building permit application submittals within the Baylands, along with compliance with RWQCB Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit Order No. R2-2015-0049 Provision C.3 (Provision C.3). In addition to these requirements, the City Council found that implementation of Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.H-1c would avoid the significant impact of water quality violations and reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

**Construction Impacts.** BMPs will be implemented during construction associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards as part of a SWPPP as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit and Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.H-1c to minimize potential adverse effects to surface or groundwater

quality. Construction contract specifications and permit approvals would be required to include strict on-site handling rules to keep construction and maintenance materials out of groundwater and soils. Construction BMPs would include but not be limited to:

- Establishing a dedicated area for fuel storage and refueling activities that includes secondary containment protection measures and spill control supplies;
- Following manufacturers' recommendations on the use, storage, and disposal of chemical products used in construction;
- Avoiding overtopping construction equipment fuel tanks;
- Properly containing and removing grease and oils during routine maintenance of equipment; and
- Properly disposing of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals.

**Operations Impacts.** Transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would result in only a very minor increase in the amount of impervious surface area compared to the amount of impervious surface area that would occur as the result of development permitted by GP-1-18 (1,800 to 2,200 dwelling units, 7.0 million square feet of non-residential building area, and associated roadways) and was analyzed in the Program EIR. Any increase in stormwater runoff generation and flows and any increase in deposition of pollutants on areas roadways would therefore also be very minor in comparison to GP-1-18. In addition, transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be subject to Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.H-1c, which would minimize potential adverse effects to surface or groundwater quality.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*b) Would the proposed project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable management of the basin?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

The Program EIR determined that Baylands development would substantially increase impervious surface area, even with the implementation of LID stormwater drainage improvements allowing for some onsite infiltration. Thus, the amount of direct groundwater recharge within the Baylands would be reduced due to the reduced amount of area available for infiltration. However, groundwater is not currently used within the Baylands, and no groundwater use is proposed. There are also no downstream users of groundwater because the Baylands is adjacent to Brisbane Lagoon and San Francisco Bay. As such, the Program EIR concluded that even if groundwater levels were to be reduced, no potential groundwater uses

or users that would be affected. In addition, Title 27 closure of the former landfill will require that infiltration is minimized to the maximum extent possible in order to prevent accumulation of leachate within the underlying waste material. Therefore, the City Council found that development permitted by GP-1-18 would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge and the impact would be less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

While transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would require water during construction and could result in minor increases in impervious surface area leading to reduction in groundwater recharge, because groundwater is not used in Brisbane as a potable water source, no groundwater uses, or users would be affected.

Water use for construction purposes would be temporary in nature and only small areas would require watering during construction. Any increase in impervious surface area associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be minor and would occur primarily within or adjacent to existing roadway rights of way which are already paved or developed. Thus, proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not use water or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*c) Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:*

*i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

**Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant (Alteration of Drainage Patterns) Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures (Erosion or Siltation)**

**Changes to Existing Drainage Patterns.** Baylands development would collect and convey onsite runoff through a modified storm drainage system that would be constructed in accordance with the City's requirements and regional MS4 NPDES permit requirements to accommodate the increase in runoff due to the net addition of impervious area and changes to existing drainage patterns. Since the developed site would consist of ground covered either by paved areas, building, or landscape that is subject to post-construction drainage control requirements that minimize erosion, impacts would be less than significant.

**Impacts from Construction and Grading.** Baylands development involves construction and grading activities that would result in exposure of disturbed surface soils to runoff, potentially causing erosion and entrainment of sediment into natural water bodies including Visitation Creek during site remediation and day-lighting of the creek channel to accommodate anticipated sea level rise. Soil stockpiles and excavated areas on the Baylands would be exposed to runoff and, if not managed properly, runoff could cause erosion and increased sedimentation and pollutants in stormwater and waters that drain to natural water bodies.

The City Council found that, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.H-1a (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) would reduce impacts associated with GP-1-18 to less than significant.

**Impacts on Visitation Creek.** The Program EIR determined that Baylands development would not alter the actual existing course (location) of Visitation Creek east of the railroad right-of-way but would daylight the currently subsurface portion of the creek from the railroad right-of-way to the Roundhouse. This design would accommodate the 100-year design storm event incorporating anticipated changes to tidal flow considering the estimated sea level rise which is anticipated to occur over the next century. Creek enhancements could cause erosion of creek banks during construction if not implemented correctly, resulting in a significant impact.

The City Council found that, while creek enhancements could cause erosion of creek banks during construction if not implemented correctly, design and construction activities associated with GP-1-18 would be subject to specific standards contained in BMPs required for site grading as well as the standards established by the City's Municipal Code that are designed to protect watercourses and riparian areas. With implementation of appropriate construction and operation-related BMPs (as required in Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.H-1a and 4.C-1g), regulatory agency's post-construction re-vegetation requirements (as required in Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a through 4.C-2c), and habitat restoration requirements, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to less than significant.

### **Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards**

Construction activities associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be required to comply with regulatory standards including implement best management practices (BMPs) and Program EIR mitigation measures designed to minimize the potential for erosion. BMPs would be specified in a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) in accordance with the NPDES General Construction Permit and the City of Brisbane's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit Order No. 2011-0083 Provision C.3.

Because transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would (1) not alter any stream course, (1) affect a much smaller area than that analyzed in the Program EIR, and (1) be subject to NPDES and Program EIR mitigation requirements, no new significant impact would result.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

**Program EIR Finding: Less than significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures**

The Program EIR determined that Baylands development would add a substantial amount of new impervious area to the site that would reduce the rate of infiltration of precipitation and increase the amount of runoff generated during a rain event. Thus, if not properly designed, development would exacerbate existing flooding onsite and offsite.

To minimize flooding impacts, drainage design plans for development permitted by GP-1-18 would include systemwide drainage improvements that accommodate all increased runoff in accordance with City Storm Drain Master Plan requirements and would correct known existing deficiencies including the Levinson Overflow Area and the existing Brick Arch Sewer system. Conceptual drainage design plans would be developed as part of the required specific plan for the Baylands. The potential to increase runoff from the site such that development might exacerbate existing flooding onsite and offsite would be a significant impact, requiring mitigation.

The City Council found that the performance standards established by Mitigation Measures 4.H-4a, 4.H-4b, and 4.H-4c would ensure future development would not cause or exacerbate onsite or offsite flooding. Impacts. As a result, GP-1-18 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane’s Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards**

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension could increase the size of impervious surface areas leading to increased runoff, that might exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems. Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be subject to the performance standards established by Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.H-4a, 4.H-4b, and 4.H-4c. Thus, any needed drainage improvements would be constructed concurrent with transportation improvements and impacts would be less than significant.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.



*iii. Create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

---

**Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures**

**Exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems.** The Program EIR noted that capacity of the existing stormwater system within and adjacent to the Baylands, specifically the Brick Arch Sewer, Visitacion Creek, Timber Box Culvert, and Bayshore Boulevard drainage system, is currently exceeded during large storm events in which runoff floods low-lying areas of the Bayshore Drainage Area including areas of the Baylands. New development within the Baylands would exacerbate flooding conditions during large storm events, and substantial improvements would be required to accommodate the 100-year peak storm event within drainage systems and streets with tidal flow and 100 years of estimated sea level rise.

The Program EIR requires Baylands development to upgrade the existing storm drainage system to safely convey the 25-year storm event entirely within the piping system and accommodate the 100-year peak storm event within the piping system and streets such that building finished floor elevations provide a minimum of 1-foot of freeboard above the 100-year storm event hydraulic grade line water elevation with tidal flow and 100 years of estimated sea level rise. Additionally, Mitigation Measure 4.H-1c requires a Final Stormwater Management Plan to be prepared and submitted to the City for approval prior to the submittal of any grading permits to meet the aforementioned drainage criteria. Mitigation Measures 4.H-4a, 4.H-4b, and 4.H-4c also require improvements of currently undersized or inadequate facilities to meet these performance standards. Baylands development also would be required to demonstrate compliance with the performance standards set forth in EIR mitigation measures, as well as compliance with existing City of Brisbane stormwater regulations and policies and applicable Municipal Storm Water NPDES Permit requirements. As a result, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Polluted runoff.** Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would introduce new impervious surfaces that would be a source of new stormwater runoff pollutants typical of urban settings, such as pollutants associated with automobiles (rubber residue from tires, oil, grease, gasoline, metals and other automotive fuels), which, if not managed appropriately, would violate water quality standards. The management of landscaped areas would also present the potential for runoff and/or infiltration of herbicides and pesticides. These types of common urban pollutants could be transported in runoff to the Bay or infiltrate into groundwater. Discharge of source pollutants to the Bay could further impair the water quality of the Bay and would be considered a significant impact. The creation of new impervious surfaces that would increase stormwater runoff volumes and present potential sources of polluted runoff would constitute a significant impact.

The Program EIR concluded that existing local stormwater management plans and policies, and State Water Board requirements, which implement Clean Water Act requirements, would minimize the creation of pollution-generating surfaces. Clean Water Act Section 402 NPDES MS4 permits require stormwater management plans, which in turn require source and treatment control measures. NPDES MS4 requirements include measures to reduce the severity of impacts by requiring stormwater drainage control/ LID design measures that are in compliance with RWQCB Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit Order No. R2-2015-0049 Provision C.3. Baylands development would be required to comply with Provision C.3 of NPDES Permit No. CAS612008 and would include operational BMPs such as LID measures to minimize the potential impact from polluted stormwater runoff.

The City Council found that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.H-1c, 4.H-4a, 4.H-4b, 4.H-4c, and 4H-5 would minimize potential sources of pollution and reduce the impacts of GP-1-18 to less than significant.

### **Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane’s Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards**

**Exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems.** Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not extend the City’s transportation system to new areas outside of the Baylands and would result in only minor increases impervious surface area, thereby resulting in minimal, if any, increased runoff. Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be subject to the performance standards and requirements of Mitigation Measures 4.H-4a, 4.H-4b, and 4.H-4c, which also require improvements of currently undersized or inadequate facilities within and adjacent to the Baylands to meet these performance standards.

**Polluted runoff.** Transportation improvements associated within proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would be subject to the requirements of Provision C.3 of NPDES Permit No. CAS612008 and would include operational BMPs such as LID measures to minimize the potential impact from polluted stormwater runoff. Such improvements would also be subject to Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.H-1c, 4.H-4a, 4.H-4b, 4.H-4c, and 4H-5 and would therefore minimize potential sources of pollution. Because proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would involve a much smaller surface area than was analyzed in the Program EIR and would be subject to the same regulatory and mitigation requirements being required of GP-1-18, impacts would be less than significant.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?*

---

**Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures**

GP-1-18 would allow construction of structures in areas that, under current topographic and infrastructure conditions, could become flooded during a 100-year storm event. However, the Program EIR requires Baylands development to upgrade the existing storm drainage system to safely convey the 25-year storm event entirely within the piping system and accommodate the 100-year peak storm event within the piping system and streets such that building finished floor elevations provide a minimum of 1-foot of freeboard above the 100-year storm event hydraulic grade line water elevation with tidal flow and 100 years of estimated sea level rise.

Additionally, Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.H-1c requires a Final Stormwater Management Plan to be prepared and submitted to the City for approval prior to the submittal of any grading permits to meet the aforementioned drainage criteria. Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.H-4a, 4.H-4b, and 4.H-4c also require improvements of currently undersized or inadequate facilities to meet these performance standards. Baylands development also would be required to demonstrate compliance with the performance standards set forth in EIR mitigation measures, as well as compliance with existing City of Brisbane stormwater regulations and policies and applicable Municipal Storm Water NPDES Permit requirements. As a result, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level

**Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards**

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension could increase impervious surface area leading to increased runoff. Multi-modal transportation improvements would occur at existing grades and would therefore not impede or redirect flood flows. Standard engineering design practice would prevent development of transportation facilities that would impede or redirect flood flows so as to cause upstream or downstream flood damage. Brisbane's City Engineer will review project designs and confirm that proposed construction projects associated with General Plan revisions implementing Mitigation Measure 4.I-1 minimize upstream and downstream flood potential.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the proposed project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: None*

---

The Program EIR was prepared pursuant to pre-2019 CEQA Guidelines that did not include this specific Appendix G issue. Thus, the Program EIR analyzed flooding, tsunami, and seiche hazards, but did not specifically address the potential release of pollutants due to inundation as the result of the occurrence of flooding or a tsunami or seiche. As discussed above, grading for site development within the Baylands, in combination with required drainage improvements would eliminate potential flooding hazards within the Baylands.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

The potential hazard related to tsunamis within San Francisco Bay has been analyzed in regional studies that show the South San Francisco USGS quadrant experiencing no inundation within the Beatty, Baylands or Sierra Point subareas, which are the three portions of Brisbane located adjacent to the Bay. In addition, the Beatty, Baylands and Sierra Point subareas were determined in the Program EIR to not be subject to flooding hazards due to wind-induced seiches primarily because the predominant wind direction is eastward. In addition, no seismically induced seiche waves have been documented in the Bay. Because site remediation, Title 27 landfill closure, and drainage improvements would be undertaken within the Baylands prior to any transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards, no impact would result.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*e) Would the proposed project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: None*

---

Because CEQA Guidelines Appendix G was modified to include this threshold as of January 2019, this specific threshold was not specifically addressed in the Program EIR. In its various analyses of water quality and groundwater, the Program EIR did not identify any instance where Baylands development would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

---

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Because construction of transportation improvements associated with would comply with all applicable provisions of the NPDES and related regulatory permits and would result in less than significant impacts, there would be no conflict with or obstructions for implementation of a water quality control plan. Also, because Brisbane does not rely on groundwater for potable or irrigation water supply, the minor consumption of water needed during construction and a minimal increase in impervious surface area associated within proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

---

*References*

---

- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), *Dam Failure Inundation Areas*. 1995.  
<http://resilience.abag.ca.gov/wp-content/documents/Map-Plates.pdf>. Accessed April 3, 2019.
- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), *Earthquake Hazard Maps for Brisbane*, 2013.  
[www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/pickcity.html](http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/pickcity.html). Accessed April 3, 2019.
- California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA), *Tsunami Inundation Areas for South San Francisco Quadrant*, June 15, 2009.
- California Geological Survey (CGS), *Tsunamis*, [www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/geologic\\_hazards/tsunami/pages/about\\_tsunamis.aspx](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/geologic_hazards/tsunami/pages/about_tsunamis.aspx), compiled in 2005. Accessed April 3, 2019.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), *Flood Insurance Rate Map for Brisbane California, Panel 0603140001B*.
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), *Fact Sheet for State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 97-03-DWQ National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000001 Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Industrial Activities Excluding Construction Activities*, 1997.
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), *Order No. 01-041 Waste Discharge Requirements and Rescission of Resolution 58-278 and Cleanup and Abatement Order 94-134*. 2001. Available: [http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/2001/R2-2001-041.pdf](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2/board_decisions/adopted_orders/2001/R2-2001-041.pdf). Accessed April 3, 2019.

**A.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING POLICY**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*a) Would the proposed project physically divide an established community?*

*Program EIR Finding: No Impact*

The Program EIR determined that proposed development would have no impacts related to division of an existing community, because the Baylands site sits along the edge of San Francisco Bay and is separated from lands to the west by Bayshore Boulevard, vegetated lands, and the office and light industrial buildings at Crocker Industrial Park; from lands to the north by the Recology facility; and from lands to the south by the Brisbane Lagoon. Thus, the City Council found that GP-1-18 would not physically divide or create a physical barrier to an established community because (1) the Baylands is already physically divided from the rest of the Brisbane community and surrounding lands; (2) there is no existing community within the Baylands; and (3) the Baylands is already divided by the Caltrain right-of-way.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane’s Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not increase the existing physical division between the Beatty, Baylands, and Sierra Point subareas and the rest of the City for the following reasons:

- Modifications to location and timing of traffic signals and spacing of intersections along Bayshore Boulevard would be designed so as to enhance mobility for Brisbane residents and businesses, thereby increasing community connectivity.
- Transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facility improvements will provide alternatives to the use of vehicular travel during peak travel times. Such facilities, combined with roadway intersection improvements and the Geneva Avenue extension, will enhance community connectivity.
- Street widening or modifications to intersection geometrics that would substantially increase the time needed for a pedestrian to cross Bayshore Boulevard are not proposed.

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards require preparation and implementation of Multi-Modal Mobility Plans for Bayshore Boulevard and the Geneva Avenue extension that would enhance mobility for Brisbane residents and businesses. Such improvements would include bicycle and pedestrian facilities and would increase connectivity of the Beatty, Baylands and Sierra Point subareas, as well as the Caltrain Bayshore Station with the rest of the City.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*b) Would the proposed project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

The City Council found that GP-1-18 would result in cumulative traffic impacts at intersections along Bayshore Boulevard that could be reduced but would still exceed applicable level of service standards included in the General Plan. The Program EIR traffic analysis demonstrated that these exceedances are attributable to background traffic growth generated by developments approved by the cities of San Francisco, Daly City, and South San Francisco that exceed the long-term traffic projections set forth in the 1994 Brisbane General Plan. As such, the City Council found that existing General Plan level of service standards for these intersections could not be achieved even in the absence of new development in the Baylands.

Recognizing that General Plan roadway level of service standards would be exceeded due to development in other cities even if no development within the Baylands occurred, Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.I-1 requires that General Plan LOS standards be revised “to reflect current traffic conditions; developments approved by the cities of San Francisco, Daly City, and South San Francisco that exceed long-term traffic projections set forth in the 1994 Brisbane General Plan; and the land use program approved in the Baylands General Plan Amendment.”

In adopting GP-1-18, the City Council found that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.I-1 would ensure that the land use program included in GP-1-18 would be consistent with General Plan LOS standards and would not have a substantial adverse effect. Impacts would thus be reduced to less than significant.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.I-1 requires that revisions to General Plan LOS standards be undertaken because future development outside Brisbane would cause the City's LOS standards to be exceeded at six intersections along Bayshore Boulevard and adjacent to the 101 freeway even in the absence of any development within the Baylands. Thus, the traffic congestion that would result from development projects consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element, including GP-1-18 would be inconsistent with General Plan Policy C.1 (LOS standards) due to traffic generated by development occurring outside of the City. Proposed revisions to the General Plan would resolve this potential inconsistency between the General Plan's Land Use Element and Circulation Element.

Although current CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 states that the effect of a land development project on automobile delay (e.g., exceeding a General Plan level of service standard) "shall not constitute a significant environmental impact," resolving the potential inconsistency between the Land Use and Circulation elements is nevertheless needed pursuant to California planning and zoning requirements that a community's General Plan be internally consistent.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

#### *References*

---

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

City of Brisbane, *The 1994 General Plan: City of Brisbane*, adopted June 21, 1994, as amended through July 2018. Available: <https://brisbaneca.org/general-plan> Accessed April 5, 2019.



**A.12 MINERAL RESOURCES**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>a) Would the proposed project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</i>				
<i>b) Would the proposed project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</i>				

*Program EIR Finding: No Impact*

The Baylands site is located in a developed urban area that has no known remaining mineral resources that could be commercially extracted. The California Geological Survey has classified lands within the San Francisco Bay Region into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) based on guidelines adopted by the California State Mining and Geology Board, as mandated by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1974. The Baylands site is mapped by the California Department of Mines and Geology as MRZ-1, an area where adequate information indicates a low likelihood of significant mineral resources. Therefore, the City Council found that GP-1-18 would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, and would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

---

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Because (1) the Bayshore Boulevard corridor, the Baylands, and intersections along the 101 freeway within Brisbane are mapped by the California Department of Mines and Geology as MRZ-1, areas with a low likelihood of significant mineral resources and (2) transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would only involve small locations immediately adjacent to existing roadway and freeway facilities, no impacts would result.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

---

*References*

---

California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey, SMARA Mineral Land Classification Data Portal, 2015. Available online:  
<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc>,  
Accessed October 2016.

City of Brisbane, *The 1994 General Plan: City of Brisbane*, adopted June 21, 1994, as amended through July 2018. Available: <https://brisbaneca.org/general-plan> Accessed April 5, 2019.

**A.13 NOISE AND VIBRATION**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
----------------	---	--------------------------------------	--	---

**Would the project result in:**

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip, public airport, or public use airport?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*a) Would the proposed project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

*Program EIR Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (Temporary Construction), Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures (Permanent Operations Impacts)*

**Temporary Construction Impacts.** Baylands construction activities would occur in multiple increments over many years and involve demolition, transport of soils, excavation, grading, trenching, paving, concrete work for foundations, and building erection.

Construction-related activities would temporarily increase ambient noise levels within and adjacent the Baylands over the duration of demolition, soils transport, excavation, grading, trenching, paving, concrete work for foundations, and building construction activities. The Program EIR determined that noise from these activities could affect residents of the Mission Blue Drive development, residents on San Francisco and Santa Clara Streets in Brisbane and

residents on Linda Vista Drive and MacDonald Street in Daly City, and residents on Desmond Street and in the Little Hollywood neighborhood in San Francisco.

The noisiest construction activity identified by the Program EIR was during pile driving, which would generate noise levels of approximately 90 to 105  $L_{eq}$  at 50 feet and up to 90  $L_{eq}$  at a distance of 200 feet. Excavation and exterior finishing would also generate a substantial amount of noise. For pile driving that may be necessary for mid- and high-rise office structures, the nearest sensitive land uses would be new housing in the northwestern portion of the Baylands that could be developed prior to mid- and high-rise offices, approximately 200 feet to the west, where intermittent pile-driving noise more than 10 dBA in excess of existing ambient levels and would exceed the 86-dBA City's construction noise standard. Pile-driving noise from construction would therefore be a significant impact. Offsite receptors located nearest construction areas requiring pile-driving under the DSP scenarios would be 1,500 feet to the north and exposed to lesser resultant noise levels of 74 dBA.

Several types of common construction equipment could exceed applicable noise standards when construction is within 75 feet of a sensitive receptor. Also, during nighttime, temporary construction-related noise could be more disturbing given the more sensitive nature of the nighttime period. A menu of actions to reduce construction noise impacts to levels required by Section 8.28.060 of the Brisbane Municipal Code is set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.J-4a.

Additionally, the Municipal Code requires construction contractors to limit standard construction activities to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. Pile driving and/or other extreme noise-generating activities (greater than 90 dBA) would be limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, with no extreme noise-generating activity permitted between 12:30 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. No extreme noise-generating activities would be allowed on weekends and holidays.

The City Council found that limiting construction hours and implementing the noise control strategies set forth in Mitigation Measures 4.J-4a and 4.J-4b would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level for all activities other than pile driving. Due to the substantial noise levels associated with potential pile driving and the proximity to residential receptors proposed in the northwestern portion of the Baylands, the City Council found that temporary construction-related noise from pile driving would be a significant unavoidable impact.

**Permanent Operations Impacts.** Noise modeling undertaken for the Program EIR indicated less-than-significant noise impacts, with Baylands-related transportation noise increases of 2.2 dB or less at all locations. By reducing the amount of traffic that would be generated in comparison to the DSP scenario, Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would reduce the less-than-significant impact identified in the Program EIR.

Once new development within the Baylands is in operation, noise would be generated by truck loading and unloading activities as well as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems on buildings. Operation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment would be subject to City Noise Ordinance standards. Provided that the equipment would be designed and used in a manner that complies with those standards, the noise impact on Baylands residences and adjacent land uses would be less than significant.

Should wind energy generation be approved within the Baylands, it would represent a third noise source. At 50 feet from sensitive noise receptors, small wind turbines would not create significant noise levels, except under high wind conditions, where noise generated by the wind itself would mask the loudness of noise generated by the wind turbines. The noise levels that would result from onsite wind turbines are below noise levels that would occur at comparable locations from US Highway 101 and the Caltrain tracks within the Baylands. Significant impacts resulting from small wind turbines onsite are not, therefore, expected as long as a 50-foot separation is maintained. Larger utility scale wind turbines have the ability to create significant noise impacts on noise sensitive uses.

The City Council found that implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.J-3a and 4.J-3b would establish performance standards for new development that would ensure noise-compatible land use relationships and impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

**Temporary Noise During Construction.** Transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would directly result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels from construction activities and indirectly result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels from increased traffic flows.

Construction activities are temporary and have a short-term duration, resulting in periodic increases in the ambient noise environment. The types of construction activities that would be associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would typically include demolition or clearing, grading/trenching, and paving and span less than six months. Pedestrian/bicycle bridge overcrossing projects would also include excavation for footings and take as long as twelve months or more. Pile driving would not be required for any construction activities associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

Typical noise levels generated by different types of construction equipment are shown in Table A, Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Construction Equipment. Operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve one or two minutes of full power operation followed by three to four minutes at lower power settings. Other primary noise sources would include random incidents lasting less than one minute (such as dropping off of large pieces of equipment or the hydraulic movement of machinery lifts).

Noise from construction activities that are authorized by a valid City permit are restricted by Section 8.28.060 of the Brisbane Municipal Code. This section limits construction hours to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. Further, this section prohibits individual pieces of construction equipment from operating such that the noise level at any point beyond the property line of the construction exceeds 86 dBA. Because Municipal Code Section 8.28.060 applies only to construction activities

**Table A: Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Construction Equipment**

Type of Equipment	Acoustical Use Factor <sup>1</sup>	L <sub>max</sub> at 5 Feet (dBA)	L <sub>max</sub> at 50 Feet (dBA)	L <sub>max</sub> at 100 Feet (dBA)
Concrete Saw	20	110	90	84
Concrete Mixer Truck	40	99	79	73
Backhoe	40	98	78	72
Dozer	40	102	82	76
Excavator	40	101	81	75
Forklift	40	98	78	72
Paver	50	97	77	71
Roller	20	100	80	74
Tractor	40	104	84	78
Water Truck	40	100	80	74
Grader	40	105	85	79
General Equipment	50	105	85	79

Note:

1 Acoustical use factor represents the percent of time equipment typically operates at full power and generating maximum noise levels during a construction day.

Source: Federal Highway Administration, *Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA-HEP-05-054)*, January 2006.

that are “authorized by a valid City permit,” these standards do not apply to roadway construction undertaken by the City. The City will nevertheless adhere to the construction hours limits set forth in Municipal Code Section 8.28.060 for its own construction projects.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not cause significant unavoidable construction noise impacts to become substantially more severe.

**Long-Term Noise following Construction.** While the transportation improvements resulting from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not directly generate noise, such improvements would accommodate increased traffic over time with associated increases in noise levels. An increase in average daily noise levels of 3 dBA is the most commonly accepted minimum discernible difference. Because noise is measured on a logarithmic scale, an increase of 3 dBA generally equates to a doubling of traffic on a roadway. Because of constraints on the

potential for widening roadway rights-of-way imposed by existing buildings and physical features (e.g., Icehouse Hill, Levinson marsh), roadway and intersection improvements that might be associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not provide for doubling of traffic along Brisbane's arterial highways and would not, therefore, generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Thus, proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not substantially increase the significant unavoidable construction noise impact disclosed in the Program EIR.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*b) Would the proposed project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

The Program EIR determined that pile driving may be necessary for the construction of high-rise office structures, which would result in groundborne vibration that could exceed the criteria published by Caltrans for protection of fragile older buildings, as well as the criterion for newer buildings.

In addition, the Program EIR determined that proposed Baylands development would expose people to vibrations from Caltrain rail operations where residences are located within 200 feet of the Caltrain station and mainline track, resulting in a significant impact. Proposed electrification of the Caltrain line would likely reduce vibration impacts, as vibration curves published by the FTA indicate that vibration levels from locomotive powered passenger trains are at least 10 Vdb greater than light-rail vehicles.

The Program EIR determined that development of new uses, roadways, and infrastructure adjacent to the historic Roundhouse, which has suffered fire damage and is a deteriorating condition, would most likely involve standard construction equipment and would be unlikely to require high-impact equipment such as pile driving. The Program EIR concluded that if pile driving were to be necessary for proposed buildings near the Roundhouse, construction-related vibration within 85 feet of the structure would have a significant impact, requiring mitigation.

The City Council found that the performance standards set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.J-2a would ensure that residential structures permitted within the Baylands by GP-1-18 would be sited and designed so as to avoid damage related to groundborne vibration from rail operations thereby reducing impacts to less than significant. In addition, the City Council found that the performance standards set forth in Mitigation Measures 4.J-2b and 4.J-2c would ensure that fragile historic structures and underground utilities would not be damaged by groundborne

vibration from any pile driving activities. As a result, the City Council found that groundborne vibration impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Construction of transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would generate varying degrees of ground-borne vibration, depending on the site-specific soils characteristics of the construction site, as well as the specific construction procedure and construction equipment being used. The physical effects of construction activities also depend on the construction characteristics of the receiver building(s). Vibration impacts can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels, to slight damage at the highest levels. Ground-borne vibrations from construction activities rarely reach levels that damage structures.

The upper end of vibration levels typically generated by standard construction equipment would be 0.089 in/sec. Such vibration levels would be generated by large bulldozers at a distance of 25 feet and would be below the criterion published by Caltrans of 0.25 in/sec for the protection of fragile buildings.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the proposed project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

While aircraft noise would be below the federal and state noise abatement criterion of 65 CNEL, and impacts would be less than significant with regard to exposing people to long-term excessive noise levels related from operations at the nearest airport, nuisance noise impacts from airport operations may be experienced by future receptors within the Baylands. While there is a potential for aircraft noise to be a nuisance to future Baylands residents, the City Council found that impacts would not be significant noise since residential uses within the Baylands would be located outside of the SFO's 65 CNEL noise contour.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

The Noise Exposure Map for San Francisco International Airport (SFO) indicates that all portions of the City of Brisbane are outside the 65-CNEL noise contour relative to aircraft noise from the airport (i.e., aircraft operations from the airport contribute less than 65 dBA to ambient



noise levels within Brisbane), which is the state and federal threshold for noise abatement pursuant to Caltrans and FAA guidelines. The southerly portion of the City is, however, within Airport Influence Area A, which is defined as an area that is flown by an aircraft at an altitude of 10,000 feet or less above mean sea level a minimum of once weekly.

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would generate both less than significant temporary increases in ambient noise levels from construction activities and permanent increases in ambient noise levels from increased traffic flows. However, because noise is measured on a logarithmic scale, such increases in noise would not combine with airport-related noise to generate a perceptible change in ambient noise levels. Thus, proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would result in less than significant impacts.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impact would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

### *References*

---

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

City of Brisbane, *The 1994 General Plan: City of Brisbane*, Chapter X, Community Health and Safety, adopted June 21, 1994.

City of San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, *Candlestick Point-Hunter's Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Transportation Study*, Technical Appendix, Volume 1 of 2. November 9, 2009.

Federal Highway Administration, *Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA-HEP-05-054)*, January 2006.

**A.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>a) Would the proposed project induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</i>				

*Program EIR Finding: Significant and Unavoidable*

GP-1-18 provides for the development of 1,800 to 2,200 residential dwelling units, which would result in approximately 4,015 to 4,905 residents within the Baylands as compared to 4,434 dwelling units and 9,888 residents that were analyzed in the Program EIR for the DSP scenario. The 7.0 million square feet of non-residential development permitted by GP-1-18 would generate approximately 17,190 new jobs within the Baylands, which is similar to the 17,540 new jobs that were analyzed in the Program EIR for the DSP scenario.

Thus, the City Council found that GP-1-18 would generate substantially less housing along with a similar amount of employment-generating uses as were analyzed in the EIR for the DSP/ scenario. However, GP-1-18 would nevertheless induce substantial population growth within the Baylands. Such growth is reflected in the significant aesthetics, air quality, noise, and traffic and transportation impacts that would result from GP-1-18.

In approving GP-1-18 and requiring Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.I-1, the Brisbane City Council found that cumulative traffic impacts at intersections on Bayshore Boulevard “are attributable to background traffic growth generated by developments approved by the cities of San Francisco, Daly City, and South San Francisco that exceed long-term traffic projections set forth in the 1994 Brisbane General Plan. As such, the level of service standards for these intersections set forth in the General Plan cannot be achieved even in the absence of new development in the Baylands.”

The City Council also found that significant unavoidable aesthetics, air quality, noise, and traffic and transportation impacts would result from the population growth associated with uses permitted by GP-1-18 and that the population and housing impacts of GP-1-18 were therefore also significant and unavoidable.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane’s Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards do not involve the construction of any homes, businesses, or other uses that would directly result in population growth. These General Plan revisions ensure that the planned population growth described in the General Plan Land Use Element, GP-1-18, and Measure JJ can occur in a manner consistent with the City’s General Plan Circulation Element.

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards recognize (1) the long-term effects of regional through traffic that is generated outside of City on the US 101 freeway, Bayshore Boulevard, the Geneva Avenue extension and intersections adjacent to the freeway and (2) existing constraints on the potential for widening roadway rights-of-way imposed by existing buildings and physical features along Bayshore Boulevard (e.g., Icehouse Hill, Levinson marsh).

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards therefore focus on multi-modal mobility within the City, including improvements to vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian systems. While these revisions to the General Plan will provide for the extension of Geneva Avenue from Bayshore Boulevard to the freeway along with some increases in roadway capacity along Bayshore Boulevard and at freeway interchanges, this additional capacity would not remove a barrier to growth other than the development permitted by GP-1-18 and would not induce additional unplanned development to the north or south of Brisbane due to:

- The very large amount of development already being approved and constructed, along with additional development that is projected to occur to the north and south of Brisbane independent of any improvements in travel time through Brisbane.
  - The Baylands Program EIR cumulative impacts analysis identified approvals for over 16,600 dwelling units and 6.5 million square feet of commercial/office use just north of the City of Baylands (Hunter’s Point Shipyard Phase 2, Candlestick Point, Executive Park, Visitacion Valley projects).

- ABAG growth projections for San Francisco indicate an increase of 137,900 households and 295,700 jobs occurring between 2010 and 2040.
- ABAG growth projections for San Mateo County indicate an increase of 60,200 households and 128,800 jobs occurring between 2010 and 2040.
- The relatively short distance (3.4 miles) Bayshore Boulevard within Brisbane represents on the 10-mile and longer commute that drivers experience between San Francisco and communities south of Brisbane in San Mateo County. While the Geneva extension might provide a more direct to the 101 freeway from Daly City than currently exists, future increases in congestion on the freeway would offset the reduced time it might take to get from Daly City to the freeway. In certifying the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR, the Brisbane City Council determined that freeway widening would need to occur over a much longer stretch of freeway than just Brisbane to make a meaningful contribution to congestion relief along the freeway. Freeway widening solely within Brisbane would create bottlenecks where such freeway improvements merged with the existing freeway configuration at the north and south ends of the City.
- The minor role that roadway improvements along Bayshore Boulevard, the Geneva Avenue extension, and at freeway interchanges in Brisbane would play in reducing commute time between San Francisco and communities south of Brisbane. Cutting projected intersection delay increases along Bayshore Boulevard through Brisbane by up to half would save motorists 40-60 seconds in the more than hour-long commute drivers can experience on the 101 freeway.

**Conclusion:** Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not cause the significant unavoidable Population and Housing impact to become substantially more severe.

*b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: No Impact*

---

Because there is no housing within the Baylands, proposed development would not displace any housing units. The City Council's findings for GP-1-18 indicated the City's that the existing lumberyard be relocated within the Baylands as part of site development. New development permitted by GP-1-18 would displace of existing businesses along Industrial Way and Tunnel Avenue, as well as displace existing temporary uses located on the former landfill. Because existing employment-generating uses within the Baylands are minimal and displacement of existing business would not require development of replacement housing elsewhere, the City Council found that no impacts would result.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

The Geneva Avenue extension and freeway interchanges within Brisbane are located within Baylands. The Program EIR previously evaluated displacement of people and housing within the Baylands and determined that no impact would result. In addition, the Program EIR also evaluated the potential for widening Bayshore Boulevard. Currently, the Bayshore Boulevard corridor is approximately 90 feet wide, with two lanes each direction and a median of approximately 20 feet.

The Program EIR determined that reconfiguring Bayshore Boulevard to provide three travel lanes in each direction, providing sidewalk improvements and turn pockets at each intersection, and re-coordinating signal timing settings to provide more green time to the westbound and eastbound split phases and reduce green time for the northbound and southbound approaches to the increase the roadway's capacity would require major right-of-way acquisition and result in secondary impacts pertaining to transit operations, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and safety due to longer crossing distances. The City Council found that these secondary impacts might be partially mitigated through pedestrian enhancements such as separated sidewalks along the length of Bayshore Boulevard; incorporating design elements that would reduce speeds to less than 30 miles per hour such as narrower travel lanes, landscape features, more frequent signalization; and providing frequent (every 500 to 750 feet) safe crossing treatments for pedestrians, but that widening of Bayshore Boulevard would also require major construction costs as well as displacement of existing businesses. In addition, widening of Bayshore Boulevard north of Geneva Avenue into San Francisco would be prevented by right-of-way constraints associated with the T-Third light rail line that terminates at the station just south of Sunnydale Avenue. Thus, the City Council found that widening of Bayshore Boulevard through Brisbane was infeasible.

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards therefore focus on enhancing mobility along Bayshore Boulevard within the roadway's existing right-of-way, avoiding demolition of buildings and displacement of businesses or housing.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*References*

---

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Association of Bay Area Governments, *Land Use Modeling Report, Plan Bay Area 2040 Final Supplemental Report*, July 2017.

**A.15 PUBLIC SERVICES**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
----------------	---	--------------------------------------	--	---

**Would the project:**

Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- |                             |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Fire protection?         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Police protection?       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Schools?                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Parks?                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*a) Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

Because GP-1-18 would generate additional demand for fire and/or emergency services, nearly doubling Brisbane’s resident and employment population, Baylands development would result about double the annual number of calls for service that Station No. 81 currently receives for its Brisbane service area.

The Program EIR noted that NCFAs are not currently meeting response time goals. Thus, Baylands development would require additional fire protection personnel and/or equipment in

order to meet NCFAs emergency service response time goals without impacting existing services currently provided to the Brisbane community. To ensure adequate fire protection services and facilities to support Baylands development and maintain adequate response times throughout the City, the required Specific Plan for the Baylands would be required as part of the planning review process to prepare and implement a Fire Protection Services Plan that provides for the timely provision of fire protection facilities, equipment, and staffing. The Fire Protection Services Plan would specify the means and methods that would be employed, over time, to ensure that the following performance standards are met:

- All Baylands development to be located within 1.5 miles of a fully staffed (four-person minimum staffing for all fire companies) and equipped NCFAs fire station.
- All buildings greater than three stories in height located within two miles of a fully staffed (four-person minimum) and equipped ladder truck company.
- Adequate fire flow and service pressure available per NCFAs standards.
- Expansion of existing fire stations or construction of new stations as needed to meet the following response time standards of the NCFAs within the Baylands:
  - Seven-minute Total Reflex Time<sup>4</sup> for a single fire company (first responder) for 90 percent of incidents;
  - Eleven-minute Total Reflex Time for multiple fire companies for 90 percent of all structure fires;
  - Fire Confinement Success Rate – ability to hold structure fires to floor or origin (i.e., preventing the fire from spreading to additional floors after first arrival on the scene) for 90 percent of structure fires; and
  - Fire Company Reliability – ability to handle 90 percent of all incidents within the Baylands from the station within whose primary service area the Baylands is located.

The City Council found that the substantial increase in current fire service demands that would result from GP-1-18 would require a new fire station or expansion of the existing Station No. 81 to provide adequate fire protection service to the Baylands and that the following measures were set forth in the Program EIR to minimize construction-related impacts related to such facilities: Mitigation Measures 4.B-2a, 4.B-2b, and 4.B-3 (construction air emissions); Mitigation Measures 4.C-1a through 4.C-1c, Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a through 4.C-2c, and Mitigation Measures 4.C-4d and 4.C-4e (biological resources); Mitigation Measures 4.D-2 and 4.D-4 (archaeological resources and human remains); Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a (ground settlement);

---

<sup>4</sup> “Total Reflex Time” is measured from the time a call is received at the county communications center to the arrival of the first apparatus at the scene. Typically, for the public, the response time clock begins when an individual becomes aware there is an emergency incident occurring. While the difference between the two may vary by only a minute or two, the distinction is significant in that fire service response time goals are set to measure fire service performance from the moment the emergency enters the system.

Mitigation Measures 4.G-2a, 4.G-2b, 4.G-2d and 4.G-2f through 4.G-2h (hazardous materials); Mitigation Measures 4.J-4a and 4.J-4b (construction period noise); and Mitigation Measure 4.N-12 (construction circulation patterns).

In addition, Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would be required to meet North County Fire Authority (NCFA) standards related to fire hydrant placement, fire flow requirements, installation of fire protection devices, and other fire code requirements and new structures within the Baylands would be required to comply with applicable building and fire code requirements, which include, for example, the installation of fire protection devices.

The City Council found that site-specific development projects within the Baylands would be subject to review and approval by the City, including emergency service providers, per the City's plan approval process set forth in Brisbane Municipal Code Section 15.44.030. Site-specific applications for industrial development, renewable energy generation facilities, and water recycling facilities would require additional review by the NCFA for special fire hazards, which is also a part of the City's plan approval process.

Based on these considerations, the City Council found that impacts on fire protection services would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not substantially increase the need for fire protection services within the City since no new habitable structures would result. In addition, mobility improvements along Bayshore Boulevard and the Geneva Avenue extension would result in beneficial effects in relation to emergency response times by facilitating improved access onto Bayshore Boulevard and to the freeway. Thus, no new or physically altered fire protection facilities would be needed.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.



*b) Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

Given the amount of proposed development in terms of both geographic area and the number residents and employees that would be present within the Baylands, development permitted by GP-1-18 would require expanded police services related to anticipated increases in traffic congestion, vehicle accidents, auto burglaries, robberies, commercial and financial crimes, crimes against persons, residential burglaries, and domestic-related incidents<sup>5</sup>. Specifically, the new residential population is anticipated to generate an increase in crimes against persons and domestic-related calls for nighttime service.

To provide equivalent coverage and response times throughout the City and the Baylands as it currently provides, the Brisbane Police Department would need one or two additional 24/7 shifts added to its patrol staffing, requiring additional officers plus an additional civilian employee. Development permitted by GP-1-18 would also necessitate addition of a patrol vehicle and other associated emergency equipment.

Although the Brisbane Police Department would require increased staffing levels, the Program EIR determined that the existing police facility has adequate space to hold any new officers that would be needed to adequately serve the Baylands and therefore no new or physically expanded facility would be required to maintain acceptable staffing ratios to serve the Baylands. However, given the location of the proposed development in relation to the existing police station, the Brisbane Police Department has determined that a storefront community police facility (retail substation) within the Baylands would be needed to maintain desired response times. Provision of such a substation would contribute to the construction impacts of future development addressed in the Program EIR.

Because the impacts of providing such a substation are addressed in the Program EIR as part of the discussion of impacts within the Baylands, including implementation of applicable mitigation measures, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to less than significant.

<sup>5</sup> Development permitted by GP-1-18 is anticipated to result in 5,088 to 5,302 calls for police service annually. While this is less than the 6,583 calls for police service that were evaluated in the Program EIR, it is a substantial increase from the 3,116 calls for police service being received annually citywide by the Brisbane Police Department.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would maximize mobility along the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and at freeway interchanges, and improve access to the freeway, recognizing projected increases in traffic that would be generated by GP-1-18 and by development outside of Brisbane. Because proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards do not propose residential or business uses and would not substantially increase traffic along Bayshore Boulevard or the Geneva Avenue extension or at freeway interchanges within Brisbane beyond that analyzed in the Program EIR, any resulting increase in calls for police service would be minor and could be met by the increased police deployment related to Baylands development. In addition, mobility improvements Bayshore Boulevard and the Geneva Avenue extension would result in beneficial impacts in relation to emergency response times by facilitating improved access onto Bayshore Boulevard, as well as access to and from the freeway. Thus, no new or physically altered police facilities would be needed.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

- c) *Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives?*
- 

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

Considering the declining enrollment and the excess capacity currently available in JUHSD schools, the City Council found that the number of students generated by GP-1-18 would not result in the need for new or expanded high school facilities beyond what is already planned within the JUHSD. Although the maximum capacity of the schools within the elementary school districts was not available, based on comparison of Baylands development-related grade K-8 student generation (542 to 623 students from residential development and commercial development) to the combined enrollment of both the Brisbane ESD and the Bayshore ESD, both current (941 students) and 15-year peak (1,135 students), information presented in the Program EIR indicated that development resulting from GP-1-18 would create a need for new grade K-8 school facilities.

Pursuant to SB 50, applicants for individual development projects within the Baylands would be required to pay school facilities impact fees established to offset the impacts of new

development on school facilities. Therefore, although development permitted by GP-1-18 would substantially increase the combined current enrollment of the Brisbane ESD and the Bayshore ESD along with an 4-5 percent increase in the enrollment of the JUHSD, payment of fees mandated under SB 50 is the mitigation measure prescribed by the statute, and payment of such fees is the exclusive method available to the City to mitigate the direct impacts on school facilities. Further, payment of such fees is presumed under the law to be mitigation in full for direct impacts to school facilities caused by increasing student enrollment.

The City found that whether needed new school facilities to serve Baylands residents would be constructed within the Baylands or offsite could not be known at the time of adoption of GP-1-18 since decisions as to the location of future schools are the sole responsibility of the school districts. Impacts associated with the provision of new school facilities resulting from GP-1-18 would contribute to the significant impacts of Baylands development and would therefore be significant. In terms of indirect impacts, the construction and operation of institutional uses was anticipated as a part of Baylands development, and the impacts of their construction and operation were discussed throughout the Program EIR. As such, the following measures were proposed to minimize indirect impacts from schools: Mitigation Measures 4.B-2a, 4.B-2b, and 4.B-3 (construction air emissions); Mitigation Measures 4.C-1a through 4.C-1c, Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a through 4.C-2c, and Mitigation Measures 4.C-4d and 4.C-4e (biological resources); Mitigation Measures 4.D-2 and 4.D-4 (archaeological resources and human remains); Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a (ground settlement); Mitigation Measures 4.G-2a, 4.G-2b, 4.G-2d, and 4.G-2f through 4.G-2h (hazardous materials); Mitigation Measures 4.J-4a and 4.J-4b (construction period noise); and Mitigation Measure 4.N-12 (construction circulation patterns). As a result, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to less than significant.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Modifications to transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not generate an increase in students, since no residential or business uses are proposed and no increase in population would result. Thus, no new or physically altered school facilities would be needed.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*d) Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered park facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

Baylands development would include construction of new parks and recreational facilities that would require clearing of existing vegetation and grading; installation of utilities, including stormwater drainage and water/wastewater lines; installation of hardscape areas for play surfaces, pathways, and parking; and installation of site furnishings and other equipment (e.g., benches, play facilities, fencing, lighting). New structures such as restrooms and picnic shelters would also be constructed. Vegetated areas would also require installation of irrigation systems in some areas.

The City Council found that construction of parks and recreational facilities was evaluated as part of overall impacts of proposed Baylands development. The City Council found that mitigation measures proposed in other sections to minimize construction-related impacts are recommended under all proposed development scenarios to reduce the impacts associated with the construction of recreational facilities (see Mitigation Measures 4.B-2a, 4.B-2b, and 4.B-3 [construction air emissions]; Mitigation Measures 4.C-1a through 4.C-1c, Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a through 4.C-2c, and Mitigation Measures 4.C-4d and 4.C-4e [biological resources]; Mitigation Measures 4.D-2 and 4.D-4 [archaeological resources and human remains]; Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a [ground settlement]; Mitigation Measures 4.G-2a through 4.G-2c and 4.G-2f through 4.G-2h [hazardous materials]; Mitigation Measures 4.J-4a and 4.J-4b [construction period noise]; and Mitigation Measure 4.N-12 [construction circulation patterns]).

The City Council found that operational impacts associated with park and recreational facilities – including increases in traffic, air pollutants, and greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and disturbance of biological, hydrologic, and cultural resources – were evaluated as part of the overall analysis of Baylands development in the Program EIR. As a result, the City Council found that impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not generate demand for parks since no residential uses are proposed and no increase in population would result. Thus, no new or physically altered park facilities would be needed.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

- e) *Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of other new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

Development permitted by GP-1-18 would introduce approximately 4,015 to 4,905 residents to the Baylands, including a resident student population of 365 to 446 along with approximately 247 additional students that might register in local schools as the result of their parents' place of employment. The permanent resident and student population would result in an increased demand for library services. Baylands-related population increases would also result in an increased demand on the community rooms, study areas, and designated community spaces that existing libraries provide.

Given the location of 14 existing branch libraries within 3.5 miles of the Baylands, including three libraries within one-half mile of the site, the Program EIR determined that it would be reasonable to anticipate that, in the absence of a library facility within the Baylands, area residents, students, and employees would tend to use other nearby library facilities, impacting the capacity of those facilities. Thus, the Program EIR concluded that Baylands development would result in a need for new library space to maintain existing services to the Brisbane community and not impact libraries in surrounding communities. This impact would be significant, and mitigation would be required.

The City Council found that provision of an adequately sized library facility within the Baylands would mitigate direct impacts of Baylands development and that the impacts of constructing and operating such a library were addressed in the Program EIR as part of the overall discussion of impacts and mitigation measures. As a result, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to less than significant.

---

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Proposed transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not result in a local population increase, since no new housing or businesses are proposed. Increased demand for libraries would not occur and no new or physically altered public facilities would be needed. No new significant impact would therefore result.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*References*

---

City of Brisbane, About BPD web page,

<http://www.ci.brisbane.ca.us/departments/police/about> Accessed May 6, 2019.

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

**A.16 RECREATION**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility could occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>a) Would the proposed project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility could occur or be accelerated?</i>				

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

Pursuant to the Quimby Act, Section 16.24.030 of the Brisbane Municipal Code established a standard of 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Application of this standard to GP-1-18 would require approximately 12.0 to 14.7 acres of parkland to serve the needs of the 4,015 to 4,905 residents that would be living within the Baylands at buildout. While the Program EIR recognized that park needs per 1,000 population refer only to the resident population, it also recognized that employees within the Baylands would use area parks and recreational facilities. Applying the Quimby Act standard to both Baylands resident and employment population, GP-1-18 would result in a need for up to 63.6 to 66.3 acres of parkland.

The Program EIR also noted that the General Plan Open Space Element sets forth the following park service standards as an aspirational goal beyond Quimby Act requirements:

- Combined Mini, Neighborhood, and Linear Parks: 10.5 acres per 1,000 residents
- Community Park: 8.0 acres per 1,000 residents

Based on the General Plan parkland standard, GP-1-18 would generate a need for 74.3 to 90.7 acres of park land. The Program EIR determined that the Specific Plan required for Baylands development would be reviewed for consistency with the City's General Plan prior to approval and would thus be required to provide adequate park land to achieve consistency with the City's General Plan.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not generate demand for parks since no residential uses are proposed and no increase in population would occur. Thus, increased use and deterioration of existing park facilities would not occur.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*b) Would the proposed project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

Baylands development would include construction of new parks and recreational facilities that would require clearing of existing vegetation and grading; installation of utilities, including stormwater drainage and water/wastewater lines; installation of hardscape areas for play surfaces, pathways, and parking; and installation of site furnishings and other equipment (e.g., benches, play facilities, fencing, lighting). New structures such as restrooms and picnic shelters would also be constructed. Vegetated areas would also require installation of irrigation systems in some areas.

The City Council found that construction of parks and recreational facilities was evaluated as part of overall impacts of proposed Baylands development. The City Council found that mitigation measures proposed in other sections to minimize construction-related impacts are recommended under all proposed development scenarios to reduce the impacts associated with the construction of recreational facilities (see Mitigation Measures 4.B-2a, 4.B-2b, and 4.B-3 [construction air emissions]; Mitigation Measures 4.C-1a through 4.C-1c, Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a through 4.C-2c, and Mitigation Measures 4.C-4d and 4.C-4e [biological resources]; Mitigation Measures 4.D-2 and 4.D-4 [archaeological resources and human remains]; Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a [ground settlement]; Mitigation Measures 4.G-2a through 4.G-2c and 4.G-2f through 4.G-2h



[hazardous materials]; Mitigation Measures 4.J-4a and 4.J-4b [construction period noise]; and Mitigation Measure 4.N-12 [construction circulation patterns]).

The City Council found that operational impacts associated with park and recreational facilities – including increases in traffic, air pollutants, and greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and disturbance of biological, hydrologic, and cultural resources – were evaluated as part of the overall analysis of Baylands development in the Program EIR. As a result, the City Council found that impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not generate demand for parks since no residential uses are proposed and no increase in population would result. Thus, no new or physically altered park facilities would be needed.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

**A.17 TRANSPORTATION**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	(1) <i>Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	(2) <i>Changed Circumstances?</i>	(3) <i>New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	(4) <i>No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
----------------	---	--------------------------------------	--	---

**Would the project:**

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*a) Would the proposed project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant (BART, Caltrain, Samtrans, pedestrian facilities); Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures (bicycle facilities) Significant and Unavoidable (roadways)*

**Impacts on Roadway Facilities.** In relation to roadways, the Program EIR focused its analysis of potential conflicts with programs, plans, ordinances, and policies addressing the circulation system focused on compliance with applicable level of service delay-based metrics. The Program EIR concluded that significant unavoidable impacts would occur in several locations since applicable level of service standards would not be met. As of January 2019, however, a conflict with programs, plans, ordinances, or policies setting forth level of service or other delay-based metrics no longer constitutes a significant impact.

**Impacts on Transit.** The Program EIR determined that the increase in transit demand generated by proposed Baylands development could be accommodated by train transit capacity (BART, Caltrain, Samtrans) and that Baylands development would not require changes to Caltrain operations at the Bayshore Station or on the Bayshore / Brisbane four-track rail segment.

Increased ridership resulting from Baylands development would cause an increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts on Muni transit service levels could result (i.e., additional buses or trains could be required due to Baylands transit trips). While this impact is addressed by Program Mitigation Measure 4.N-7, the City Council found that while payment of such mitigation fees is common within San Francisco, because the City of Brisbane could not control how SFMTA would actually use such funds, implementation of Program Mitigation Measure 4.N-7 is uncertain, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Impacts on Pedestrian Facilities.** The Program EIR concluded that pedestrian circulation within the Baylands would be improved and Baylands development would not disrupt existing pedestrian facilities outside the project site. However, pedestrian accessibility would continue to be limited due to the lack of existing pedestrian facilities in some areas (including segments of Bayshore Boulevard with no sidewalks south of Geneva Avenue).

**Impacts on Bicycle Facilities.** The Program EIR determined that bicycle circulation within the Baylands would be improved under existing and cumulative conditions, and development would not disrupt existing bicycle facilities outside the Baylands. Proposed development would not interfere with planned bicycle facilities or create inconsistencies with adopted bicycle system plans. However, because none of the Concept Plan scenarios included detailed requirements to enhance the bicycling environment and maximize bicycle accessibility, the Program EIR concluded that significant impacts to bicycle accessibility could occur requiring mitigation. The City Council found that implementation of Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.N-11, which established specific requirements for development of bicycle facilities for the Baylands, would reduce impacts of GP-1-18 to less than significant.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards ensure that the planned development and population growth described in the Land Use Element, GP-1-18, and Measure JJ can occur in a manner consistent with the General Plan Circulation Element. Proposed General Plan revisions are intended to recognize:

- The long-term effects that regional through traffic generated outside of City will have on the US 101 freeway, Bayshore Boulevard, the Geneva Avenue extension, and intersections adjacent to the freeway;
- The City's lack of authority and financial capacity to make meaningful improvements to the freeway, and

- Existing constraints on the potential for widening roadway rights-of-way along Bayshore Boulevard imposed by existing buildings and physical features (e.g., Icehouse Hill, Levinson marsh).

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards therefore focus on multi-modal mobility within the City, including improvements to vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian systems. Thus, resulting transportation improvements would provide multi-modal mobility along the Bayshore Boulevard and Geneva Avenue extension corridors and improve mobility at freeway interchanges within the City, consistent with General Plan policies addressing transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities within the City.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

***b) Would the proposed project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b)?***

*Program EIR Finding: None*

The Notice of Preparation for the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR preceded adoption of Senate Bill (SB) 743, upon which CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 is based, by several years. In addition, CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 had not been approved at the time the Draft Program EIR was released for public review. Approval of CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 occurred subsequent to certification of the Program EIR and adoption of GP-1-18 by the Brisbane City Council.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would result in transportation projects such as modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension. As stated in CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 (b)(2):

“Transportation projects that reduce, or have no impact on, vehicle miles traveled should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. For roadway capacity projects, agencies have discretion to determine the appropriate measure of transportation impact consistent with CEQA and other applicable requirements.”

Proposed revisions to the General Plan LOS standards do not involve the construction of any homes, businesses, or other uses that would generate or induce population or employment

growth that would increase vehicular travel or vehicle miles traveled<sup>6</sup>. While these General Plan revisions will provide for some increases in roadway capacity along Bayshore Boulevard and at freeway interchanges, this additional capacity would not remove a barrier to growth or induce growth as discussed in Section 2.3.11, Land Use and Planning, and Section 2.3.14, Population and Housing, of these Addendum Findings but would encourage increased use of non-vehicular travel.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

- c) *Would the proposed project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

The Program EIR determined that the design of all proposed transportation and circulation features associated with Baylands development would be required to be consistent with the Brisbane General Plan and applicable City roadway design standards. In addition, City review of the required Specific Plan for Baylands development would require implementation of City roadway design standards and site-specific development within the Baylands would also be subject to review and approval by the City. Because the City's development review process would ensure that applicable roadway and trail design standards are adhered to, the City Council found that installation of roadways and pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the Baylands would avoid that safety hazards or incompatible uses, resulting in a less than significant impact.

---

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

All modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would comply with standard engineering design practice, City design requirements, and applicable Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. The multi-modal plans for Bayshore Boulevard and the Geneva Avenue extension that are required by proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards will address geometric design along the corridors, including issues such as offset intersections, site distance, and conflicting turn movements as well as provision of grade-separated crossings, thereby

---

<sup>6</sup> See discussion of population growth in Section 4.11, Land Use and Planning and Section 4.14, Population and Housing.

enhancing the safety of travel. In addition, proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards do not propose any uses that might conflict with safe traffic movement within the City.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*d) Would the proposed project result in inadequate emergency access?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

---

The Program EIR determined that existing emergency response routes within or in the vicinity of the Baylands would either be maintained or rerouted as necessary as part of Baylands development, which would include the construction of new roadways to facilitate emergency access. In addition, the Specific Plan for the Baylands will require site-specific development within the Baylands to be designed in accordance with City and North County Fire Authority standards, which include provisions that address emergency access (e.g., minimum street widths, minimum turning radii). As a result, the City Council found impacts on emergency access would be less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards provide for multi-modal mobility improvements along Bayshore Boulevard and the Geneva Avenue extension and set performance standards for freeway interchanges that would enhance emergency response onto and along Bayshore Boulevard, to and from the freeway, and within the City.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*References*

---

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG). *Final San Mateo County Congestion Management Program 2015*. November 2015. Available:

[http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2015-CMP\\_Final\\_rev.pdf](http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2015-CMP_Final_rev.pdf).

Accessed May 2, 2019.

**A.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
----------------	--	---	---	--

**Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:**

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- a) *Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code §5020.1(k)?*

*Program EIR Finding: None*

The Program EIR for Baylands development predates CEQA requires for analysis of Tribal Cultural Resources.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

No Tribal cultural resources are known to occur within the Baylands or along the Bayshore Boulevard corridor or the US 101 freeway. Such resources will not, therefore, be adversely affected by transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards. See Appendix C for results of required Tribal consultation regarding cultural and Tribal cultural resources.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

- b) *Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code §5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

*Program EIR Finding: None*

The Program EIR for Baylands development predates CEQA requires for analysis of Tribal Cultural Resources.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

No Tribal cultural resources are known to occur within the Baylands or along the Bayshore Boulevard corridor or the US 101 freeway. Such resources will not, therefore, be adversely



affected by transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards. See Appendix C for results of required Tribal consultation regarding cultural and Tribal cultural resources.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

**A.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes or regulations related to solid waste?				

- a) *Would the proposed project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

*Program EIR Finding: No Impact (Water Treatment), Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures (Stormwater Drainage), Significant and Unavoidable (Water Storage, Recycled Water Plant)*

**Water Treatment.** The Program EIR determined that no water treatment facilities for the provision of potable water supplies to future uses within the Baylands would be needed or constructed as part of development, and there would be no impact.

**Stormwater Drainage Facilities.** Baylands development would increase the amount of impervious surfaces and, as a result, would increase stormwater runoff. The Program EIR determined that Baylands development would improve and expand the existing stormwater drainage system, including grading; removal of existing storm water infrastructure; installation of new pipe, box culverts, and storage basins, and increasing the detention capacity of the Central Drainage Channel to address the increased stormwater runoff. Stormwater treatment would also be installed.

The Program EIR concluded that construction of the new stormwater drainage facilities would contribute to significant impacts of Baylands development in relation to hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, geology and soils, vegetation and wildlife, air quality, traffic, and noise. The City Council found that these impacts would be reduced to less than significant through implementation compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures provided in Program EIR Sections 4.B, *Air Quality*; Section 4.C, *Biological Resources*; Section 4.E, *Geology, Soils, and Seismicity*; Section 4.G, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*; Section 4.H, *Hydrology and Water Quality*; Section 4.J, *Noise and Vibration*; and Section 4.N, *Traffic and Circulation*.

**Water Storage.** Additional local storage capacity within the City would be required to provide for fire flows and peak day demand to serve Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18. Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.O-1b requires the developer to either construct facilities or reimburse the City for a fair share of the costs borne by the City should the City construct local storage and water delivery facilities.

The Program EIR determined that the City has future plans to build a water storage tank to directly provide fire flow demand and peak demand equalization to lower pressure zones, including the Baylands, but that funding has not been identified, nor has a specific site or schedule for construction been developed for new water storage tanks. The location, design, and method of construction for future water storage facilities to serve Baylands development could not therefore be determined in the Program EIR, which stated that it could be assumed

that in order to provide for sufficient water pressure to the Baylands, a new storage tank would need to be located at an elevation higher than the Baylands, most likely in an offsite hillside location.

The City Council found that construction of a new storage tank could result in environmental impacts due to (1) siting, which could affect slope stability or visual, biological, land use, and/or cultural resources; and (2) construction, which could result in noise, dust, other air pollutant emissions, soil erosion, and possible water quality effects. While the City Council recognized it is likely that impacts of siting and constructing a local water storage facility could be avoided or mitigated to less-than-significant levels through a combination of siting options and mitigation measures, because the location, design, and method of construction for future water storage facilities could not be known, impacts associated with a water storage facility would be significant and unavoidable.

**Recycled Water Plant.** Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would include construction of a recycled water plant to treat sewage generated within the Baylands and supply recycled water for irrigation and non-potable plumbing via a dual-piped plumbing system.<sup>7</sup> Construction of this facility would contribute to significant onsite aesthetic, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and traffic impacts discussed throughout the Program EIR.

The City Council found that the Program EIR set forth the following applicable mitigation measures: Mitigation Measure 4.A-3 (screening of outdoor storage); Mitigation Measures 4.B-2a and 4.B-2b (construction emissions); Mitigation Measures 4.C-1a through 4.C-1c, Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a through 4.C-2c, and Mitigation Measures 4.C-4d and 4.C-4e (biological resources); Mitigation Measures 4.D-2 and 4.D-4 (archaeological resources and human remains); Mitigation Measures 4.G-2a and b (site remediation); Mitigation Measure 4.G-2d (NPDES permitting), Mitigation Measure 4.G-2e (hazardous materials business plan), Mitigation Measures 4.G-2f through h (soil vapor barriers), Mitigation Measure 4.G-3 (school facilities construction), Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a and Mitigation Measures 4.J-4a and 4.J-4b (construction period noise); and Mitigation Measure 4.N-12 (construction circulation patterns).

However, even with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Program EIR, recycled water plant operations would contribute to significant unavoidable air quality impacts. The City Council therefore found that the impacts of the recycled water plant would be significant and unavoidable.

---

<sup>7</sup> During the early to middle portions of Baylands development, sewage generated within the Baylands would flow to the Bayshore Sanitary District's collection system for delivery to the SFPUC and treatment.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension could require minor relocation of water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications lines within or immediately adjacent to existing roadway rights-of-way. Such relocations would be completed concurrent with transportation improvement projects to ensure that utility lines were properly located within roadway rights-of-way and provide adequate separation of “wet” and “dry” utilities.

**Conclusion:** The potential for minor utility relocations within or immediately adjacent to roadway rights-of-way was considered as part of the transportation improvements evaluated in relation to each of the environmental issues addressed in these findings, which document that no new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards, nor would the impacts of proposed General Plan revisions cause any significant impact documented in the Program EIR to be substantially more severe.

*b) Would the proposed project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures*

---

Because Brisbane does not have adequate existing water supplies to serve Baylands development or to build out all other portions of the City, the Program EIR identified and analyzed a reasonably likely supplemental water supply - a surface water transfer of up to 2,400 acre-feet per year (AFY) from the Oakdale Irrigation District (OID) to Brisbane, along with an extensive water conservation program (Water Savings Program E) including demand management measures and provision of recycled water via an onsite recycled water plant.

The Program EIR acknowledged that implementation of the proposed water transfer agreement would require approvals of final Water Supply and Conveyance Agreements between Brisbane and OID, between Brisbane and the Modesto Irrigation District (MID), and Brisbane and the SFPUC for individual portions of such a water transfer that would also require project-level engineering design, operational plans, and environmental evaluation and CEQA documentation.

The City Council found that identification of a secure water supply would not be required by law until such time as a specific plan for Baylands development would be considered for approval. The City Council further found that GP-1-18 included a “reasonably likely and

sufficient water supply” that could support proposed uses within the Baylands and that a “secure and reliable water supply” would be required to be identified prior to specific plan approval and secured prior to site development. Because such a secure water supply did not exist at the time GP-1-18 was approved, GP-1-18 would result in a significant impact for which mitigation is required.

In addition to the need to secure sufficient water supply to meet the long-term annual water demands of Baylands development, the City Council determined that Brisbane does not have existing facilities that could provide adequate peak day/peak hour water flow to the Baylands in the event of an emergency. Additional storage capacity within the City would therefore be needed to provide adequate fire flows and meet peak daily water demands, resulting in a significant impact.

Finally, the City Council found that should the proposed OID water transfer to Brisbane ultimately be approved, its implementation would contribute to a potential impact on the Tuolumne River associated with changes in the SFPUC’s existing reservoir release pattern from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir that had previously been identified by the SFPUC, which adopted a mitigation measure. Per the adopted mitigation measure, the SFPUC would modify the way it releases water from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir such that significant impacts to the streamside meadows and other alluvial deposits along the Tuolumne River below the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir would be avoided. Although the SFPUC had already adopted the mitigation measure needed to address this impact, the Program EIR concluded that the contribution of Baylands development to that impact would be significant.

The City Council found that implementation of Program EIR Mitigation Measures 4.O-1a and 4.O-1b would ensure provision of an adequate, reliable water supply for the Baylands, along with provision of adequate storage facilities for daily and emergency purposes. Program EIR Mitigation Measure 4.O-1c would require Baylands development contribute its fair share to previously approved mitigation being implemented by the SFPUC should provision of water supply to the Baylands involve the proposed transfer of OID water supplies through the SFPUC without impacting customers of any water agency involved in the provision of water supply to the Baylands. As a result, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would be reduced to less than significant.

#### *Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane’s Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

While transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would use water during construction, such use would be temporary in nature and, due to the small size of anticipated construction sites, would not require extensive watering of large land areas. In addition, proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not introduce new residential, commercial, or other land uses that would increase existing water consumption within the City. While transportation improvements would, in some cases, require removal of

ornamental landscaping, replacement landscaping and irrigation would be installed, emphasizing use of drought-tolerant vegetation. Any new landscaped areas required for transportation improvements associated with G revisions to General Plan LOS standards would also be provided with drought-tolerant landscaping. Overall, the amount of new landscaped areas within the City would be small and not require new or expanded water supplies.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*c) Would the proposed project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

Baylands development permitted by GP-1-18 would result in a substantial increase in the generation of wastewater. Until an onsite recycled water plant is in full operation producing water for onsite irrigation purposes, all wastewater flows would be discharged to the existing Bayshore Sanitary District (BSD) wastewater collection system and sent to the SFPUC for treatment and discharge to San Francisco Bay. As part of the required Specific Plan for the Baylands, a preliminary infrastructure plan would be prepared to identify how wastewater infrastructure, including treatment capacity, would be provided and how construction of such infrastructure would be phased and financed. Such a preliminary infrastructure plan would be subject to review and approval by the City. Thus, the Program EIR determined that wastewater flows from Baylands development would be properly treated and disposed of through facilities that comply with RWQCB wastewater treatment requirements and impacts would be less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not introduce new residential, commercial, or other land uses capable of generating wastewater.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*d) Would the proposed project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

**Construction.** Buildout of the Baylands is anticipated to occur over a 20-year period and would generate a substantial amount of solid waste such as wood, metal, concrete, bricks, drywall/gypsum/sheetrock, carpet, and dirt/fill during construction. GP-1-18 would generate 20,414 to 21,343 tons of solid waste over the construction period, which is approximately 19 to 23 percent less than the 26,381 tons that was analyzed in the EIR. Chapter 15.75 of the Brisbane Municipal Code sets forth requirements for solid waste diversion and recycling and requires that construction and demolition debris be diverted from going to a landfill by using recycling, reuse, and diversion programs that development permitted by GP-1-18 would be required to meet.

The combined remaining capacity of the local area landfills is 200,492,708 cubic yards. Solid waste disposed of during Baylands construction would represent approximately 0.01 percent of this remaining capacity. There would be no limitation on disposal of construction waste from the Baylands since local landfills that would accept this kind of waste have an estimated closure date of 2077 or earlier.

**Operations.** The Program EIR determined there is remaining landfill capacity through 2077. GP-1-18 would result in generation of 87,460 to 91,460 pounds of solid waste daily, which the Program EIR determined represents a very small portion of remaining landfill capacity when taking into account implementation of programs required by Chapter 8.32 of the Brisbane Municipal Code for recycling, recovery, and participation in programs to reduce the quantity of waste sent to landfills. The City Council found that existing landfills would have adequate capacity to accept all Baylands-related waste, and impacts would be less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

**Construction Impacts.** The City will apply the recycling and reuse requirements of Municipal Code Chapter 15.75 to transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards and require that 50 percent of construction and demolition debris be either recycled or reused to reduce landfill disposal. Compliance with these recycling and reuse requirements would ensure consistency with State and local waste diversion standards. As demonstrated in the Brisbane Baylands Program EIR, compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 15.75 would also ensure that construction activities would not exceed the capacity of local solid waste infrastructure or impair attainment of solid waste diversion goals.

**Operations Impacts.** Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard,



along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not introduce new residential, commercial, or other land uses capable of generating solid waste.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*e) Would the proposed project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes or regulations related to solid waste?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

---

Baylands development would generate a substantial amount of solid waste, with a temporary waste stream generated during construction and a permanent waste stream generated from the new developed land uses after construction is complete. Because disposal of Baylands demolition and construction-generated solid waste in a landfill must comply with Section 15.75 of the Brisbane Municipal Code and operation of uses within the Baylands would be required to participate in the City's ongoing waste diversion programs, the program EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

As noted above, construction projects associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS Standards will comply with Municipal Code Chapter 15.75. The city will also ensure that construction projects also comply with any other applicable federal, state, and local solid waste management and diversion requirements. Transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not introduce new residential, commercial, or other land uses capable of generating solid waste.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*References*

---

City of Brisbane, 1993 *City of Brisbane 1993 General Plan Environmental Impact Report Volume 1: Environmental Setting, December 1993*. Palo Alto, California, prepared by Thomas Reid Associates, 1993.

City of Brisbane, *Brisbane Baylands Final Program Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2006022136)*, July 2018.

U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), *New Construction and Major Renovation Reference Guide, October 2007, Version 2.2, 2007*.

**A.20 WILDFIRE**

*Would proposed General Plan Amendment GP-1-19 require major revisions to the Brisbane Baylands EIR due to new or substantially more severe significant impacts as the result of:*

<i>Issues:</i>	<i>(1) Proposed Revisions to General Plan LOS Standards?</i>	<i>(2) Changed Circumstances?</i>	<i>(3) New Information of Substantial Importance?</i>	<i>(4) No New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts</i>
----------------	--	---	---	--

**If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:**

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*a) Would the proposed project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

*Program EIR Finding: Less than Significant*

The Program EIR determined that City review of the required Specific Plan and site-specific development and emergency response requirements are sufficient to ensure that the potential significant health and safety effects associated with possible impairment or implementation of

any emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant. By reducing overall development intensity within the Baylands, the City Council found that impacts associated with GP-1-18 would remain less than significant.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

Modifications to existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would occur in an urban setting that has been developed with urban uses in the past and does not adjoin any wildlands that are at risk for wildfires.

In addition, transportation improvements associated with revisions to General Plan LOS standards would facilitate implementation of emergency response and energy evacuation plans by minimizing congestion and providing alternatives to vehicular travel to facilitate evacuation in an emergency situation.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

*b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the proposed project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

---

*Program EIR Finding: None*

---

Because CEQA Guidelines Appendix G was modified to include this threshold as of January 2019, this specific threshold was not specifically addressed in the Program EIR.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

---

The Bayshore Boulevard corridor and Geneva Avenue extension traverse urban and suburban settings that are not generally subject to wildland fires. Transportation improvements associated with proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not extend the City's transportation system to areas where woodland, shrub, or grassland vegetative communities might present a wildland fire hazard. Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not, therefore, directly or indirectly cause a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

- c) *Would the proposed project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

*Program EIR Finding: None*

Because CEQA Guidelines Appendix G was modified to include this threshold as of January 2019, this specific threshold was not specifically addressed in the Program EIR.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

The Bayshore Boulevard and Geneva Avenue extension corridors traverse urban and suburban settings that are not generally subject to wildland fires. Modification of existing intersection configurations, location and timing of traffic signals, spacing of intersections, and roadway geometrics along Bayshore Boulevard, along with provision of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements within the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and along the Geneva Avenue extension would not extend the City's transportation system to areas where woodland, shrub, or grassland vegetative communities might present a wildland fire hazard. Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not, therefore, require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.

- d) *Would the proposed project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

*Program EIR Finding: None*

Because CEQA Guidelines Appendix G was modified to include this threshold as of January 2019, this specific threshold was not specifically addressed in the Program EIR.

*Impacts Associated with Revising Brisbane's Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standards*

Proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards would not extend the City's transportation system to new areas where woodland, shrub, or grassland vegetative communities might present a wildland fire hazard, nor would these revisions introduce any new habitable structures within the City. Thus, people or structures would not be exposed to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes as the result of the proposed project.

**Conclusion:** No new significant impacts would result from proposed revisions to General Plan LOS standards.