CITY OF BURLINGAME

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

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

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

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

To: Interested Individuals
County Clerk of San Mateo

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

Subject: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (ND-588-P)
225 California Drive – Construction of a New 4-Story Commercial Building

Project Location: 225 California Drive, Burlingame, CA 94010

Project Description: The applicant is proposing to construct a four-story building that would include a mix of retail and commercial uses and a three-level underground parking garage. The building footprint would cover approximately 17,500 square feet. The project proposes 1,820 square feet of retail space and 43,235 square feet of office space. The project height conforms to the 55-foot height limit for the Howard Mixed Use zone. The parking ordinance requires 145 parking spaces for the project. The project will provide 130 parking spaces because the applicant has committed to provide a car share program (e.g., Zipcar or other similar type of service). The DSP allows up to a 10 percent reduction in the parking requirements (with City approval) for projects with car share facilities provided on-site. Accordingly, the project's parking count would comply with City regulations.

The project proposes a traditional architectural style to be compatible with other buildings downtown. Additional landscaping would include trees on the ground floor exterior, along with planters in decorative pots that line the front of the building on Highland Avenue. The balconies would be paved and include decorative pots and planters. The total construction time is estimated to be 16 months.

According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the property at the existing 215 California Drive is listed as a "LUST Clean-up Site" pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The property at 215 California Drive is currently registered as an "Open- Site Assessment" for a Leaking Underground Storage Tank that was removed in 2011. On-going monitoring is being conducted as directed by the San Mateo County Health Department. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 will be implemented to ensure that impacts to the public or the environment would be less than significant.

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration: In accordance with Section 15072(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, notice is hereby given of the City's intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project described above. A mitigated negative declaration is a negative declaration prepared for a project when the initial study has identified potentially significant effect on the environment, but (1) revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by, the applicant before the proposed negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid effect or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur, and (2) there is no substantial evidence in the light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment. The City of Burlingame has completed a review of the proposed project, and on the basis of an Initial Study and mitigations, finds that the project will not have a significant effect upon the environment. The Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study are available for public review at City Hall, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California, 94010, or online at www.burlingame.org/225california.

Comment Period: As mandated by State Law, the minimum comment period for this document is 20 (twenty) days and begins on February 23, 2016 and ends on March 14, 2016. Comments may be submitted during the review period. Persons having comments concerning this project, including objections to the basis of determination set forth in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, are invited to furnish their comments summarizing the specific and factual basis for their comments, in writing to:

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

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

PUBLIC HEARING: The Planning Commission hearing to review the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and Commercial Design Review for this project has not been scheduled at this time.

Posted: February 23, 2016

225 California Drive Project

PROPOSED
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (MND)

February 2016

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
Division 13, Public Resources Code

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

Project Description

The applicant is proposing to construct a four-story building that would include a mix of retail and commercial uses and a three-level underground parking garage. The building footprint would cover approximately 17,500 square feet. The project proposes 1,820 square feet of retail space and 43,235 square feet of office space. The project height conforms to the 55-foot height limit for the Howard Mixed Use zone. The parking ordinance requires 145 parking spaces for the project. The project will provide 130 parking spaces because the applicant has committed to provide a car share program (e.g., Zipcar or other similar type of service). The DSP allows up to a 10 percent reduction in the parking requirements (with City approval) for projects with car share facilities provided on-site. Accordingly, the project's parking count would comply with City regulations.

The project proposes a traditional architectural style to be compatible with other buildings downtown. Additional landscaping would include trees on the ground floor exterior, along with planters in decorative pots that line the front of the building on Highland Avenue. The balconies would be paved and include decorative pots and planters. The total construction time is estimated to be 16 months.

According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the property at the existing 215 California Drive is listed as a "LUST Clean-up Site" pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The property at 215 California Drive is currently registered as an "Open- Site Assessment" for a Leaking Underground Storage Tank that was removed in 2011. On-going monitoring is being conducted as directed by the San Mateo County Health Department. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 will be implemented to ensure that impacts to the public or the environment would be less than significant.

Determination

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is proposed by the City of Burlingame for the project. The Initial Study and supporting documents have been prepared to determine if the project would result in potentially significant or significant impacts to the environment (**Exhibit A, Initial Study**). On the basis of the Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed action, with the incorporation of the mitigation measures described below, will not have a significant effect on the environment. The 20 mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study are listed in **Table 1a** below. The public review period will occur from Monday, February 23, 2016 to Monday March 14, 2016. The supporting technical reports that constitute the record of proceedings upon which this determination is made are available for public review at the City of Burlingame Community Development Department office at 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame CA 94010, between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday.

Table 1a Summary of Project Impacts		
Environmental Factor	*Mitigation Measures*	*Level of Environmental Impact*
Aesthetics	Mitigation Measure AES-1: The project developer shall install low-profile, low-intensity lighting directed downward to minimize light and glare. Exterior lighting shall be low mounted, downward casting, and shielded. In general, the light footprint shall not extend beyond the periphery of each property. Implementation of exterior lighting fixtures on all buildings shall also comply with the standard California Building Code (Title 24, Building Energy Efficiency Standards) to reduce the lateral spreading of light to surrounding uses, consistent with Burlingame Municipal Code Section 18.16.030 that requires that all new exterior lighting for commercial developments be designed and located so that the cone of light and/or glare from the light element is kept entirely on the property or below the top of any fence, edge or wall.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Air Quality	Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The contractor shall implement the BMPs listed below that are required of all projects. ▪ All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. ▪ All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. ▪ All visible mud or dirt 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. ▪ All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph).	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Table 1a Summary of Project Impacts		
Environmental Factor	*Mitigation Measures*	*Level of Environmental Impact*
	▪ All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. ▪ Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. ▪ All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. ▪ Post a publicly visible sign 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. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.	
Cultural Resources	Mitigation Measure CUL-1: In the event archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work shall be halted within 100 feet of the discovered materials and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations. If an archaeological site is encountered in any stage of development, a qualified archeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource qualifies as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource. In the event that it does qualify, the archaeologist shall prepare a research design and archaeological data recovery plan to be implemented prior to or during site construction. The archaeologist shall also prepare a written report of the finding, file it with the appropriate agency, and arrange for curation of recovered materials.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Cultural Resources	Mitigation Measure CUL-2: A discovery of a paleontological specimen during any phase of the project shall result in a work stoppage in the vicinity of the find until it can be evaluated by a professional paleontologist. Should loss or damage be detected, additional protective measures or further action (e.g., resource removal), as determined by a professional paleontologist, shall be implemented to mitigate the impact.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Cultural Resources	Mitigation Measure CUL-3: In the event that human remains are discovered during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Table 1a Summary of Project Impacts		
Environmental Factor	*Mitigation Measures*	*Level of Environmental Impact*
	suspected to overlie adjacent human remains. The county coroner shall be informed to evaluate the nature of the remains. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Lead Agency shall work with the Native American Heritage Commission and the applicant to develop an agreement for treating or disposing of the human remains.	
Geology and Soils	Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Project design and construction shall adhere to Title 18, Chapter 18.28 of the Burlingame Municipal Code, and demonstrate compliance with all design standards applicable to the California Building Code Zone 4 would ensure maximum practicable protection available to users of the buildings and associated infrastructure.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Geology and Soils	Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Project design and construction, including excavation activities, shall comply with Chapter 33 of the CBC, which specifies the safety requirement to be fulfilled for site work. This would include prevention of subsidence and pavement or foundations caused by dewatering.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Geology and Soils	Mitigation Measure GEO-3: The applicant shall prepare a monitoring program to determine the effects of construction on nearby improvements, including the monitoring of cracking and vertical movement of adjacent structures, and nearby streets, sidewalks, utilities, and other improvements. As necessary, inclinometers or other instrumentation shall be installed as part of the shoring system to closely monitor lateral movement. The program shall include a pre-condition survey including photographs and installation of monitoring points for existing site improvements.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: The contractor shall comply with Title 8, California Code of Regulations/Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) requirements that cover construction work where an employee may be exposed to lead. This includes the proper removal and disposal of peeling paint, and appropriate sampling of painted building surfaces for lead prior to disturbance of the paint and disposal of the paint or painted materials.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: The applicant shall contract a Certified Asbestos Consultant to conduct an asbestos survey prior to disturbing potential asbestos containing building materials and follow the Consultant's recommendations for proper handling and disposal.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: The applicant shall prepare, and submit, a SMP/Environmental Management Plan to the San Mateo County Health Department for approval, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The SMP/Environmental Management Plan shall address the possibility of encountering subsurface contaminants, including groundwater, during construction activities, and the relevant measures	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Table 1a Summary of Project Impacts		
Environmental Factor	*Mitigation Measures*	*Level of Environmental Impact*
	for identifying, handling, and disposing of subsurface contaminants. The SMP/Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted and approved by the San Mateo County Health Department prior to issuance of a building permit.	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: The contractor shall ensure the appropriate handling, storing, and sampling of any soil to be removed from the subject property, as per the SMP, so as to eliminate potential health and safety risks to the public, including construction workers.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Mitigation Measure HAZ-5: In the event that groundwater, or other subsurface contaminants, are encountered during excavation, grading, or any other demolition/construction activities at the project site, the contractor shall ensure that the procedure for evaluating, handling, storing, testing, and disposing of contaminated groundwater is implemented, as per the SMP (see Mitigation Measure HAZ-3).	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Mitigation Measure HAZ-6: Workers handling demolition and renovation activities at the project site shall be trained in the safe handling and disposal of any containments with which they are handling or disposing of on the project site.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Noise	Mitigation Measure NOI-1: The contractor shall ensure that the interior noise levels are maintained at or below 50 dBA Leq(1-hr). Treatments would include, but are not limited to, sound-rated wall and window constructions, acoustical caulking, protected ventilation openings, etc. The specific determination of which noise insulation treatments are necessary shall be conducted during final design of the project. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, shall be submitted to the City, along with the building plans and approved design, prior to issuance of a building permit.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Noise	Mitigation Measure NOI-2: The contractor shall install forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all exterior-facing rooms of the office building so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control interior noise and achieve the interior noise standards.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Noise	Mitigation Measure NOI-3: The use of typical vibration-generating construction equipment, such as hoe rams, dozers, and drills, shall be prohibited within 10 feet of any adjacent commercial building. The use of heavy vibration-generating construction equipment, such as vibratory rollers or clam shovel drops, within 25 feet of any adjacent commercial/residential building shall be prohibited as well. Or Alternatively, a construction vibration monitoring plan shall be implemented to document conditions prior to, during, and after	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Table 1a Summary of Project Impacts		
Environmental Factor	*Mitigation Measures*	*Level of Environmental Impact*
	vibration generating construction activities. All plan tasks shall be undertaken under the direction of a licensed Professional Structural Engineer in the State of California or other qualified persons as determined by the City and be in accordance with industry-accepted standard methods. The construction vibration monitoring plan shall be implemented to include the following tasks: ▪ Identification of the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 50 feet of the project site. ▪ Performance of a photo survey, elevation survey, and crack monitoring survey for each structure within 50 feet of construction activities identified as sources of high vibration levels. Surveys shall be performed prior to any construction activity, in regular interval during construction and after project completion and shall include internal and external crack monitoring in structures, settlement, and distress and shall document the condition of foundations, walls and other structural elements in the interior and exterior of said structures. ▪ Development of a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, define structure-specific vibration limits, and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions. Construction contingencies would be identified for when vibration levels approached the limits. ▪ At a minimum, vibration monitoring shall be conducted during demolition, excavation, and foundation construction. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements. ▪ If vibration levels approach limits, suspend vibratory construction activities or methods and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures. ▪ Designate a person responsible for registering and investigating claims of excessive vibration. The contact information of such person shall be clearly posted on the construction site. ▪ Conduct post-survey on structures where either monitoring has indicated high levels or complaints of damage has been made. Make appropriate repairs or provide compensation where damage has occurred as a result of construction activities. The results of all vibration monitoring shall be summarized and submitted in a report shortly after substantial completion of each	

Table 1a Summary of Project Impacts		
Environmental Factor	*Mitigation Measures*	*Level of Environmental Impact*
	phase identified in the project schedule. The report will include a description of measurement methods, equipment used, calibration certificates, and graphics as required to clearly identify vibration-monitoring locations. An explanation of all events that exceeded vibration limits will be included together with proper documentation supporting any such claims.	
Noise	Mitigation Measure NOI-4: ▪ Noise-generating activities at the construction site or in areas adjacent to the construction site associated with the project in any way will be restricted to the hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday, and 9:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturdays, and 10:00 am to 06:00pm on Sundays and holidays. ▪ Construct solid plywood fences around the construction site adjacent to operational businesses, residences, or other noise-sensitive land uses. ▪ A temporary noise control blanket barrier could be erected, if necessary, along building facades adjoining the construction site. This mitigation would only be necessary if conflicts occurred which were irresolvable by proper scheduling. Noise control blanket barriers can be rented and quickly erected. ▪ All internal combustion engine driven equipment will be equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. ▪ Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be strictly prohibited. ▪ Stationary noise generating equipment (e.g., concrete crusher) will be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors, and acoustically shielded with temporary noise barriers, material stockpiles, etc. to reduce noise levels at nearby residences. The noise barriers shall provide a break in the line-of-sight between the equipment and the nearest receptors, which would result in a minimum noise reduction of 5 dBA. ▪ "Quiet" air compressors and other stationery noise sources will be utilized where technology exists. The “quiet” equipment shall be a minimum of 5 dBA lower in noise level than conventional equipment. ▪ Control noise from construction workers’ radios to a point where they are not audible at existing residences bordering the project site. ▪ The contractor will prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. This plan shall be distributed to noise-sensitive uses within 1,200 ft of the project site. ▪ A "disturbance coordinator" will be designated, and will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Table 1a Summary of Project Impacts		
Environmental Factor	***Mitigation Measures***	***Level of Environmental Impact***
	construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented as soon as possible. A telephone number for the disturbance coordinator shall be posted at the construction site and included in the notices sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule. The construction contractor will log construction noise complaints, the causes of the complaints, and the measures implemented to address the complaints. The log will be provided to the City upon request.	
Transportation and Traffic	**Mitigation Measure TRA-1:** Prior to issuance of grading and building permits, the project applicant shall submit a Traffic Control Plan. The requirements within the Traffic Control Plan include, but are not limited to, the following: truck drivers would be notified of and required to use the most direct route between the site and U.S. 101, as determined by the City Engineering Department; all site ingress and egress would occur only at the main driveways to the project site; specifically designated travel routes for large vehicles would be monitored and controlled by flaggers for large construction vehicle ingress and egress; warning signs indicating frequent truck entry and exit would be posted on adjacent roadways if requested; and any debris and mud on nearby streets caused by trucks would be monitored daily and may require instituting a street cleaning program. In addition, eight loads of heavy equipment being hauled to and from the site each month would be short-term and temporary.	**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**
Utilities	**Mitigation measure UTIL-1:** The applicant shall prepare a report to determine if the water and sewer main requires upsizing. This analysis will be reviewed by the City and if required, the applicant will be required to pay for their pro-rata share of the upsizing or a designated run of the line, the details of which would be determined by the Department of Public Works prior to building permit approval.	**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**

FOR 2/22/16

William Meeker
Community Development Director

Date

EXHIBIT A

City of Burlingame
225 California Drive Project

Initial Study

Prepared By:

Circlepoint
1814 Franklin Street, Suite 1000
Oakland, CA 94612

Prepared For:

City of Burlingame
Community Development Department
501 Primrose Road
Burlingame, CA 94010

February 2016

Page Intentionally Left Blank

225 CALIFORNIA DRIVE PROJECT

INITIAL STUDY

Prepared for City of Burlingame

February 2016

Page left intentionally blank

Table of Contents

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected iv

Determination v

Project Description 1

Environmental Impact Checklist

1 Aesthetics 6

2 Agriculture Resources 9

3 Air Quality 10

4 Biological Resources 19

5 Cultural Resources 22

6 Geology and Soils 25

7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 29

8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 32

9 Hydrology and Water Quality 38

10 Land Use and Planning 43

11 Mineral Resources 45

12 Noise 46

13 Population and Housing 54

14 Public Services 56

15 Recreation 58

16 Transportation and Traffic 59

17 Utilities and Service Systems 65

18 Mandatory Findings of Significance 69

References 71

List of Tables

Table 1 Project Components

Table 2 Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Table 3 Construction Period Emissions

Table 4 Short-term and Long-term Measurement Data

Table 5 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Table 6 Existing and Proposed Trips

Table 7 Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Conditions

Table 8 Cumulative Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Conditions

List of Figures

Figure 1 Project Site

Figure 2 Proposed Exterior Elevations

Figure 3 Locations of Sensitive Receptors

Appendices

Appendix A: Project Plans

Appendix B: Shadow Analysis and Peer Review

Appendix C: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment

Appendix D: California Historical Resources Information System Records Search

Appendix E: Geotechnical Report

Appendix F: Human Health Risk Assessment

Appendix G: Noise Assessment

Appendix H: Transportation Impact Analysis

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

1. Project Title:	225 California Drive
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Burlingame 501 Primrose Road Burlingame, CA 94010
3. Contact Person and Phone Number:	Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Telephone: (650) 558-7253 E-Mail: kgardiner@burlingame.org
4. Project Location:	225 California Drive Burlingame, CA
5. San Mateo County Assessor's Parcel Number:	APN 029-211-080
6. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	Dewey Land Company 999 Baker Way, Suite 300 San Mateo, CA 94404
7. General Plan Designation:	Howard Avenue Mixed Use District
8. Zoning:	Howard Avenue Mixed Use District
9. Description of Project:	See project description below
10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:	See project description below

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- ☒ Aesthetics
- ☒ Air Quality
- ☒ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☐ Hydrology & Water Quality
- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☐ Population & Housing
- ☐ Recreation
- ☒ Utilities & Service Systems
- ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- ☐ Biological Resources
- ☒ Geology & Soils
- ☒ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Land Use & Planning
- ☒ Noise
- ☐ Public Services
- ☒ Transportation & Traffic
- ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Jim Harder FOR 2/22/16

William Meeker, Community Development Date

Page left intentionally blank

Summary of Mitigation Measures 225 California Drive	
Mitigation Measure Number	**Mitigation Measure**
Mitigation Measure AES-1	The project developer shall install low-profile, low-intensity lighting directed downward to minimize light and glare. Exterior lighting shall be low mounted, downward casting, and shielded. In general, the light footprint shall not extend beyond the periphery of each property. Implementation of exterior lighting fixtures on all buildings shall also comply with the standard California Building Code (Title 24, Building Energy Efficiency Standards) to reduce the lateral spreading of light to surrounding uses, consistent with Burlingame Municipal Code Section 18.16.030 that requires that all new exterior lighting for commercial developments be designed and located so that the cone of light and/or glare from the light element is kept entirely on the property or below the top of any fence, edge or wall.
Mitigation Measure AQ-1	The contractor shall implement the BMPs listed below that are required of all projects. ▪ All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day as necessary to prevent dust. ▪ All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. ▪ 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. ▪ All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph). ▪ All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. ▪ Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. ▪ All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. ▪ Post a publicly visible sign 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. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
Mitigation Measure CUL-1	In the event archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work shall be halted within 100 feet of the discovered materials and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations. If an archaeological site is encountered in any stage of development, a qualified archeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource qualifies as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource. In the event that it does qualify, the archaeologist shall prepare a research design and archaeological data recovery plan to be implemented prior to or during site construction. The archaeologist shall also prepare a written report of the finding, file it with the appropriate agency, and arrange for curation of recovered materials.

Summary of Mitigation Measures 225 California Drive	
Mitigation Measure CUL-2	A discovery of a paleontological specimen during any phase of the project shall result in a work stoppage in the vicinity of the find until it can be evaluated by a professional paleontologist. Should loss or damage be detected, additional protective measures or further action (e.g., resource removal), as determined by a professional paleontologist, shall be implemented to mitigate the impact.
Mitigation Measure CUL-3	In the event that human remains are discovered during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains. The county coroner shall be informed to evaluate the nature of the remains. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Lead Agency shall work with the Native American Heritage Commission and the applicant to develop an agreement for treating or disposing of the human remains.
Mitigation Measure GEO-1	Project design and construction shall adhere to Title 18, Chapter 18.28 of the Burlingame Municipal Code, and demonstrate compliance with all design standards applicable to the California Building Code Zone 4 would ensure maximum practicable protection available to users of the buildings and associated infrastructure.
Mitigation Measure GEO-2	Project design and construction, including excavation activities, shall comply with Chapter 33 of the CBC, which specifies the safety requirement to be fulfilled for site work. This would include prevention of subsidence and pavement or foundations caused by dewatering.
Mitigation Measure GEO-3	The applicant shall prepare a monitoring program to determine the effects of construction on nearby improvements, including the monitoring of cracking and vertical movement of adjacent structures, and nearby streets, sidewalks, utilities, and other improvements. As necessary, inclinometers or other instrumentation shall be installed as part of the shoring system to closely monitor lateral movement. The program shall include a pre-condition survey including photographs and installation of monitoring points for existing site improvements.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-1	The contractor shall comply with Title 8, California Code of Regulations/Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) requirements that cover construction work where an employee may be exposed to lead. This includes the proper removal and disposal of peeling paint, and appropriate sampling of painted building surfaces for lead prior to disturbance of the paint and disposal of the paint or painted materials.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-2	The applicant shall contract a Certified Asbestos Consultant to conduct an asbestos survey prior to disturbing potential asbestos containing building materials and follow the Consultant's recommendations for proper handling and disposal.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-3	The applicant shall prepare, and submit, a SMP/Environmental Management Plan to the San Mateo County Health Department for approval, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The SMP/Environmental Management Plan shall address the possibility of encountering subsurface contaminants, including groundwater, during construction activities, and the relevant measures for identifying, handling, and disposing of subsurface contaminants. The SMP/Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted and approved by the San Mateo County Health Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-4	The contractor shall ensure the appropriate handling, storing, and sampling of any soil to be removed from the subject property, as per the SMP, so as to eliminate potential health and safety risks to the public, including construction workers.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-5	In the event that groundwater, or other subsurface contaminants, are encountered during excavation, grading, or any other demolition/construction activities at the project site, the contractor shall ensure that the procedure for evaluating, handling, storing, testing, and disposing of contaminated groundwater is implemented, as per the SMP (see **Mitigation Measure HAZ-3**).

Summary of Mitigation Measures 225 California Drive	
Mitigation Measure HAZ-6	Workers handling demolition and renovation activities at the project site shall be trained in the safe handling and disposal of any containments with which they are handling or disposing of on the project site.
Mitigation Measure NOI-1	The contractor shall ensure that the interior noise levels are maintained at or below 50 dBA Leq(1-hr). Treatments would include, but are not limited to, sound-rated wall and window constructions, acoustical caulking, protected ventilation openings, etc. The specific determination of which noise insulation treatments are necessary shall be conducted during final design of the project. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, shall be submitted to the City, along with the building plans and approved design, prior to issuance of a building permit.
Mitigation Measure NOI-2	The contractor shall install forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all exterior-facing rooms of the office building so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control interior noise and achieve the interior noise standards.
Mitigation Measure NOI-3	The use of typical vibration-generating construction equipment, such as hoe rams, dozers, and drills, shall be prohibited within 10 feet of any adjacent commercial/residential building. The use of heavy vibration-generating construction equipment, such as vibratory rollers or clam shovel drops, within 25 feet of any adjacent commercial/residential building shall be prohibited as well. Or Alternatively, a construction vibration monitoring plan shall be implemented to document conditions prior to, during, and after vibration generating construction activities. All plan tasks shall be undertaken under the direction of a licensed Professional Structural Engineer in the State of California or other qualified persons as determined by the City and be in accordance with industry-accepted standard methods. The construction vibration monitoring plan shall include the following tasks: ▪ Identification of the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 50 feet of the project site. ▪ Performance of a photo survey, elevation survey, and crack monitoring survey for each structure within 50 feet of construction activities identified as sources of high vibration levels. Surveys shall be performed prior to any construction activity, in regular interval during construction and after project completion and shall include internal and external crack monitoring in structures, settlement, and distress and shall document the condition of foundations, walls and other structural elements in the interior and exterior of said structures. ▪ Development of a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, define structure-specific vibration limits, and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions. Construction contingencies would be identified for when vibration levels approached the limits. ▪ At a minimum, vibration monitoring shall be conducted during demolition, excavation, and foundation construction. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements. ▪ If vibration levels approach limits, suspend vibratory construction activities or methods and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures. ▪ Designate a person responsible for registering and investigating claims of

Summary of Mitigation Measures 225 California Drive	
	excessive vibration. The contact information of such person shall be clearly posted on the construction site. ▪ Conduct post-survey on structures where either monitoring has indicated high levels or complaints of damage has been made. Make appropriate repairs or provide compensation where damage has occurred as a result of construction activities. The results of all vibration monitoring shall be summarized and submitted in a report shortly after substantial completion of each phase identified in the project schedule. The report will include a description of measurement methods, equipment used, calibration certificates, and graphics as required to clearly identify vibration-monitoring locations. An explanation of all events that exceeded vibration limits will be included together with proper documentation supporting any such claims.
Mitigation Measure NOI-4	▪ Noise-generating activities at the construction site or in areas adjacent to the construction site associated with the project in any way will be restricted to the hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday, and 9:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturdays, and 10:00 am to 06:00pm on Sundays and holidays. ▪ Construct solid plywood fences around the construction site adjacent to operational businesses, residences, or other noise-sensitive land uses. ▪ A temporary noise control blanket barrier could be erected, if necessary, along building facades adjoining the construction site. This mitigation would only be necessary if conflicts occurred which were irresolvable by proper scheduling. Noise control blanket barriers can be rented and quickly erected. ▪ All internal combustion engine driven equipment will be equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. ▪ Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be strictly prohibited. ▪ Stationary noise generating equipment (e.g., concrete crusher) will be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors, and acoustically shielded with temporary noise barriers, material stockpiles, etc. to reduce noise levels at nearby residences. The noise barriers shall provide a break in the line-of-sight between the equipment and the nearest receptors, which would result in a minimum noise reduction of 5 dBA. ▪ "Quiet" air compressors and other stationery noise sources will be utilized where technology exists. The “quiet” equipment shall be a minimum of 5 dBA lower in noise level than conventional equipment. ▪ Control noise from construction workers’ radios to a point where they are not audible at existing residences bordering the project site. ▪ The contractor will prepare a construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. This plan shall be distributed to noise-sensitive uses within 500 ft of the project site. ▪ A "disturbance coordinator" will be designated, and will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented as soon as possible. A telephone number for the disturbance coordinator shall be posted at the construction site and included in the notices sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule. The construction contractor will log construction noise complaints, the causes of the complaints, and the measures implemented to address the complaints. The log will be provided to the City upon request.

Summary of Mitigation Measures 225 California Drive	
Mitigation Measure TRA-1	Prior to issuance of grading and building permits, the project applicant shall submit a Traffic Control Plan. The requirements within the Traffic Control Plan include, but are not limited to, the following: truck drivers would be notified of and required to use the most direct route between the site and U.S. 101, as determined by the City Engineering Department; all site ingress and egress would occur only at the main driveways to the project site; specifically designated travel routes for large vehicles would be monitored and controlled by flaggers for large construction vehicle ingress and egress; warning signs indicating frequent truck entry and exit would be posted on adjacent roadways if requested; and any debris and mud on nearby streets caused by trucks would be monitored daily and may require instituting a street cleaning program. In addition, eight loads of heavy equipment being hauled to and from the site each month would be short-term and temporary.
Mitigation Measure UTIL-1	The applicant shall prepare a report to determine if the water and sewer main requires upsizing. This analysis will be reviewed by the City and if required, the applicant will be required to pay for their pro-rata share of the upsizing or a designated run of the line, the details of which would be determined by the Department of Public Works prior to building permit approval.

Page left intentionally blank

Project Description

Existing Project Setting

The project site is located within the downtown area of Burlingame, within San Mateo County. The project site includes three existing street addresses, within two attached buildings: 215, 217, and 233 California Drive. California Drive, Highland Avenue, and Hatch Lane surround the 0.4-acre parcel (Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 029-211-080).

Existing Conditions and Land Use

The project site is located within the Howard Avenue Mixed Use (HMU) planning area of the *Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan* (DSP).[1] The DSP identifies the HMU District as a focus area that will provide for a variety of retail, commercial, office, and residential uses in accordance with the DSP's land use designations and development standards.

The project site is relatively flat and is located approximately 30 feet above mean sea level. The site is located immediately southwest of the Caltrain tracks and approximately 1 mile west of the San Francisco Bay. The site is developed with two, connected, commercial one-story structures that are currently vacant and total 13,730 square feet of retail/commercial space. No vegetation exists on the project site. Former occupants included Sterling Cleaners, Federal Auto Parts, Cycles Unlimited, a landscape architect, and Gilmans Kitchens and Baths, and Fine Consign Quality Furniture. The project site previously contained underground storage tanks (UST), including one leaking underground storage tank (LUST). These tanks were removed in 2011. See **Section 8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials,** for a more detailed discussion on this topic. A small paved parking area is located in the rear of the project site facing Hatch Lane that accommodates approximately six vehicles. Access to the site is provided from Highland Avenue, a one-way southbound roadway (**Figure 1**).

Commercial, retail, and office areas surround the project site to the west and south; residential areas are located to the southeast of the project site. Sakae restaurant and the San Mateo Welfare and Health Union Chapter are located immediately adjacent to the project site. The Burlingame Caltrain Station is located several hundred feet north of the project site, within walking distance. Washington Elementary School is located approximately 0.2 miles northeast of the project site; Burlingame High School is located approximately 0.5 miles north of the project site. Washington Park is also located within 0.1 mile of the project site.

Proposed Project Components

The project includes construction of a four-story building that would include a mix of retail and office uses and a three-level underground parking garage (see **Table 1**). The building footprint would cover approximately 17,500 square feet. The project proposes 1,820 square feet of retail space and 43,235 square feet of office space. The project height conforms to the 55-foot height limit for the HMU zone. **Figure 2** includes visual renderings of the proposed height elevations. The City parking ordinance requires 145 parking spaces for the project. The project would provide 130 parking spaces because the applicant has committed to provide a car share program (e.g., Zipcar or other similar type of service). The DSP allows up to a 10 percent reduction in the

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

parking requirements (with City approval) for projects with car share facilities provided on-site. Accordingly, the project's parking count would comply with City regulations. A detailed description of each level of the four-story building is provided below. The project plans are included as **Appendix A** of this initial study**.**

Table 1 Project Components

Proposed Component Type	Square Feet
Retail Use	1,820
Office Use	43,235
Landscaping/Planters	267
Parking	56,905 (130 spaces)
Building Utilities (ground level)	2,780

Source: MBH Architect, 2015

Proposed Building

Garage Levels (G3-G1)

The three garage levels, G1, G2, and G3, would be approximately 34 feet below grade. The G1, G2, and G3 levels each include 36 parking spaces. Access to the garage levels would be via the ground floor entrance on Highland Avenue and downward on the vehicular ramp. The parking areas would include an elevator room and two staircases with access to the above four levels. The garage levels also include a mechanical room and building storage.

Ground Level

The ground level would be at-grade and include the main commercial lobby, 1,820 square feet of retail space, and parking spaces for tenants of the building, including handicap accessible and car share spaces. Vehicles would enter at ground level via Highland Avenue and would either use the available parking spaces or take the vehicular ramp to the lower level garage parking. A bicycle room and garbage/recycling room would be located on the ground floor. Pedestrians would enter the building from the main entry on the northern side of the building at Highland Avenue or from the two additional pedestrian entrances along Highland Avenue. Upper floors would be accessible via an elevator in lobby, a staircase connected to the lobby, or a staircase on the southern side of the building.

Upper Levels (2-4)

The second and third levels would each include 14,240 square feet of office space. The second level includes four outdoor balcony areas on the west and east side of the building. The fourth floor includes 14,045 square feet of commercial space and a balcony along the front of the building facing Highland Avenue. Structural columns would be scattered throughout the commercial area as support for the overall structure. A men and women's restroom and closet would be located in the center of the floor. The floors would be accessible via elevators and two staircases.

Roof Level

The roof level would be accessible via staircase and would contain the mechanical equipment and exhaust from the garage. Several solar panel arrays are proposed for the roof deck that would generate some renewable electricity for the building. The roof level would not be designed to accommodate tenant recreational use.

Design and Landscaping

The project is proposed to contain a more traditional architectural style to be compatible with other buildings downtown. The ground level lobby and store front would have large floor to ceiling clear glass windows and metal doors. The building siding would include white painted plaster and a slate stone base. The upper floors would include a custom decorative leaf pattern frieze panel. The second floor windows along Highland Avenue would have decorative wrought iron railing to further enhance the character of the building. The project design would include openings and modulation on the ground floor to match the scale and cadence of the surrounding neighborhood. This would be accomplished using different opening sizes and styles on the ground floor. The stone base would be intended to provide a respectful nod to the neighboring retail facades.

The existing project site contains no landscaping or vegetation. The project proposes four City standard trees on the ground floor exterior, along with planters in decorative pots that line the front of the building on Highland Avenue. The balconies would be paved and include decorative pots and planters.

Utilities

The Burlingame Public Works Department provides water and wastewater service to the project site. The project site is connected to the City's utility infrastructure which includes an existing 8-inch water line and a 10-inch sanitary sewer line. The new building would tie-in to these existing lines. New construction is required to comply with California Fire Code requirements for fire flow, based on the size of the building and type of construction, and hydrant spacing. Upon building permit submittal, Central County Fire Department will require that the project comply with State Fire Code for emergency water supply (hydrants) with regard to the increase of square footage at the project site and necessary flow rate (gallons per minutes); if the existing water line cannot meet the flow rate then the applicant would be responsible for upsizing the water line. The Street and Sewer Division of the Department of the City Public Works Department maintains Burlingame's stormwater infrastructure. The project site is connected to an existing 15-inch stormwater line and the new building would tie-in to this existing line to convey stormwater infrastructure. As described in **Section 17, Utilities and Sewer Systems,** the applicant will need to do an analysis to determine if the sewer main requires upsizing. This analysis will be reviewed by the City and if required, the applicant will be required to pay for their pro-rata share of the upsizing or a designated run of the line, the details of which would be determined by the Department of Public Works prior to building permit approval. The proposed project would replace existing impervious surfaces with 17,226 square feet of new impervious surface and 267 square feet of landscaping. Approximately, six (6) roof drains would collect rainwater and pipe it through a storm filter before emptying into an existing 15-inch storm drain system.

Construction

The proposed construction methods are considered to be conceptual and are subject to review and approval by the City of Burlingame. For the purposes of this environmental document, the analysis considers the construction plan as described below.

The existing buildings, concrete, and paving on the site would be demolished and removed as part of the project. A "temporary slurry/cut-off wall" would be constructed around the project site before any soil would be removed. This wall would serve two purposes: 1) act as a retaining wall around the project site, and 2) prevent groundwater from infiltrating onto the site. The wall would be built in the ground by mixing the soil around the perimeter of the project site with a slurry mix until it would form a subterranean wall around the

project site. The wall would be approximately 30 inches thick and extend to a depth of approximately 55 feet. This construction technique is referred to as a Cutter Soil Mix System (CSM). It utilizes a set of milling wheels working in the vertical plane. This mechanical mixing action of the milling wheels helps break the soil into small particles. The mixing tool is placed into the ground at a continuous rate. The soil matrix is broken up by the cutting wheels at the same time a neat cement grout is pumped through a set of nozzles, located between the cutting wheels, where it is mixed thoroughly with the loosened soil. The perimeter of the temporary shoring system would be constructed by overlapping a series of CSM panels. Soldier piles are placed into the fluid soil mix after each panel is completed. These soldier piles are not driven into the ground, but rather placed into the mix which is fluid enough to allow for the piles to be inserted into place.

Once the slurry/cut-off wall is built in the ground, construction workers would excavate soil to a depth of approximately 40 feet (which is the bottom of the planned project depth). As the soil is off-hauled, tiebacks would be installed to provide the temporary lateral support for the excavation until the garage wall is constructed. Temporary tiebacks are grouted tendons that transfer forces into the ground through the steel and grout body; the tiebacks would be approximately 6 to 8 inches in diameter. The temporary tiebacks are installed through prefabricated blockouts in soldier piles (previously set in the CSM wall) as the site is excavated. The temporary tiebacks would be installed using a hydraulically operated drill rig that has the capability of casing and drilling at the same time (duplex drill method). The temporary tiebacks are placed in 2 rows, the first row between 7 to 10 feet below grade, and the second row at approximately 22 to 25 feet below grade. The tiebacks are spaced approximately 5 feet on center. Drilling would be performed from the face of the shoring beam to the design tip elevation. These tiebacks would be underpinned to adjacent properties and would require necessary approvals for such work.

The project assumes approximately 25,000 cubic yards of soil export. All soil, including contaminated soil would be off-hauled to Ox Mountain (Half Moon Bay) or a similarly appropriate facility. The hauling trucks would access the site by heading south on California Drive from US 101 (Broadway interchange), making a slight right turn onto Highland and stopping in front of the site. Once full, the trucks would continue down Highland before turning left onto Howard Avenue in order to turn back onto California Drive and proceed in either the north or south direction, depending on the final destination of the off-haul. Once excavation is complete, construction workers would drill a hole in the ground and fill it with rebar and concrete to install a ground anchor. The ground anchor would be installed for the proposed building structure to resist potential underground vertical and horizontal uplift pressures. Once the anchor is in place, the parking garage would be constructed.

Total construction time is anticipated to be approximately 16 months. Construction would occur during the construction hours allowed by the Burlingame Municipal Code, Section 18.07.110, specifically:

Weekdays: 7:00 am – 7:00 pm
Saturdays: 9:00 am – 6:00 pm
Sunday and Holidays: 10:00 am – 6:00 pm

Access and Circulation

The project site is located south of U.S. Highway 101 (US 101) and north of El Camino Real; both major traffic corridors providing access to Burlingame. Vehicles would access and exit the site from an entrance to the garage on Highland Avenue, which is a one-way southbound roadway (see **Figure 1**). The project location

would provide easy access to the Burlingame Caltrain station. Bicycle parking areas would be provided, as well. Future employees in the building would be within walking distance to a number of restaurants and amenities.

Project Approvals

The project requires the following approvals:

- Design review – required for new commercial buildings to determine (Code Section 25.57.010(c)). Planning Commission will consider design features and compatibility with nearby historic structures and character
- Adoption of a mitigated negative declaration – California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) clearance
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) permit is to be obtained for the shoring at the excavation in the basement per CAL/OSHA requirements
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to obtain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit
- Grading permit

Environmental Impact Checklist

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
1. Aesthetics				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Setting

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

The project site lies within the central portion of the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan area. This area is zoned as the Howard Avenue Mixed Use area (HMU), which consists of a mix of uses including retail, office, and multifamily residential. According to the *Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration* (Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND), ground floor retail use and housing on the upper levels (above commercial uses) are encouraged within HMU land uses. Railroad tracks run parallel to California Drive as close as 270 feet from the project site and the Burlingame Caltrain Station is also immediately adjacent to California Drive.

This project site is located on a flat, urbanized site that is surrounded by retail and commercial uses. The project site is entirely developed with a vacant one-story commercial building and a small surface parking lot in the rear of the site facing Hatch Lane. No vegetation exists on the site. Sightlines are typically restricted by flat topography, low elevation, and surrounding development.

The surrounding area consists of one- and two-story buildings with an occasional taller structure. Most of these structures have little to no setback from the road. A handful of nearby lots are paved for surface parking or auto sales. A shadow report was prepared for the project in response to public concern of potential aesthetic impacts. While shadow effects are not a CEQA topic, this report is included as **Appendix B** for information purposes only.

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

Construction

Construction of the proposed project would involve earthmoving operations and grading activities. As a result, construction equipment, construction vehicles, staging areas, and associated construction debris would be visible on the project site for the duration of construction (approximately 16 months). The visual character and quality of the site would change for a temporary period of time, depending on the work and equipment used. However, the visual effects of construction activities would be similar to other types of development and construction that typically occur within the area and are temporary in nature.

Operation

The project would construct a four-story structure on a currently developed parcel surrounded by commercial uses, retail businesses, and transportation corridors. The project would fill the existing lot with narrow side setbacks, recreating the solid visual mass along Highland Avenue. These elements, combined with light landscaping and planters, would engage the sidewalk on a human scale. The rear side of the building facing Hatch Lane would reflect the design elements of the California Drive façade.

The proposed building would be taller than adjacent buildings but would be within the maximum allowable 55-foot height limit of the HMU zone. Openings in the building’s roofline are designed to create lightness on top of the building.

The project would use materials to reduce its perceived mass to blend with the neighboring buildings. These materials would include stone, glass reinforced concrete, and wood finishes. The proposed structure would include a stone base to match neighboring retail street elements, and ground-floor openings to reflect the scale and cadence of the surrounding area. Upper floors would have glass walls and recessed openings to create a balanced elevation that also fits the character of the neighborhood. The various architectural textures, profiles, materials, and color pallets were selected based on their consistency reflect the traditional style of the City of Burlingame. However, the overall design reflects a more modern architectural style than what currently exists in much of the surrounding community.

Although the height of the proposed building would be taller than surrounding buildings, it is within the maximum height limit for the HMU zone. The project was designed to be consistent and complimentary with the vision of the DSP. In addition, the building has been designed to meet the requirements of the City of Burlingame Commercial Design Guidebook. As a result, the structure would align with the urban characteristic of downtown Burlingame and would not substantially degrade the visual quality and character of the project site and project area. The impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

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

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*

2. Agriculture Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:

a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The project site is fully developed with a one-story commercial building and has a small surface parking lot; no pervious surfaces exist on the site. The United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service soil map delineates the project site as Urban Land, with the farmland classification as Not Prime Farmland. The California Department of Conservation, Natural Resources Agency 2010 map of Important Farmland identifies Burlingame as Urban and Built Up Land.

Discussion

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (No Impact)
and
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (No Impact)
and
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (No Impact)

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*

3. Air Quality

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

Would the project:

a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e)	Frequently create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment was prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin in January 2016 to identify and evaluate the potential air quality effects related to the project (**Appendix C**).

Air Pollutants of Concern

The San Francisco Bay Area (Bay Area) meets all ambient air quality standards with the exception of ground-level ozone, respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}), and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$). High ozone levels are caused by the cumulative emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x). These precursor pollutants react under certain meteorological conditions to form high ozone levels. Controlling the emissions of these precursor pollutants is the focus of the Bay Area's attempts to reduce ozone levels. The highest ozone levels in the Bay Area occur in the eastern and southern inland valleys that are downwind of air pollutant sources. High ozone levels aggravate respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, reduced lung function, and increase coughing and chest discomfort.

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

Toxic Air Contaminants

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

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

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

Regulatory Agencies

BAAQMD is the regional agency tasked with managing air quality in the region. At the state level, the CARB (a part of the California Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)) oversees regional air district activities and regulates air quality at the state level. The BAAQMD published California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Guidelines I 2010 (revised in 2011) that are used in this assessment to evaluate air quality impacts of projects.

Significance Thresholds

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

BAAQMD’s adoption of significance thresholds contained in the 2011 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines was called into question by an order issued March 5, 2012, in California Building Industry Association (CBIA) v. BAAQMD (Alameda Superior Court Case No. RGI0548693). The order requires BAAQMD to set aside its approval of the thresholds until it has conducted environmental review under CEQA. The ruling made in the case concerned the environmental impacts of adopting the thresholds and how the thresholds would indirectly affect land use

development patterns. In August 2013, the Appellate Court struck down the lower court's order to set aside the thresholds. However, this litigation remains pending as the California Supreme Court recently accepted a portion of CBIA's petition to review the appellate court's decision to uphold BAAQMD's adoption of the thresholds. The specific portion of the argument to be considered is in regard to whether CEQA requires consideration of the effects of the environment on a project (as contrasted to the effects of a project on the environment). Therefore, the significance thresholds contained in the 2011 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines are applied to this project.

The project site is located in the northeastern portion of San Mateo County, within the San Francisco Area Air Basin. Ambient air quality standards have been established at both the state and federal level. The San Francisco Area Air Basin meets all such ambient air quality standards requirements, with the exception of ground-level ozone, respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}) and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$). High ozone levels are caused by the cumulative emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x). These precursor pollutants react under certain meteorological conditions to form high ozone levels. Controlling the emissions of these precursor pollutants is the focus of the Bay Area's attempts to reduce ozone levels.

Table 2 Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds	Operational Thresholds	
	Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Annual Average Emissions (tons/year)
Criteria Air Pollutants			
ROG	54	54	10
NO_x	54	54	10
PM_{10}	82	82	15
$PM_{2.5}$	54	54	10
CO	Not Applicable	9.0 ppm (8-hour average) or 20.0 ppm (1-hour average)	
Fugitive Dust	Construction Dust Ordinance or other Best Management Practices	Not Applicable	
Health Risks and Hazards for New Sources			
Excess Cancer Risk	10 per one million		
Chronic or Acute Hazard Index	1.0		
Incremental annual average $PM_{2.5}$	0.3 $\mu g/m^{3*}$		
Health Risks and Hazards for Sensitive Receptors (Cumulative from all sources within 1,000 foot zone of influence) and Cumulative Thresholds for New Sources			
Excess Cancer Risk	100 per one million		
Chronic Hazard Index	10.0		
Annual Average $PM_{2.5}$	0.8 $\mu g/m^3$		

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds	Operational Thresholds	
	Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Annual Average Emissions (tons/year)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG Annual Emissions	Compliance with a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy OR 1,100 metric tons or 4.6 metric tons per capita		
Note: ROG = reactive organic gases, NOx = nitrogen oxides, PM_{10} = course particulate matter or particulates with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers (µm) or less, $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter or particulates with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5µm or less; and GHG = greenhouse gas; $\mu g/m^3$ = Micrograms per meter cubed			

Source: Illingworth & Rodkin, 2016

Sensitive Receptors

There are groups of people more affected by air pollution than others. CARB has identified the following persons who are most likely to be affected by air pollution: children under 16, the elderly over 65, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. These groups are classified as sensitive receptors. Locations that may contain a high concentration of these sensitive population groups include residential areas, hospitals, daycare facilities, elder care facilities, elementary schools, and parks. The closest off-site sensitive receptors are residences located on the upper floor of the adjoining building at 241 California Drive as shown in **Figure 3**. There are other residences located further from the project site to the west, north, and south.

Discussion

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

As noted above in the setting discussion, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is in non-attainment for state and federal standards for O_3, $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}. Steps needed to achieve compliance with these regulations have been identified, as described below.

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

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

A project would be determined to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality plan if it would be inconsistent with the regional growth assumptions, in terms of population, employment, or regional growth in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). The emission strategies in the Clean Air Plan were developed, in part, on regional population, housing, and employment projections prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The project is consistent with the General Plan designation of Howard Mixed Use zoning for the site. As such, the use of this site for commercial purposes is already included in the Clean Air Plan.

The project would not directly increase the City's population as it does not include residential units. The commercial building, on the project site, would be replaced with a single four-story mixed-use building, including three levels of underground parking. Due to the close proximity of public transit, including Caltrain, Samtrans and BART, no significant increase in traffic is anticipated with project implementation. Consequently, development of the project would not conflict with population and VMT projections used to develop the Clean Air Plan planning projections (see **Section 16, Transportation and Traffic**). Additionally, the project proposes to include a series of solar panels on the roof to provide a source of renewable electricity for the building. The project would not obstruct implementation of these plans, and therefore no impact would occur.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for the non-attainment air pollutants and their precursors. These thresholds are for ozone precursor pollutants (ROG and NOx), PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, and apply to both construction period and operational period impacts.

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2.2 was used to predict emissions from construction of the site assuming full build out of the project, by inputting the project land use types and size, and anticipated construction schedule and construction equipment. The proposed project land uses were factored into the CalEEMod land use categories as follows: 43,235 square feet of "General Office Building," 1,820 square feet of "Strip Mall" (which refers to the proposed retail land uses), and 130 parking spaces entered as "Enclosed Parking with Elevator." Additionally, the CalEEMod modeling assumed up to 25,000 cubic yards of soil export, 1,214 tons for building and pavement demolition, and 1,200 cement and 4 asphalt truck one-way trips.

Construction

The project schedule assumes that the project would be built out over a period of approximately 330 construction work days (16 months). Average daily emissions were computed by dividing the total construction emissions by the number of construction days**. Table 3** below shows average daily construction emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10} exhaust, and $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust during construction of the project. As indicated in **Table 3**, predicted project emissions would not exceed the BAAQMD significance thresholds (see **Appendix C** for additional information).

Construction activities would generate dust and equipment exhaust on a temporary basis during construction activities from site preparation, demolition, ground disturbance, and the operation of construction equipment and other vehicles. Construction dust has the potential for creating a nuisance at nearby properties. Standard Permit Conditions require that all basic BAAQMD BMPs be implemented, as described in **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** below.

Table 3 Construction Period Emissions

Scenario	ROG	NOx	PM_{10} Exhaust	$PM_{2.5}$ Exhaust
Construction emissions (tons)	0.68 tons	1.32 tons	0.04 tons	0.04 tons
Average daily emissions (pounds)[1]	4.1 lbs	8.0 lbs	0.2 lbs	0.2 lbs
BAAQMD Thresholds (pounds per day)	*54* lbs	*54* lbs	*82* lbs	*54* lbs
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Notes: [1]Assumes 330 workdays
Source: Illingworth & Rodkin, 2015

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The contractor shall implement the following BMPs listed below that are required of all projects:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 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 (CCR)). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Operation

In the 2011 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines update, BAAQMD identifies screening criteria for the sizes of land use projects that could result in significant air pollutant emissions. For operational impacts, the screening project size is identified at 346,000 square feet for commercial developments. Mixed-use projects of smaller size would be expected to have less-than-significant impacts with respect to operational-period emissions. Since the project proposes to operate at 1,820 square feet of retail and 43,235 square feet of office space, it is concluded that emissions would be below the BAAQMD significance thresholds for the operational period. Additionally, development would be near existing transit with regional connections and could reduce vehicle-related emissions, as well as potentially provide employment for the surrounding residential uses.

Carbon monoxide emissions from traffic generated by the project would be the pollutant of greatest concern at the local level. Congested intersections with a large volume of traffic have the greatest potential to cause high-localized concentrations of carbon monoxide. Air pollutant monitoring data indicate that carbon monoxide levels have been at healthy levels (i.e., below state and federal standards) in the Bay Area since the early 1990s. As a result, the region has been designated as attainment for the standard. The highest measured level over any 8-hour averaging period during the last 3 years in the Bay Area is less than 3.0 parts per million (ppm), compared to the ambient air quality standard of 9.0 ppm. According to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared for the project, intersections affected by the project would have traffic volumes less than 5,000 vehicles hourly, which is much less than the BAAQMD screening criteria of 44,000 vehicles per hour at an intersection. Therefore, the project would not cause a violation of an ambient air quality standard for carbon monoxide.

Project operation would not cause a violation of any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The temporary effects of fugitive dust from grading and construction activities will be minimized through the implementation of Standard Permit Conditions outlined in **Mitigation Measure AQ-1**. Therefore, with implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1**, this impact would be less than significant.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

Past, present and future development projects contribute to the region's adverse air quality impacts on a cumulative basis. By its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. No single project is sufficient in size to by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. If a project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable, then the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.

The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines state that a significant air quality impact would result if the project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant or a precursor to that pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable national or state ambient air quality standard. Given the nature of the proposed use (primarily office), the operational criteria pollutant screening size for the project is 346,000 square feet. The project would operate at 1,820 square feet of retail and 43,235 square feet of office space, and would be below the screening criteria developed by BAAQMD. Therefore, the project would not exceed the pollutant emissions thresholds and the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is not considered cumulatively considerable.

Due to the project size, operational period emissions would be less than significant. However, because the project proposes to demolish existing facilities onsite, modeling of construction emissions was conducted to quantify project impacts (see **Table 3** above). The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines consider potential impacts from fugitive dust to be less than significant if best management practices (BMPs) are employed to reduce these emissions. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

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

Operation of the project is not expected to cause any localized emissions that could expose sensitive receptors (including infants and children as most sensitive) to unhealthy air pollutant levels. No stationary sources of TACs (typically factories, refineries, power plants, etc.), are proposed as part of the project. Construction activity would generate dust and equipment exhaust on a short-term temporary basis. The project would not introduce any new sensitive receptors to the area. Construction equipment and associated heavy-duty truck traffic could generate diesel exhaust, which is a known TAC. Diesel exhaust and $PM_{2.5}$ can pose both potential health and nuisance impacts to nearby receptors. Sensitive receptors within close proximity to construction activity are at a higher risk of being exposed to TACs, and the subsequent health impacts associated with exposure to high levels of DPM and $PM_{2.5}$. The closest off-site sensitive receptors are residences located above the street-level restaurant at 241-243 California Drive, next door to the project site. There are other residences located further from the project site to the west, north, and south.

Refined community risk assessment modeling for project construction was conducted using CalEEMod and the U.S. EPA ISCST3 model. BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer and non-cancer risk are set at 10 in one million cancer risk, 0.3µg/m^3 for $PM_{2.5}$, and 1.0 Hazard Index (HI). The maximum modeled annual $PM_{2.5}$ concentration (based on combined exhaust and fugitive dust) was 0.4µg/m^3 . Therefore, annual $PM_{2.5}$ concentration would be above the BAAQMD significance threshold of 0.3µg/m^3 and would be considered significant. During project construction, the incremental residential infant cancer risk at the maximally exposed individual receptor would be 49 in one million and the maximum incremental residential adult cancer risk would be 0.9 in one million. Given the above, excess cancer risk for infant exposure at off-site residential receptors would be above the BAAQMD significance threshold of 10 in one million and would be considered significant. The maximum HI (based on DPM concentration) was computed as 0.06, which is below the BAAQMD significance criterion of 1.0.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2** would reduce risks associated with construction emissions, and increased infant cancer risk. Any impacts associated with project implementation and the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant.

> **Mitigation Measure AQ-2:** All diesel-powered off-road equipment larger than 50 horsepower and operating on the site for more than two days continuously shall, at a minimum, meet U.S. EPA particulate matter emissions standards for Tier 4 engines or equivalent.

Furthermore, the construction contractor could use other measures to minimize construction period DPM emissions to reduce the predicted cancer risk below the thresholds. Such measures may be the use of alternative powered equipment (e.g., LPG-powered lifts), alternative fuels (e.g., biofuels), added exhaust emission control devices, or a combination of measures, provided that these measures are approved by the City and demonstrated to reduce community risk impacts to less than significant.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** is considered to reduce exhaust emissions by 5 percent and fugitive dust emissions by over 50 percent. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-2** would further reduce on-site diesel exhaust emissions. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures AQ-1** and **AQ-2**, the computed maximum increased residential infant cancer risk for construction would be 4.8 in one million and annual $PM_{2.5}$

concentration would be 0.1µg/m^3. The cancer risk and $PM_{2.5}$ concentration would be below the BAAQMD thresholds of 10 per one million for cancer risk and 0.3µg/m^3 for $PM_{2.5}$ concentration, respectively. Therefore, with implementation of these mitigation measures, the project would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to community risk caused by construction activities.

e) Frequently create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Less than Significant)

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
4. Biological Resources				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or state-protected wetlands, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Fundamentally conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The biological resources occurring on and near the project site were evaluated by Pacific Biology on August 4, 2015. The project site is located in an urban area and is surrounded by dense commercial and residential development. The project site is completely developed and is currently occupied with a one-story commercial building. There are no trees or other vegetation on the site.

Discussion

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

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

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

During the August 2015 site visit, a search was conducted for riparian habitats and other sensitive plant communities. There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive plant communities on the project site. Therefore, no impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive plant communities would occur.

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

During the August 2015 site visit, a search was conducted for creeks, wetlands, and other potentially jurisdictional resources. There are no creeks or wetlands present on the project site. Therefore, no impacts to federally protected wetlands and other waters would occur.

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

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

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (No Impact)

The City of Burlingame defines a "protected tree" as any tree with a trunk circumference of 48 inches or more measured 54 inches above the ground. The City of Burlingame defines a "street tree" as any woody perennial plant that grows on City property (right-of-way). There are no trees on the project site and no tree removal or tree pruning is required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the removal or alteration of a protected tree and would not conflict with the requirements of a local tree protection ordinance. Therefore, no related impact would occur.

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

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
5. Cultural Resources				
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Setting

A cultural records search for the project site was conducted through the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) in June 2015. The results of this records search are discussed below and included as **Appendix D**. A number of archaeological sites, Native American cultural resources, and paleontological resources have been discovered throughout San Mateo County. Given this, there is potential to uncover unrecorded buried cultural resources. The City of Burlingame does not contain buildings and structures that appear to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The existing structures on the project site were developed between 1921 and 1935.

Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Less than Significant)

There are 23 structures within the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan area that were identified as potentially eligible for the CRHP and the NRHP. In addition, there are 51 structures within the downtown area that convey certain aspects of Burlingame's history and heritage, but are not eligible for the CRHR and NRHP. According to the CHRIS search, there are two known historical resources within several hundred feet of the project area boundaries. One recorded resource, the Severn Lodge Dairy Wallscape sign is a painted 14 x 53-foot advertisement located approximately 80 feet away from the project at 220 California Drive. This sign is a State Point of Historical Interest and has been listed in the CRHR. The other is a property located at 241 Highland Avenue, adjacent to the project site. However, the 241 Highland Avenue property has been determined ineligible for the National Register by consensus through Section 106 process; it has not been evaluated for CRHR or Local Listing. Additionally, this address doesn't appear to have any particular structure associated with it upon further review, and is not included in the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND list of

historic structures. The DSP also identifies 200 California as a historic structure, which is located at a distance of approximately 110 feet northeast of the project site. This structure currently operates as a Honda automobile dealership.

The demolition of structures and project construction would temporarily generate groundborne vibrations that could potentially impact the historic resources adjacent to or nearby the site. As further described above, the nearest historic structure is approximately 80 feet northeast of the project site. To assess potential vibration impacts, the noise analysis considers a conservative threshold limit of 0.08 in/sec PPV.[2] The 0.08 in/sec PPV is the threshold was adopted by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and is used for potentially historic or older structures. If groundborne vibrations exceed 0.08 in/sec PPV, then it is assumed that potential structural damage may occur to historic or fragile structures. At 80 feet, vibration levels from construction of the project were measured to be 0.05 in/sec PPV, which is below the 0.08 in/sec PPV threshold. Groundborne vibrations at this level may be perceivable by humans, but structural damage to these historic structures is not likely.

While new construction projects in the downtown area have the potential to impact historic resources, the DSP includes a number of methods to maintain and/or restore historical resources and properties, including a comprehensive design review process. The design review would ensure high-quality designs and architectural compatibility within the area. With regard to protecting historic resources, the design review would require the new buildings to consider historic character and features in the downtown area as a whole. The project would undergo design review by the Burlingame Planning Commission to ensure that the project meets acceptable design guidelines that blend with the vision of the downtown area, including the historic context of the area. Additionally, Goal D-1 of the DSP would ensure that the new construction projects fit into the context and scale of the existing downtown historic character. In support of the goal, the Planning Commission will consider design features and compatibility with nearby historic structures and character in its Design Review Findings. Therefore, implementation of the project would not diminish the integrity of the location, setting, feeling, association, workmanship, design, or materials for any historic structure. Given the above, the impact would be less than significant.

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

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

[2] PPV is the Peak Particle Velocity which is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of a vibration wave measured in inches per second (in/sec PPV).

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

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

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

No known paleontological resources have been recorded at the project site or within the vicinity; the nearest known fossil-bearing site is located at least 4 miles away from the project site. Further, the project site is fully developed and is part of a row of contiguous parcels with commercial and/or retail uses. Moreover, because the project site is fully developed, construction of the project would occur in an area that has been subject to subsurface disturbance. Therefore, construction of the project is not likely to directly or indirectly destroy paleontological or geologic resources as no such resources are known in the project vicinity. Given the lack of known resources and that the fully-developed site has been previously disturbed, the probability of encountering paleontological resources is low. However, construction activities, including excavation could potentially destroy unknown paleontological resources. This is considered a potentially significant impact. In the event that paleontological resources are discovered during site development, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-2** would mitigate this potentially significant impact to less-than-significant level.

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

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

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

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
6. Geology and Soils				
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as it may be revised), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

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

Qualified geotechnical engineers completed a geotechnical investigation for the project and determined that the project site is suitable to support commercial development with adherence to provided development recommendations. **Appendix E** includes this report.

Discussion

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (No Impact)

Four historically active faults are located within 15.5 miles of the project site:

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

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

The City is in relative proximity to historically active faults; as such, there is potential for development within the sphere to be subject to strong seismic ground shaking, including the project site. The intensity of earthquake ground motions would depend on the characteristics of the generating fault, distance to the fault and rupture zone, earthquake magnitude, earthquake duration, and site-specific geologic conditions. The San Andreas Fault is the closest active fault to the project site, and lies approximately 2.9 miles west of downtown Burlingame. Earthquakes along this fault are characteristically very strong (Modified Mercalli Intensity VIII) and groundshaking of this intensity could result in heavy damage. As stated in the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, Burlingame soils are reasonably stable under seismic conditions. Given this, implementation of the project would expose people and structures to strong seismic groundshaking if an earthquake were to occur in the area. Adherence to **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

> **Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** project design and construction shall adhere to Title 18, Chapter 18.28 of the Burlingame Municipal Code, and demonstrate compliance with all design standards applicable to the California Building Code Zone 4 would ensure maximum practicable protection available to users of the buildings and associated infrastructure.

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

Because the project site is in a seismically active region, some potential for seismic-related ground failure exists. The project site is flat-lying and is underlain predominately by stiff clays and medium dense sands. Given this, the potential for significant seismic settlement is low. The Association of Bay Area Governments

mapped the project site as having low potential for liquefaction. Additionally, an analysis performed by geotechnical engineers (see **Appendix E**) concluded low potential for liquefaction to affect the site. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides? (No impact)

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

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

The project site is fully developed and is occupied with a one-story commercial building. The existing building and asphalt would be demolished and removed as part of the project. Construction activities would be required to comply with the provisions in Appendix J of the California Building Code (CBC) (2007) in regards to grading, excavating, and earthwork construction. Soil erosion after construction would be controlled by implementation of approved landscape and irrigation plans, as needed. Additionally, the building footprint would cover the entire project site at approximately 17,500 square feet, with the rest of the site mostly paved for decorative planters. Therefore, there would be little exposed soil on that site that would contribute to soil erosion effects. Further, conformance to the City grading standards and the county Stormwater Management Plan would prevent substantial erosion as a result of construction and implementation associated with the project. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

and

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

As previously discussed, the project site is not located in an area with high susceptibility to landslide effects or liquefaction owing to its flat topography. For these reasons, the geotechnical report also determined the potential for lateral spreading to be low. Furthermore, soils at the project site are predominantly stiff to very stiff clays and sands. Therefore, the potential for differential seismic settlement is low.

According to the geotechnical report, test results indicated a PI of 7 for surface soils, which indicates a low expansion potential to wetting and drying cycles, and a PI of 16 for soils at a depth of 9.5 feet, which indicates medium swelling potential. Furthermore, the geotechnical engineers measured groundwater at a depth of approximately 16.5 feet below grade at one boring location, which would factor into building excavation and other underground construction design plans with regard to dewatering as necessary.

As described in the project description, the planned garage excavation would construct a temporary slurry/cut-off wall that would be underpinned to adjacent properties with tiebacks. The project design and construction, including excavation activities, would be required to comply with Chapter 33 of the CBC, which specifies the safety requirements to be fulfilled for site work and protection of adjacent properties from damage during excavation (**Mitigation Measure GEO-2**). This would include the prevention of subsidence or pavement or

foundations caused by dewatering. Adherence must also be demonstrated to Chapter 18 of the CBC as outlined in **Mitigation Measure GEO-1**, which sets forth building construction standards including, but limited to, expansive soils. Additionally, the geotechnical report prepared for the project includes recommendations for site work, grading, building foundations (to the adjacent properties), flatwork, retaining walls, and pavements that would further reduce the effect to less than significant (**Appendix E**). Adherence to **Mitigation Measure GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

> **Mitigation Measure GEO-2**: Project design and construction, including excavation activities, shall comply with Chapter 33 of the CBC, which specifies the safety requirement to be fulfilled for site work. This would include prevention of subsidence and pavement or foundations caused by dewatering.
>
> **Mitigation Measure GEO-3:** The applicant shall prepare a monitoring program to determine the effects of construction on nearby improvements, including the monitoring of cracking and vertical movement of adjacent structures, and nearby streets, sidewalks, utilities, and other improvements. As necessary, inclinometers or other instrumentation shall be installed as part of the shoring system to closely monitor lateral movement. The program shall include a pre-condition survey including photographs and installation of monitoring points for existing site improvements.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks of alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (No Impact)

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

Toxic Air Contaminants

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Assessment was prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin in January 2016 to address Air Quality and GHG emission impacts associated with the project (see **Appendix C**).

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere, GHGs, regulate the earth's temperature. This phenomenon, known as the greenhouse effect, is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate. The most common GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO_2) and water vapor but there are also several others, most importantly methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). These are released into the earth's atmosphere through a variety of natural processes and human activities. Sources of GHGs are generally as follows:

- CO_2 and N_2O are byproducts of fossil fuel combustion
- N_2O is associated with agricultural operations such as fertilization of crops
- CH_4 is commonly created by off-gassing from agricultural practices (e.g., keeping livestock) and landfill operations
- Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) were widely used as refrigerants, propellants, and cleaning solvents but their production has been stopped by international treaty
- HFCs are now used as a substitute for CFCs in refrigeration and cooling
- PFCs and sulfur hexafluoride emissions are commonly created by industries such as aluminum production and semi-conductor manufacturing

Each GHG has its own potency and effect upon the earth's energy balance. This is expressed in terms of a global warming potential (GWP), with CO_2 being assigned a value of 1 and sulfur hexafluoride being several orders of magnitude stronger with a GWP of 23,900. In GHG emission inventories, the weight of each gas is multiplied by its GWP and is measured in units of CO_2 equivalents (CO_2e).

An expanding body of scientific research supports the theory that global warming is currently affecting changes in weather patterns, average sea level, ocean acidification, chemical reaction rates, and precipitation rates, and that it will increasingly do so in the future. The climate and several naturally occurring resources within California could be adversely affected by the climate change trend. Increased precipitation and sea level rise could increase coastal flooding, saltwater intrusion, and degradation of wetlands. Mass migration

and/or loss of plant and animal species could also occur. Potential effects of global climate change that could adversely affect human health include more extreme heat waves and heat-related stress; an increase in climate-sensitive diseases; more frequent and intense natural disasters such as flooding, hurricanes and drought; and increased levels of air pollution.

Regulatory Setting

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

According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the City adopted the Burlingame Climate Action Plan in June 2009 with the goal reducing GHG emissions to 286,402 MT CO_2e by 2020.[3] Although the Burlingame Climate Action Plan is not an established Climate Action Plan, the City also conforms to the state target for 2050 (emissions at 80 percent below 1990 levels) set forth in Executive Order (EO) S-03-05. Additionally, EO B-30-15 establishes an interim statewide GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Additionally, the construction and operation of all new buildings in the City are required to comply with energy efficiency standards included in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Title 24 identifies specific energy efficiency requirements for building construction and systems operations that are intended to ensure efficient energy usage over the long-term life of the building.

Discussion

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

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

Construction

Project construction activities are predicted to generate 239 MT of CO_2e. Neither BAAQMD nor the City has an adopted threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions and project construction emissions would be below the BAAQMD operational significance threshold of 1,100 MT of CO_2e annually. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. However, BAAQMD encourages the incorporation of best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction where feasible and applicable. Best

[3] City of Burlingame. October 2010 (Amended September 2011). Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan.

management practices may include, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment for at least 15 percent of the fleet; using at least 10 percent local building materials; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials (see **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** for a list of the BMPs that will be implemented during construction).

Operation

Due to the project size, operational period GHG emissions would be less than significant. BAAQMD identified screening criteria for the sizes of land use projects that could result in significant GHG emissions in their May 2011 update to the CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. For operational impacts, the screening project size is identified at 53,000 square feet for commercial developments. Mixed use commercial development projects of smaller size would be expected to have less-than-significant impacts with respect to operational period GHG emissions. Since the project proposes to operate at a total of 1,820 square feet of retail and 43,235 square feet of office space, it is concluded that emissions would be below the BAAQMD significance threshold of 1,100 MT of CO_2e annually. Impacts associated with the generation of greenhouse gas emissions, directly or indirectly, would be less than significant with project implementation.

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

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The project site is currently developed with two connected commercial one-story structures that total 13,730 square feet of retail/commercial space, with a small surface parking lot in the rear of the lot facing Hatch Lane. A Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) was prepared by Green Environment, Inc. (GEI) in September, 2015 to identify and evaluate the potential hazards to human health in the vicinity of the project site (see **Appendix F**). The San Mateo County Groundwater Protection Program reviewed the HHRA and concurred with the risk findings.

The existing structures on the project site were developed between 1921 and 1935. Sterling Cleaners operated through 1959 in a small building located at the southwest end of what is currently 217 California Drive and was connected and merged into the building that occupied the northeast half at a later date. Investigations by GEI identified five abandoned Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) associated with Sterling Cleaners in the rear of the property yard. The five tanks were removed in 2011; however, there are two cleanup site cases that remain open, one of which is a Leaking UST site, and are being monitored by the San Mateo County Local oversight program (LOP). The anticipated LUST case closure/completion date is June 2018. Since Sterling Cleaners vacated, the occupants of 217 California Drive have included Federal Auto Parts, Cycles Unlimited, a landscape architect, and more recently Gilman's Kitchens and Baths. Since 2014, the only occupant in the 215 California Drive space has been a window showroom and sales business tenant.

The existing buildings were constructed before the 1976 Toxic Substances Control Act, and therefore have the potential to contain asbestos and lead-based paint. Health hazards associated with asbestos include increased risks of cancer and respiratory-related illnesses and diseases, while lead may cause a range of health effects, including behavioral problems, learning disabilities, seizures and death. Exposure to groundwater contamination, asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and lead-based paint during construction and demolition activities could result in a potentially significant hazard to human health unless properly mitigated.

Discussion

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

Implementation of the project would construct a four-story, mixed-use building. Common chemicals used in commercial and office settings include cleaners, toners, correction fluid, paints, and maintenance materials. Use of these types of products would not involve substantial use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials.

During construction of the project, paint, building material finishing products, and automotive oil would be used as well. However, such materials are used temporarily and typically do not generate hazardous air emissions or pose a long-term threat to human health or the environment. Improper disposal could increase risk of exposure for nearby residents through direct contact or by adversely affecting soil, groundwater, or other surface waters. However, any hazardous materials transportation, use, and disposal, as part of the project, would be subject to state and federal hazardous materials laws and regulations. Primary federal laws pertaining to hazardous materials and wastes include the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) and the Comprehensive Environmental Responsibility, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). RCRA includes procedures and requirements for managing hazardous materials, and for cleanup of such releases. CERCLA delineates the liability for contamination between current property owners and others. The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act regulates the transport of hazardous materials. The federal government delegates enforcement authority to the states. With adherence to such regulations regarding the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

According to the City of Burlingame and San Mateo County Health System public records reviewed during preparation of the HHRA, the project site has had documented hazardous material use and storage associated with the past property uses. The project site has been documented to contain five removed USTs, including one gasoline tank, three Stoddard Solvent tanks, and one bunker oil tank. Additionally, residues of Petroleum Hydrocarbons, Ethylbenzene, and xylenes were reported in the soil samples taken from the project site at the time that the USTs were removed. For these reasons, San Mateo County Health System Groundwater Protection Program currently regulates the project site.

Accordingly, GEI conducted soil and groundwater tests at the project site for potential hazardous substances. Based on the results, the HHRA report shows that the soil, soil vapor, and groundwater samples contain levels of Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), 1, 2-dichloroethane and traces of other diesel constituents.

Operation

The project would connect to the existing municipal services, which would not use the extraction of groundwater for water supply. The project would construct a three-story underground parking structure under a four-story office/retail building. Since the site is expected to be covered entirely by the building footprint, future employees and visitors of the building would not have direct access to site soil or groundwater. However, the VOCs present in the soil could potentially volatize and enter the office/retail space. Therefore, the HHRA analyzed potential human risk to such exposure.

According to the HHRA, cancer risks of 1×10^{-6}, and non-cancer risks (i.e., Hazard Indices) of 1.0 or less are considered de minimus, and would not pose an unacceptable health risk. The risk results at this site for future employees, who would be working at the office building, show that potential cumulative cancer risks were less than 1×10^{-6}, and potential total non-cancer risks (i.e., Hazard Indices) were less than 1.0. These results indicate that the potential risks and hazards to future users of the site are considered less than significant. The HHRA concluded that no special protective elements need to be incorporated with the building design because potential exposure is anticipated to be negligible for future building occupants.

Construction

As stated above, reported groundwater contamination at the project site was found below ground surface. A "temporary slurry/cut-off wall" would be constructed around the project site before any soil would be removed. This wall would serve two purposes: 1) act as a retaining wall around the project site, and 2) prevent groundwater from infiltrating the project site. The wall would be built in the ground by mixing the soil around the perimeter of the project site with a slurry mix until it would form a subterranean wall around the project site. The wall would be approximately 30 inches thick and extend to a depth of 55 feet. This type of wall is designed for construction projects that are located below the groundwater table because they would cut-off inflow of surrounding groundwater. The HHRA determined that construction workers would potentially come into contact with the groundwater until the slurry wall is in place. Such exposure is anticipated to be negligible for groundwater (see **Appendix F**). Water that may accumulate in the excavation would be continuously pumped into holding tanks and removed offsite so that workers would not be exposed to contaminants in pooled water.

Construction workers would also come into contact with contaminated soil and soil vapor. Once the slurry/cut-off wall is built in the ground, construction workers would excavate soil to a depth of approximately 40 feet (which is the bottom of the planned project depth). All soil, including contaminated soil would be off-hauled to Ox Mountain (Half Moon Bay) or similar appropriate facility. Contact with soil vapor may occur via either volatilization from soil vapor coming from soil on the project site or excavated soil, or volatilization from soil VOCs during the process of excavation. Exposure to these VOCs is not expected to constitute a major source of risk because VOCs are expected to rapidly dissipate into ambient air and would be in insignificant concentrations once released.

While the HHRA concludes that potential exposure risks to contaminants would be minimal, the applicant will prepare a Soils management Plan (SMP) or Environmental Management Plan for the San Mateo County Health Department's approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The SMP will further address the possibility of encountering subsurface contaminants, including groundwater, during construction activities, and the relevant measures for identifying, handling, storing, and disposing of subsurface contaminants.

In addition to existing subterranean contaminants on the site, the project would require demolition of structures that could potentially expose construction workers or others to asbestos and lead-based products.

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

> **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1**: The contractor shall comply with Title 8, California Code of Regulations/Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) requirements that cover construction work where an employee may be exposed to lead. This includes the proper removal and disposal of peeling paint, and appropriate sampling of painted building surfaces for lead prior to disturbance of the paint and disposal of the paint or painted materials.
>
> **Mitigation Measure HAZ-2**: The applicant shall contract a Certified Asbestos Consultant to conduct an asbestos survey prior to disturbing potential asbestos containing building materials and following the Consultant's recommendations for proper handling and disposal.
>
> **Mitigation Measure HAZ-3**: The applicant shall prepare, and submit, a Soils Management Plan (SMP)/Environmental Management Plan to the San Mateo County Health Department for approval, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The SMP/Environmental Management Plan shall address the possibility of encountering subsurface contaminants, including groundwater, during construction activities, and the relevant measures for identifying, handling, and disposing of subsurface contaminants. The SMP/Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted and approved by the San Mateo County Health Department prior to issuance of a building permit.
>
> **Mitigation Measure HAZ-4**: The contractor shall ensure the appropriate handling, storing, and sampling of any soil to be removed from the subject property, as per the SMP, so as to eliminate potential health and safety risks to the public, including construction workers.
>
> **Mitigation Measure HAZ-5**: In the event that groundwater, or other subsurface contaminants, are encountered during excavation, grading, or any other demolition/construction activities at the project site, the contractor shall ensure that the procedure for evaluating, handling, storing, testing, and disposing of contaminated groundwater is implemented, as per the SMP (see **Mitigation Measure HAZ-3**).

Mitigation Measure HAZ-6: Workers handling demolition and renovation activities at the project site will be trained in the safe handling and disposal of any containments with which they are handling or disposing of on the project site.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Less than Significant)

Washington Elementary School is the nearest school to the project site, located approximately 0.2 miles northeast. Demolition of the existing building would potentially involve the handling and disposal of hazardous waste products, including asbestos, lead, motor and transmission oils, etc. Most of these substances are typically found within commercial sites. Additionally, the excavation and grading associated with construction activities at the project site could result in encountering potentially contaminated soils, soil vapors, and groundwater. Handling of such substances would be regulated by state and federal hazardous materials laws that would minimize the risk of exposure to nearby land uses, including Washington Elementary School. Additionally, implementation of **Mitigation Measures HAZ-1** through **HAZ-6** would further reduce potential risk of exposure to nearby land uses.

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

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Less than Significant)

According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the property at 215 California Drive is listed as a "LUST Clean-up Site" pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The property at 215 California Drive is currently registered as an "Open- Site Assessment" for a Leaking Underground Storage Tank that was removed in 2011[4]. On-going quarterly groundwater monitoring is being conducted as directed by the San Mateo County Health Department. As stated above in **b)** the results of the HHRA concluded that contamination of soil and groundwater at the project site would not have a significant impact on human health. However, due to the potential hazards associated with encountering subsurface contaminants during construction, **Mitigation Measures HAZ-1** through **HAZ-6** will be implemented to ensure that impacts to the public or the environment would be less than significant.

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

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

San Francisco International Airport (SFO) is approximately 3 miles northwest of the project site. According to the DSP, the project site is within the *1996 San Mateo Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP)*[5]. The ALUP is subject to land use policies and restrictions, which include a 300 ft height restriction associated with FAA regulations. The proposed project entails the construction of a four-story, mixed-use building totaling 55 feet in height. Given that the height of the building is below the 300-foot height restriction, there are no anticipated safety hazards to people residing or working in the project area. More recently, the *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco Airport 2012* indicated that the project site is located within the Airport Area of Influence; however, the project site does not fall within any of the "safety compatibility zones" and is therefore not considered as being within an area of potential danger involving the operation of San Francisco International Airport.[6] Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

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

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less than Significant)

The project would build the new structure on previously developed commercial land. Access points to the site would be constructed to ensure proper access for emergency vehicles. The City does not have an established evacuation plan. However, the proposed project would adhere to the guidelines established within the Safety Element of the General Plan. Additionally, the Safety Operations Plan between the Cities of Burlingame and Hillsborough would be implemented in the case of an emergency, and the project would comply with procedures determined by the Safety Operations Plan, if such an event arose[7]. Therefore, the project would not conflict with and adopted emergency response or evacuation plan and the impact is less than significant.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (No Impact)

The project site and the surrounding vicinity are entirely developed. The area does not contain, and is not adjacent to wildlands. Accordingly, implementation of the project would not result in the exposure of people or structures to significant loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

---

[5] City of Burlingame. October 2010 (Amended September 2011). *Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan*, Hazards and Hazardous Material, pg. 149.

[6] The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, 2012. *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco Airport 2012.* Available at: http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Consolidated_CCAG_ALUCP_November-20121.pdf

[7] City of Hillsborough,2007. *Emergency Operations Plan*. Available at: http://www.hillsborough.net/DocumentCenter/View/591.

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

Setting

San Mateo County is within the San Francisco Bay part of the Coast Range Geologic Province. Annual average precipitation in San Mateo County is reported at approximately 19.6 inches. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) monitor water quality in the Bay Area. These agencies oversee the implementation of (NPDES) stormwater discharge permits. The SWRCB has implemented a NPDES General Construction Permit for the State of California; for projects disturbing 1-acre or more of soil, and a Notice of Intent (NOI) and SWPPP must be prepared prior to commencement of

construction. Burlingame participates in the San Mateo Countywide Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP), and is required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs under a Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit (MRP) (Provision C.3.b.). LID practices include source control BMPs, site design BMPs, and stormwater treatment BMPs onsite or at a joint stormwater treatment facility.

Burlingame Water Division of the Public Works Department, which purchases treated water from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, provides potable water to the project site. Approximately 85 percent of the water supply comes from the Hetch Hetchy watershed in the Sierra Nevada Mountains and approximately 15 percent comes from local watersheds. The project site does not contain any natural surface drainage. Stormwater runoff is entirely contained within a storm drainage system that utilizes Burlingame Creek, Ralston Creek, and Terrace Creek for drainage purposes. The project site does not have any surface waters; the nearest body of surface water to the subject property is the San Francisco Bay, located approximately 1 mile north of the project site. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 12 feet below ground surface in several locations. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the project site is located within Zone B, which is an area subject to inundation by a 0.2 percent annual chance flood event.

Discussion

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

Construction of the new building would involve ground disturbing activities such as trenching, grading, and demolition. Subterranean construction activities would excavate to a depth of approximately 40 feet. Groundwater is encountered at 16.5 feet below ground surface.

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

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

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

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (No Impact)

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

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion of siltation on- or off-site? (Less than Significant)

and

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

There are no natural drainage features within downtown Burlingame. The existing drainage pattern entails the use of lined channels, culverts, and underground pipes, all of which eventually drain into the San Francisco Bay. Project construction would involve ground disturbing activities. As noted, project construction would be subject to the NPDES General Construction Permit that imposes strict requirements and control on construction and post-construction activities.

Once operational, the amount of surface runoff generated by the project is not expected to increase compared to existing conditions. Under existing conditions, the impervious surface area is 17,493 square feet; with project implementation, the impervious surface area would total 17,226 square feet. Thus, the area of impervious surface would represent a net decrease of 267 square feet with project implementation, and therefore surface runoff will not increase and the new building would not significantly alter the existing drainage patterns. No new water intensive activities are proposed that would contribute substantial additional runoff that could exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems in the area. The project site is connected to existing 15-inch stormwater lines and the new building would tie-in to these existing lines to convey stormwater infrastructure. Additionally, with compliance to state and local regulations, and the implementation of BMPs, impacts to drainage patterns and surface runoff, resulting in erosion or siltation would be minimized. As such, the project would not contribute substantial amounts of sediment to storm drain systems or alter existing drainage patterns to the extent that would result in flooding on-or off-site. The impact would be less than significant.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Less than Significant)

and

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Less than Significant)

As stated above in **c)**, and **d)**, the proposed project would not alter the existing impervious surface to a point at which the drainage, and surface runoff, in the area would be affected. Standard Permit Conditions would require the project to implement a SWPPP with BMPs during construction activities to protect water quality from potential contaminants in stormwater runoff emanating from the construction site. The project would also be subject to the requirements of Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit. No new significant sources of polluted runoff would be created. With compliance to state and local regulations, and the implementation of BMPs, any impacts to surface runoff, resulting in additional sources of polluted runoff, or degradation to water quality, would be less than significant.

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

and

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

According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the project site is categorized by FEMA as Zone B (500 year floodplain), which is an area subject to inundation by a 0.2 percent annual chance flood event. The project proposes the construction of a four-story office building, and as such, no housing would be constructed as a result of the project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Less than Significant)

The closest dam to the project site is crystal Springs Dam, located approximately 5 miles southwest of the project site. Due to the dam's distance from the project site, it does not pose extensive safety hazards to the project; the 5-mile distance would significantly reduce the velocity of moving water, and consequently any possible impacts in the unforeseen incidence of dam failure would not expose people or structures within the project vicinity to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death. Additionally, the dam is currently undergoing renovations to enhance the safety of the structure in the event of a major earthquake.[8] Implementation of the project would not significantly change the existing conditions and expose people or structures to significant risk due to failure of a levee or a dam. Therefore, the impacts due to development in Flood Hazard Areas would be less than significant.

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

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

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. Land Use and Planning				
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The project site is within Burlingame City limits and within the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan Area. Burlingame is divided into a series of planning areas which contain a variety of land uses, including commercial, office, cultural, civic, and quasi-civic. According to the DSP, the project site and adjacent parcels are within the Howard Mixed Use (HMU) District. The land use designation for this project allows for a variety of retail, commercial, office, and upper-floor residential uses.

Discussion

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

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

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (No Impact)

The project site is governed by the general plan, DSP, and the Burlingame Municipal Code (BMC). According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the project site and adjacent parcels are designated HMU, which supports retail and office uses. The project would redevelop a vacant commercial building and construct retail at the ground floor and three levels of offices, thereby supporting increased ground-floor retail uses along Howard Avenue, supporting Goal LU-1 in the DSP. Further, the project is consistent with Chapter 25.33 HMU District Regulations of the BMC. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any land use plans or policies, and no impact would occur.

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

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. Mineral Resources				
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The California Geological Survey (CGS) is responsible under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMARA) for classifying land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ) based on the known or inferred mineral resource potential of that land. Based upon available data, the project site and area surrounding the project limits have been classified as MRZ-1, which is defined as "areas where adequate geologic information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence."[9] This finding is reflected in the San Mateo County General Plan Mineral Resources map.

Discussion

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

and

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

The project site is currently developed and not used for mineral recovery activities. Moreover, no known mineral resources are known to exist within the project site and area surrounding the project limits, as indicated by The Mineral Resource Zones and Resource Sectors San Francisco and San Mateo Counties Maps[10] and the San Mateo County General Plan. Implementation of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and residents of the state, nor of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

[9] California Department of Conservation. (n.d.). Guidelines for Classification and Designation of Mineral Lands. Available: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/smgb/guidelines/documents/classdesig.pdf. Accessed: August 2015.

[10] California Geological Survey. 1983. Mineral Resource Zones and Resource Sectors, Special Report 146, Plates 2.3 and 2.43, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
12. Noise				
Would the project result in:				
a) Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

Illingworth and Rodkin, Inc. prepared a Noise Assessment for the project site in January 2016, which includes details of the analysis and provides background information on noise and vibration. The Noise Assessment is included as **Appendix G**.

Noise-sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include residential land uses located in the upper floor of the adjacent building at 241 California Drive. Additionally, commercial businesses located adjacent to the project site are considered as well. San Francisco International Airport is about 3 miles northwest of the site. Railroad trains and vehicle traffic are the primary sources of noise in the vicinity of the project site; railroad tracks run parallel to California Drive as close as 270 feet from the project site and the Burlingame Caltrain Station is also immediately adjacent to California Drive. The project site is located in the vicinity of at-grade train crossings at Oak Grove Avenue, North Lane, Howard Avenue, and Bayswater Avenue; therefore, train warning whistles are prevalent in the area. Additionally, a survey of existing commercial uses in the vicinity of the project site revealed that occasional car washes and servicing at the auto dealership to the northwest are temporary stationary noise sources affecting the Site. As described in **Section 5, Cultural Resources,** two historic structures are located near the project site at 220 California Drive (80 feet) and 200 California Drive (110 feet). Potential groundborne vibration impacts, as it relates to these resources, is further analyzed below.

A noise monitoring survey was done to quantify ambient noise levels at representative noise-sensitive locations adjacent to the project site. The survey was conducted between August 4 to 6, 2015, and included two short-term measurements (ST-1 and ST-2), and one long-term measurement (LT-1), taken throughout the project site as summarized in **Table 4**. Each of the two short-term measurements consisted of consecutive ten-minute measurement intervals, while the long-term measurement occurred over a 24-hr period.

Table 4 Short-term and Long-term Measurement Data

Measurement Location	Date/Time	Leq[1]	Lmax[2]	L(1)[3]	L(50)[4]	L(90)[5]	CNEL[6]
ST-1: 105 ft from center of California Drive	8/4/2015 11:50-12:00	62	75	73	60	55	66**
	8/4/2015 12:00-12:10	61	70	69	60	55	66**
ST-2: 30 ft from center of Howard Avenue	8/6/2015 11:20-11:30	62	77	72	60	56	68**
LT-1: 65 ft from center of California Drive, 290 ft from railroad tracks	8/4/2015-8/6/2015	66*	70*	69*	66*	64*	71

Source: Illingworth & Rodkin, 2015

Notes: * Average of all daytime measurement intervals

**CNEL estimated based on corresponding long-term measurement data.

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

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

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

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

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

[6] CNEL - Community Noise Level Equivalent Level.

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

Allowable hours of construction within the City are between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm on weekdays, 9:00 am and 6:00 pm on Saturdays, and 10:00 am and 06:00 pm on Sundays and holidays, as established by The City of Burlingame Municipal Code's construction section.

Discussion

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

The project would increase noise on- and off-site from existing conditions; the project would place future users in an environment that exceeds the standard for the type of land use proposed. The future noise environment at the project site would continue to result primarily from local transportation, and Caltrain railroad noise within the project vicinity. According to the noise analysis performed for the project site, the future exterior noise exposure is calculated to be up to 71 dBA CNEL at the northernmost building facade, which exceeds the City's standard of 65 dBA CNEL. However, the project has no proposed outdoor sensitive land uses along the north façade. The project proposes small outdoor decks along the westernmost and easternmost building facades; however, these decks would not be considered sensitive to environmental noise given the infrequency of use by building occupants. Noise levels at the decks would be reduced by more than 10 dBA because of acoustical shielding provided by buildings in the vicinity and the proposed building.

With regard to interior noise levels, due to vehicle traffic, and the close proximity of the Caltrain, the future users at the site could potentially experience interior noise levels ranging from 66 dBA CNEL to 75 dBA CNEL L_{eq}(1-hr), which would exceed the interior noise and land use compatibility standards. The State of California's wall and roof-ceiling assemblies exposed to adjacent roadways Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of at least 50 or a composite Outdoor-Indoor Transmission Class (OITC) rating of no less than 40, would provide at least 35 to 40 dBA of noise reduction in interior spaces. Additionally, the inclusion of adequate forced-air mechanical ventilation systems is normally required so windows may be kept closed at the occupant's discretion.

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

> **Mitigation Measure NOI-1**: The contractor shall ensure that the interior noise levels are maintained at or below 50 dBA Leq(1-hr). Treatments would include, but are not limited to, sound-rated wall and window constructions, acoustical caulking, protected ventilation openings, etc. The specific determination of which noise insulation treatments are necessary shall be conducted during final design of the project. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, shall be submitted to the City, along with the building plans and approved design, prior to issuance of a building permit.
>
> **Mitigation Measure NOI-2**: The contractor shall install forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all exterior-facing rooms of the office building so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control interior noise and achieve the interior noise standards.

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

b) Expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

The construction of the project may generate perceptible vibration when heavy equipment or impact tools (e.g. jackhammers, hoe rams) are used, and construction activities such as demolition, site preparation work, foundation work, new building framing, and finishing, and paving could result in perceptible groundborne vibration. Vibration levels would vary depending on soil conditions, construction methods, and equipment used. **Table 5** shows typical types of construction equipment, in general, and associated vibration effects. Ground-borne noise occurs when ground-borne vibration causes the ground surface and structures to radiate audible acoustical energy, and is primarily an issue for underground rail systems. Ground-borne noise would not be an issue at the project site.

Caltrans recommends a vibration limit of 0.5 in/sec PPV for buildings that are structurally sound and designed to modern engineering standards; however, groundborne vibration levels exceeding 0.3 in/sec PPV could have the potential to result in structural damage or impacts to normal buildings. To assess potential vibration impacts to nearby historic structures, the noise analysis considers a conservative threshold limit of 0.08 in/sec PPV. If groundborne vibrations exceed 0.08 in/sec PPV, then it is assumed that potential structural damage may occur to historic or fragile structures. The nearest historic structure is at 220 California Drive at a distance of 80 feet northeast of the project site. At 80 feet, vibration levels from construction of the project are anticipated to be 0.05 in/sec PPV, which is below the 0.08 in/sec PPV threshold. According to the Caltrans, groundborne vibrations at this level may be perceivable by humans, but structural damage to these historic structures is not likely as described in **Section 5, Cultural Resources**.

The nearest commercial and residential land uses would be adjacent to the project site at 241 California Drive. Groundborne vibrations exceeding 0.3 in/sec PPV would have the potential to result in architectural damage to normal buildings. When two specific types of construction equipment are used at a distance of 5 feet (vibratory roller and clam shovel drop), the measured vibration levels at the adjacent commercial/residential structure is anticipated to be approximately 1.1 in/sec PPV. When other typical construction equipment is used at a distance of 5 feet, the measured vibration levels at the adjacent commercial/residential structure is anticipated to be approximately 0.5 in/sec PPV. As a result, these anticipated vibration levels would exceed the 0.3 in/sec PPV threshold and could potentially cause structural damage to adjacent buildings. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-3** would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Table 5 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment		PPV at 25 ft (in/sec)	Approximate L_v at 25 ft (VdB)
Pile Driver (Impact)	Upper Range	1.158	112
	Typical	0.644	104
Pile Driver (Sonic)	Upper Range	0.734	105
	Typical	0.170	93
Clam Shovel Drop		0.202	94
Hydromill (slurry wall)	In Soil	0.008	66
	In Rock	0.017	75
Vibratory Roller		0.210	94
Hoe Ram		0.089	87

Equipment	PPV at 25 ft (in/sec)	Approximate L_v at 25 ft (VdB)
Large Bulldozer	0.089	87
Caisson Drilling	0.089	87
Loaded trucks	0.076	86
Jackhammer	0.035	79
Small Bulldozer	0.003	58

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

Mitigation Measure NOI-3: The use of typical vibration-generating construction equipment, such as hoe rams, dozers, and drills, shall be prohibited within 10 feet of any adjacent commercial/residential building. The use of heavy vibration-generating construction equipment, such as vibratory rollers or clam shovel drops, within 25 feet of any adjacent commercial/residential building shall be prohibited as well.

Or

Alternatively, a construction vibration monitoring plan shall be implemented to document conditions prior to, during, and after vibration generating construction activities. All plan tasks shall be undertaken under the direction of a licensed Professional Structural Engineer in the State of California or other qualified persons as determined by the City and be in accordance with industry-accepted standard methods. The construction vibration monitoring plan shall be implemented to include the following tasks:

- Identification of the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 50 feet of the project site.
- Performance of a photo survey, elevation survey, and crack monitoring survey for each structure within 50 feet of construction activities identified as sources of high vibration levels. Surveys shall be performed prior to any construction activity, in regular interval during construction and after project completion and shall include internal and external crack monitoring in structures, settlement, and distress and shall document the condition of foundations, walls and other structural elements in the interior and exterior of said structures.
- Development of a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, define structure-specific vibration limits, and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions. Construction contingencies would be identified for when vibration levels approached the limits.
- At a minimum, vibration monitoring shall be conducted during demolition, excavation, and foundation construction. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements.
- If vibration levels approach limits, suspend vibratory construction activities or methods and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.
- Designate a person responsible for registering and investigating claims of excessive vibration. The contact information of such person shall be clearly posted on the construction site.
- Conduct post-survey on structures where either monitoring has indicated high levels or complaints of damage has been made. Make appropriate repairs or provide compensation where damage has occurred as a result of construction activities.

- The results of all vibration monitoring shall be summarized and submitted in a report shortly after substantial completion of each phase identified in the project schedule. The report will include a description of measurement methods, equipment used, calibration certificates and

graphics as required to clearly identify vibration-monitoring locations. An explanation of all events that exceeded vibration limits will be included together with proper documentation supporting any such claims.

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

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

A review of the Transportation Impact Analysis report prepared for the project concluded that that the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in traffic volumes in the project vicinity (see **Section 16, Transportation and Traffic**, and **Appendix H**). Project-generated traffic is calculated to increase traffic noise levels by 0.2 dBA, and as a result, would remain similar to existing conditions. The traffic noise increase associated with the project would not be detectable. Additionally, an enclosed three-level parking garage would be located below-grade of the project site. However, the parking garage entrance/exit would be located more than 80 feet south of the nearest noise-sensitive receptor. The sounds of vehicles entering and exiting the garage would be below ambient traffic noise levels. The Noise Analysis concludes that the proposed commercial building would provide shielding, obscuring direct line-of-sight between the entrance/exit from the nearest sensitive receptors. Noise generating activities at the project site would not substantially differ than those under existing conditions. Additionally, the project would locate operational sources of noise such as mechanical equipment adjacent to existing commercial and residential land uses in the area. Proposed structures on site would include ventilation systems that would be expected to generate relatively low noise levels because of the acoustical shielding provided by the building. For example, the project would locate mechanical equipment rooms below grade within the parking garage on levels G1-G3, and the HVAC room on the ground floor of the building. This equipment would be fully enclosed by the proposed building. Parking garage ventilation shafts would exhaust at the roof level, two floors above the elevation of the nearest noise-sensitive receptors. Noise-sensitive receptors at the second level of the adjacent building (241 California Drive) would not have direct line-of-sight to any of the equipment or exhausts proposed by the project. Such ventilation systems would be designed with standard Building Code requirements and would not be expected to generate noise levels exceeding existing conditions either within or outside of the project site. Future noise levels due to mechanical equipment operation are not expected to be noticeable above existing noise levels attributable to ground-transportation noise sources. Given the above, the impact is less than significant.

d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

Project construction is anticipated to last approximately 16 months, and would occur between the hours designated by the Burlingame Municipal Code. Project construction activities that are expected to impact noise levels within the project vicinity include demolition, site preparation, grading/excavation, trenching, exterior/interior building, and paving- all of which utilize heavy construction equipment. In general, the loudest phases of construction would be during demolition and excavation of the project site. These two phases of construction would occur for approximately 3 to 4 consecutive months.

During construction, maximum noise levels would vary depending on the equipment and the nearest sensitive receptors would be adjacent to the project site. Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels would be anticipated to be 74 to 85 dBA L_{eq} outside the nearest residence during busy construction activities (when construction is on the westernmost portion of the site). Existing daytime noise levels at these residences were calculated to range from 56 to 65 dBA L_{eq}. As a result, the significance threshold would be 61 to 70 dBA L_{eq} (existing conditions plus 5 dBA). Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels would be anticipated to be 83 to 94 dBA L_{eq} outside the nearest commercial/residential building (located adjacent to the project site) during construction. Project construction activities that are expected to impact noise levels within the project vicinity include demolition, site preparation, grading/excavation, trenching, exterior/interior building, and paving- all of which utilize heavy construction equipment. Construction activities would intermittently exceed this threshold; however, exposure to construction noise above the threshold levels would occur for a period of less than 12 months. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI – 4**, temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure NOI-4:

- Noise-generating activities at the construction site or in areas adjacent to the construction site associated with the project in any way will be restricted to the hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday, and 9:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturdays, and 10:00 am to 06:00 pm on Sundays and holidays.
- Construct solid plywood fences around the construction site adjacent to operational businesses, residences, or other noise-sensitive land uses.
- A temporary noise control blanket barrier could be erected, if necessary, along building facades adjoining the construction site. This mitigation would only be necessary if conflicts occurred which were irresolvable by proper scheduling. Noise control blanket barriers can be rented and quickly erected.
- All internal combustion engine driven equipment will be equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be strictly prohibited.
- Stationary noise generating equipment (e.g., concrete crusher) will be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors, and acoustically shielded with temporary noise barriers, material stockpiles, etc. to reduce noise levels at nearby residences. The noise barriers shall provide a break in the line-of-sight between the equipment and the nearest receptors, which would result in a minimum noise reduction of 5 dBA.
- "Quiet" air compressors and other stationery noise sources will be utilized where technology exists. The “quiet” equipment shall be a minimum of 5 dBA lower in noise level than conventional equipment.
- Control noise from construction workers’ radios to a point where they are not audible at existing residences bordering the project site.
- The contractor will prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. This plan shall be distributed to noise-sensitive uses within 1,200 ft of the project site.
- A "disturbance coordinator" will be designated, and will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented as soon as possible. A

telephone number for the disturbance coordinator shall be posted at the construction site and included in the notices sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule. The construction contractor will log construction noise complaints, the causes of the complaints, and the measures implemented to address the complaints. The log will be provided to the City upon request.

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

SFO is the closest airport to the project site, located approximately 3 miles northwest of the site. While occasional aircraft overflights are audible, intermittent aircraft noise is not a significant contributor to the ambient noise environment. The Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND identifies that the project site is within the airport land use plan (ALUP) for SFO; however, the project site does not fall within the 60 dB CNEL or higher contours of noise generated by planes taking off and landing[11]. As a result, both exterior and interior noise levels resulting from aircraft would be compatible with the project; therefore the project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

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

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

11 PBS&J. 2010. Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. San Francisco, California. Prepared for City of Burlingame, California, pages 165-168.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. Population and Housing				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the population in the City of Burlingame was 29,342 in January 2010, and the population is expected to grow by 3.9 percent before 2020, and an additional 2.9 percent between 2020 and 2030. As described in the Plan Bay Area Forecast of Jobs, Population and Housing, jobs in the City are expected to increase by 33,290 between 2010 and 2040[12]. Overall, the community is becoming increasingly built-out due to the lack of undeveloped acreage within the City boundary.

Discussion

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Less than significant)

The project proposes a retail/office mixed-use building, with a combined maximum occupancy of approximately 494 persons. Using the DSP's standard 3.03 employees per 1000 square feet of office space, the project would generate approximately 140 employees[13]. While the project would provide employment opportunities, it would be unlikely that the development would be large enough to attract growth on a regional level from the amount of jobs it would provide. The project would conform to the DSP and Zoning Code regulations. The project would indirectly induce slight growth through the intensification and development on the surrounding land uses. However, given that the project is an infill project, and that no residential component is proposed, indirect growth associated with the employment opportunities generated by the project would not exceed what has been assumed by the DSP and the impact would be less than

[12] ABAG, 2013. *Plan Bay Area: Final Forecast of Jobs, Population and Housing*. Available at: http://planbayarea.org/pdf/final_supplemental_reports/FINAL_PBA_Forecast_of_Jobs_Population_and_Housing.pdf.

[13] Based on the "Fiscal Impact of Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan," prepared by Economics Research Associates (ERA), May 26, 2009: Office uses require an average of 1,000 square feet per 3.03 employees. 46,260*3.03/1000=140 employees (total office space/3.03 employees per every 1000 sf)

significant. Additionally, the project would not involve the extension of an existing road or infrastructure that would provide access to other portions of the City and County. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

and

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

A vacant commercial building currently occupies the project site. Additionally, no residential land uses are present. As a result, project implementation would not cause displacement of existing housing or people that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no related impact would occur.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*

14. Public Services

Would the project:

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

i) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
v) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The Central County Fire Department (CCFD) provides fire protection services within Burlingame, Millbrae, and Hillsborough. CCFD has 87 full-time employees including 82 uniform personnel. CCFD's equipment includes six fire engines, one fire truck, and one search & rescue truck. There are six fire stations within the CCFDs jurisdiction; the closest fire station is located 0.65 miles northwest of the project site at 799 California Drive. The current response time for the CCFD is approximately 4 minutes for 95 percent of emergency calls, which is above the 6 minute 59 second County standard response time.[14]

The Burlingame Police Department (BPD) provides emergency services to the City of Burlingame. BPD has one police station and it is located at 1111 Trousdale Drive. According to a conversation with Lieutenant Kiely, BPD employs 56 employees that include 37 sworn officers. The general plan does not designate a standard ratio of police officers to residents, or a standard emergency response time; however, Lieutenant Kiely indicated that the current emergency response time is acceptable at approximately 7.5 minutes.[15]

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

[14] Christine Reed, Fire Inspector; Central County Fire Department; Personal communication; September 30, 2015.

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

Discussion

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

i) Fire protection? (No Impact)

The project would construct a mixed-used commercial and retail building on the project site that is already developed. No residential land uses are proposed and thus would not result in a direct increase in population. The CCFD has determined that there is adequate equipment, staff, and facilities to provide services to the project site, and no additional staff, facilities, or equipment would be needed as a result of project implementation[16]. As a result, there would be no impact to fire protection services.

ii) Police protection? (No Impact)

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

iii) Schools? (No impact)

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

iv) Parks? (No Impact)

and

v) Other public facilities? (No Impact)

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

[16] Christine Reed, Fire Inspector; Central County Fire Department; Personal communication; September 30, 2015.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. Recreation:				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

Burlingame has approximately 18 recreation sites that consist of: 4 playgrounds; 9 parks, and 2 recreational centers. The 18.9 acre Washington Park is located less than 0.1 miles north of the project site. The 1.1-acre Pershing Park is located approximately 0.4 miles west of the project site.

Discussion

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Less than Significant)

and

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Less than Significant)

As described, Washington Park and Pershing Park are located within 0.1 mile of the project site. These neighborhood parks provide recreational opportunities for the nearby community. The proposed project would construct a mixed-use office and retail structure on an already developed project site. As a result, no residential development is proposed and thus would not directly increase the population. Therefore, the project would not require development of new park facilities. Implementation of the project would not alter access to this park during construction or operation. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant or Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
16. Transportation / Traffic				
Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

A Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared by Abrams Associates in December, 2015 for the project and is included in **Appendix H**. The analysis describes the existing and future conditions for transportation with and without the project. Additionally, the report includes information on the regional and local roadway networks, pedestrian and transit conditions, and transportation facilities associated with the project.

The following traffic forecasting scenarios were considered in the analysis:

- Existing: Based on existing peak hour volumes and existing intersection configurations
- Existing Plus Project: Based on existing traffic volumes plus trips generated from the project
- Cumulative Conditions: Year 2040 cumulative volumes based on planned and approved projects
- Cumulative Plus Project Conditions: Year 2040 cumulative volumes based on planned and approved projects plus the proposed project

The project site is located west of US 101 and east of El Camino Real; both are major traffic corridors providing access to Burlingame. Transit facilities serving the project site include public transit and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Two major public mass transit operators, Samtrans and Caltrain, provide service adjacent to Burlingame. Samtrans Route 46 and 292 provide access to the project site. The project site is also several hundred feet from the Burlingame Caltrain station.

Existing operational conditions were evaluated using the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), Level of Service (LOS) methodology with Synchro Software. LOS is the relationship between the capacity of an intersection (or roadway segment) to accommodate the volume of traffic moving through it at any given time. The LOS describes traffic flow with six ratings ranging from A to F, with "A" indicating relatively free flow of traffic and "F" indicating stop-and-go traffic and traffic jams. The City of Burlingame does not have any Council-adopted definitions of significant traffic impacts, although a LOS D at all intersections during peak hours is considered an acceptable standard.

The TIA considered LOS at the following intersections:

1. California Drive and Oak Grove
2. California Drive and Burlingame Avenue
3. California Drive and Peninsula Avenue
4. Burlingame Avenue and Lorton Avenue
5. Lorton Avenue and Howard Avenue

Discussion

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)
and
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Less than Significant)

Operation

The project site is fully developed with commercial land uses and the lot is paved and generates approximately 371 average daily trips (ADT). With pass-by trips included, the existing site generates approximately 245 ADT.[17]

As outlined in the project description, the project includes the construction of a new four-story building with an underground parking garage that would include a mix of retail and office land uses. New occupants of the building would be within walking distance of the downtown area with easy access to retail and restaurants. Additionally, the project site is several hundred feet from Burlingame Caltrain Station and near Samtrans public transit. Given this, the TIA assumes a reduction of up to 10 percent in daily trips due transit accessibility. With pass-by trips included, the existing site generates approximately 479 ADT (**Table 6**). The

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

project is anticipated to produce approximately 61 new vehicle trips during the AM peak hours; 63 during the PM peak hours. However, when the existing trips are factored in, the project site would produce 234 ADT, 56 new vehicle trips during the AM peak hours, and 42 new vehicle trips during the PM peak hours.

Table 6 Existing and Proposed Trips

	Average Daily Trips	Number of AM Peak Trips	Number of PM Peak Trips
Existing Site (with pass-by included)	245	5	21
Proposed Project (with pass-by included)	479	61	63
Net trips	***234***	***56***	***42***

Source: Abrams Associates, 2015

Existing Plus Project

Table 7 shows the projected existing plus project intersection level of service conditions. Although additional vehicle trips would be generated with project implementation, the existing plus project conditions would continue to meet the acceptable City standard of LOS C, or better, during weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Table 7 Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Conditions

	Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Existing		Existing Plus Project	
				Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1	Oak Grove Avenue and California Drive	Signalized	AM	22.0	C	22.1	C
			PM	20.9	C	21.0	C
2	Burlingame Avenue and California Drive	Signalized	AM	6.7	A	7.3	A
			PM	6.4	A	6.4	A
3	Peninsula Avenue and California Drive	Signalized	AM	21.1	C	22.2	C
			PM	33.4	C	34.6	C
4	Burlingame Avenue and Lorton Avenue	All Way Stop	AM	8.5	A	8.7	A
			PM	9.1	A	9.1	A
5	Howard Avenue and Lorton Avenue	All Way Stop	AM	9.1	A	9.2	A
			PM	10.4	B	10.5	B

Source: Abrams Associates, 2015

Cumulative Plus Project

Table 8 shows the cumulative plus project intersection level of service conditions. The intersection of Peninsula Avenue and California Drive is projected to have a LOS E condition for PM peak hour under both cumulative and cumulative plus project conditions. However, this intersection would operate at LOS E in the future regardless of whether or not the proposed project is constructed. Additionally, the project would not increase the average delay at this intersection.

Table 8 Cumulative Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Conditions

	Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Cumulative		Cumulative Plus Project	
				Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1	Oak Grove Avenue and California Drive	Signalized	AM	26.4	C	26.5	C
			PM	25.0	C	25.1	C
2	Burlingame Avenue and California Drive	Signalized	AM	7.2	A	7.9	A

	Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Cumulative		Cumulative Plus Project	
				Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
			PM	6.9	A	7.0	A
3	Peninsula Avenue and California Drive	Signalized	AM	31.8	C	34.4	C
			PM	62.4	E	63.5	E
4	Burlingame Avenue and Lorton Avenue	All Way Stop	AM	8.9	A	9.1	A
			PM	9.6	A	9.7	A
5	Howard Avenue and Lorton Avenue	All Way Stop	AM	9.8	A	9.9	A
			PM	11.7	B	11.9	B

Source: Abrams Associates, 2015

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County 2013 Congestion Management Program requires new development projects that add 100 or more peak hour trips to the CMP roadway to implement Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures that would reduce potential impacts. According to the TIA, the proposed project would not add 100 or more peak hour trips to the CMP roadway; therefore, a TDM is not required. The project would not contribute to any unacceptable traffic operations within the study area and would not increase average delay by more than 5 seconds. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Construction

Approximately four pieces of heavy equipment are estimated to be transported on and off the site each month throughout the demolition and construction of the proposed project. The hauling trucks would access the site by heading south on California Drive from US 101 (Broadway interchange), making a slight right turn onto Highland and stopping in front of the site. Once full, the trucks would continue down Highland before turning left onto Howard Avenue in order to gain access back to turn back onto California Drive and proceed in either the north or south direction, depending on the final destination of the off-haul. Heavy equipment transport to and from the site could cause traffic impacts in the vicinity of the project site during construction which would be a potential significant impact. However, each load would be required to obtain all necessary permits, which would include conditions. Prior to issuance of grading and building permits, the project applicant would be required to submit a Traffic Control Plan (**Mitigation Measure TRA-1**).

The Traffic Control Plan would indicate how parking for construction workers would be provided during construction and ensure a safe flow of traffic in the project area during construction. This analysis assumed construction of the entire project in one phase to identify the potential worst-case traffic effects. Therefore, the demolition and construction activities associated with the proposed project or its individual phases would not lead to noticeable congestion in the vicinity of the site or the perception of decreased traffic safety resulting in a less- than- significant impact.

> **Mitigation Measure TRA-1:** Prior to issuance of grading and building permits, the project applicant shall submit a Traffic Control Plan. The requirements within the Traffic Control Plan include, but are not limited to, the following: truck drivers would be notified of and required to use the most direct route between the site and U.S. 101, as determined by the City Engineering Department; all site ingress and egress would occur only at the main driveways to the project site; specifically designated travel routes for large vehicles would be monitored and controlled by flaggers for large construction vehicle ingress and egress; warning signs indicating frequent truck entry and exit would be posted on adjacent roadways if requested; and any debris and mud on nearby streets caused by trucks would be

monitored daily and may require instituting a street cleaning program. In addition, eight loads of heavy equipment being hauled to and from the site each month would be short-term and temporary.Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Less than Significant)

San Francisco International Airport (SFO) is approximately 3 miles northeast of the project site. According to the DSP, the project site is within the *1996 San Mateo Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP)* (Specific Plan, 2010. Pg. 131). The proposed development entails the construction of a four story mixed use building, and no aircraft use would be required for operation or construction of any of the project buildout. As such, the project would not lead to an increase in air traffic, and no impact would occur. Therefore, the project would result in no impact.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Less than Significant)

The project would have its entrance and exit driveway on Highland Avenue. Based on a review of the proposed site plan there are no anticipated increases in safety or operational hazards associated with project implementation (see **Appendix H**). The project site design has been required to conform to the City of Burlingame and the San Mateo County design standards and the site design is not expected to create any impacts to pedestrians, bicyclists, or traffic operations. The TIA determined that no internal site circulation or access issues have been identified that would cause a traffic safety problem or any unusual traffic congestion or delay. Therefore, impacts associated with potential increases in hazards due to project design features would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Less than Significant)

The TIA analysis determined that emergency access would be sufficient with regard to number of access points, roadway width, and proximity to fire stations. All lane widths within the project would meet the minimum width that can accommodate emergency vehicles and the final emergency vehicle access plan would be subject to final approval from the Fire Department. No internal site circulation or access issues have been identified that would cause a traffic safety problem or any unusual traffic congestion or delay. Therefore, the development of the project is expected to have less-than-significant impact regarding emergency vehicle access.

e) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Less than Significant)

The proposed 130 off-street parking spaces, and the car share facility, are anticipated to be sufficient to serve the project site, and would meet the City's parking requirements. The project itself is estimated to generate demand for about 94 parking spaces, while the ITE Trip Generation Handbook projects parking demand for mixed-use buildings of the same size as the proposed project site to be 111 parking spaces, both of which are lower than the 130 proposed parking spaces that will be provided for with project implementation. The impact would be less than significant.

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

As stated above, the project site is directly across from the Caltrain station and the Samtrans route 292, and 0.3 miles from the Samtrans route 46. The project would promote continued use of these public transit facilities. Increased use of available public transit would generate increased pedestrian traffic in the project vicinity; however the project is not expected to impact existing pedestrian, or bicycle facilities. The project would not interfere with any existing bus routes and would not remove or relocate any existing bus stops. Furthermore, the project would not contribute to any unacceptable traffic operations within the study area and would not increase average delay by more than 5 seconds; therefore, no significant impacts to transit are expected. As a result, the project would result in a less than significant impact.

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

Setting

The Burlingame Public Works Department administers the City's water system. According to the Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the City receives it water supply from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) which obtains 85 percent of its water supply from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and 15 percent from local watersheds. The City also uses well water and recycled water for supplying non-potable water used for irrigation. According to the *City of Burlingame 2010 Urban Water Management Plan*, the City's average water demand is 4.32 million gallons per day (mgd), or 82 percent of the City's 5.23 mgd allotted supply. Generally, 43 percent of water consumption is from single-family residential uses, 18 percent by multi-family residential uses, 14 percent by industrial uses, 10 percent from commercial uses, 6 percent from irrigation uses, and 2 percent from institutional uses.

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

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

Allied Waste Industries (AWI) provides solid waste collection, transportation, and disposal services to the City of Burlingame. AWI hauls waste to the San Carlos Transfer Station, located at 25 Shoreway Road in San Carlos, then to Ox Mountain Sanitary Landfill, located at 12310 San Mateo Rd, Half Moon Bay. This facility has a maximum throughput of 3,598 tons per day and had a remaining capacity of 26,898,089 cubic yards (as of January May 31, 2011).[18] When the 2001 permit was issued, Ox Mountain Landfill's scheduled closure date was 2023.[19]

Discussion

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

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

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

The project site is fully developed with commercial land uses and the lot is paved. As outlined in the project description, the project would construct a new four-story building over a three levels of underground parking. The existing project site is connected to the City's utility infrastructure by includes 2-inch water lines and 10-inch sanitary sewer lines. The new building would tie-in to these existing lines. The project would increase water demand and wastewater generation because the square footage of the building would increase from the existing site. Water and wastewater infrastructure serving the project site is anticipated to continue to have capacity to handle the project and would not require construction of additional facilities.

> **Mitigation Measure UTIL-1:** the applicant shall prepare a report to determine if the water and sewer main requires upsizing. This analysis will be reviewed by the City and if required, the applicant will be required to pay for their pro-rata share of the upsizing or a designated run of the line, the details of which would be determined by the Department of Public Works prior to building permit approval.

[18] CalRecycle. 2015. Facility/Site Summary Details: Corinda Los Trancos Landfill (OX Mtn) (41-AA-0002). Available: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Detail. Accessed: October 8, 2015.

[19] CalRecycle. 2015. Documents: Corinda Los Trancos Landfill (OX Mtn) (41-AA-0002). Available: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Document. Accessed: October 8, 2015.

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

The project site is fully developed with commercial land uses and a small paved parking lot, with a total of 17,493 square feet of impervious surfaces. The proposed project would demolish and replace existing impervious surfaces with 17,226 square feet of new impervious surface and 267 square feet of landscaping. Approximately, 10 roof drains would collect rainwater and pipe it through a storm filter before emptying into an existing 15-inch storm drain system. Given that there would be a net decrease of 267 sf in impervious surface area on site, existing facilities would be capable of handling stormwater runoff. The impact would be less than significant.

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

The project site is currently developed for commercial uses and has been previously occupied as such since the 1950s, but the site is currently mostly vacant in status. From 2005-2010, the City of Burlingame consumed an average of 4.32 million gallons per day (mgd). According to the project applicant, the existing site is estimated to use approximately 1,000 gpd of water, based on the land use type. The project applicant anticipates the project would require approximately 4,000 gpd, a >.1 percent increase in the average daily water demand. According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND and the Urban Water Management Plan, the City is allocated 5.23 mgd (5,230,000 gpd), and proposed development efforts outlined for the downtown area are not expected to exceed its total water supply through 2030. Furthermore, the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND accounted for this project and concluded that it would result in a negligible impact to water supplies. The impact would be less than significant.

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

The project site is currently developed for commercial use and has been previously occupied as such since the 1950s, but the site is currently vacant in status. The WWTP located at 1103 Airport Boulevard has an average yearly flow is 3.2 mgd (3,200,000 gpd), and a total plant capacity of 5.5 mgd (5,500,000 gpd). According to the project applicant, the existing site is estimated to generate approximately 1,000 gpd of wastewater, based on the land use type. The project applicant anticipates the project would generate approximately 4,000 gpd, a .1 percent increase in current average daily flow. Furthermore, the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND accounted for this project and concluded that it would result in a negligible impact to wastewater treatment capacity. The impact would be less than significant.

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

The Ox Mountain Landfill had a remaining capacity of 27 million tons in 2011. There is currently a 15-year agreement for this facility, which will expire in 2018. According to AWI, which owns and operates the Ox Mountain Landfill, the landfill has a remaining life period that extends beyond the existing 15-year agreement at current disposal rates. The existing project site is developed with commercial land uses. The proposed

project would likely increase the overall solid waste generation for the site because the project would increase in size. However, such an increase would be negligible and the City's landfill would continue to have ample capacity for such an increase. Impacts from solid waste disposal would be less than significant.

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

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant or Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. Mandatory Findings of Significance				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable? ("Cumulative considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

The project site does not provide suitable habitat for any regionally occurring special-status plant or wildlife species for the following reasons: (1) the site is in a densely developed urban area and is isolated from areas of natural habitat; and (2) the site is paved and was previously used for commercial purposes. Therefore, impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species from development and operation of the project are not expected to occur. Mitigation measures that would adequately protect a known historical resource and any currently unknown cultural resources that may be uncovered during project construction are also included herein. With this mitigation, the project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment; affect habitat, fish, and wildlife species; or cultural resources.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable? ("Cumulative considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? (Less than Significant)

The existing project site is currently developed for commercial uses. The project would demolish the existing structure and construct a four-story building with an underground parking garage that would include a mix of retail and commercial uses.

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

Furthermore, the project site is governed by the City's General Plan, DSP, and the Burlingame Municipal Code (BMC). According to the Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan IS/MND, the project site and adjacent parcels are designated HMU, which supports retail and office uses. The project would redevelop a vacant commercial property and construct a building with a mix of retail and commercial uses, which is consistent with Chapter 25.33 HMU District Regulations of the BMC.

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

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

References

Abrams and Associates. 2015. 225 Transportation Impact Analysis.

Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2007: Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the

Year 2035, December 2006. Based on the Burlingame 'subregional study area.' Available at: http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/research/projections_2007.html

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2010. BAAQMD Air Quality Guidelines. Available: http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm. Accessed: September 22, 2015.

California Department of Conservation. (n.d.). Guidelines for Classification and Designation of Mineral Lands. Available: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/smgb/guidelines/documents/classdesig.pdf. Accessed: August 2015.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2015. California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB). Records search for San Mateo County.

California Geological Survey. 1983. Mineral Resource Zones and Resource Sectors, Special Report 146, Plates 2.3 and 2.43, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.

CalRecycle. 2015. Documents: Corinda Los Trancos Landfill (OX Mtn) (41-AA-0002). Available: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Document. Accessed: October 8, 2015.

CalRecycle. 2015. Facility/Site Summary Details: Corinda Los Trancos Landfill (OX Mtn) (41-AA-0002). Available: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/41-AA-0002/Detail. Accessed: October 8, 2015.

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, 2012. Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco Airport 2012. Available at: http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Consolidated_CCAG_ALUCP_November-20121.pdf

City of Burlingame. April 2000. City of Burlingame General Plan.

City of Burlingame. October 2010 (Amended September 2011). Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan.

City of Burlingame. May 2010. Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan Initial Study/Mitigated Declaration.

City of Burlingame. 2010 Urban Water Management Plan

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

Cornerstone Earth Group. March 2015. Geotechnical Investigation 215 California Drive Office Building.

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

Department of Toxic Substances Control (ENVIROSTOR). 2015. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. Available: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public. Accessed: September 23, 2015

Illingworth & Rodkin. October 2015. 225 California Drive Draft Noise Assessment.

Illingworth & Rodkin. September 2015. 225 California Drive Draft Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment.

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

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

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

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

Project Site

Figure 1

Source: Google Earth, 2015; Circlepoint; 2015

NORTH ELEVATION

SOUTH ELEVATION

Proposed Exterior Elevations

Figure 2

Source: MBH Architect, 2015

Legend

- Project Site
- Location of Maximum TAC Impact
- x Location of Residential Receptors

N

Locations of Sensitive Receptors

Figure 3

Source: Illingworth & Rodkin, 2016

This page intentionally left blank.