

RESOLUTION NO. -2012

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (FINAL EIR) PREPARED FOR THE BURLINGAME POINT PROJECT, ADOPTING THE WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT, AND APPROVAL OF VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP, COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR DAY CARE USE

RESOLVED, by the CITY COUNCIL of the City of Burlingame that:

WHEREAS, the applicant has applied for various planning approvals for development of property located at 300 Airport Boulevard in Burlingame, California in April, 2010; and

A. CEQA AND REVIEW PROCESS

WHEREAS, an Environmental Impact Report has been prepared and application has been made for amendments to the Bayfront Specific Plan, amendments to the zoning code related to the Anza Point North and parking regulations, amendment to the sign code, rezoning of a portion of the site from the APS zone district to the APN zone district, vesting tentative parcel map, development agreement, commercial design review, and conditional use permit for day care use for construction of 767,000 square feet of new uses including office space or life science uses, retail uses, food services, a childcare facility and an exercise facility on property located at 300 Airport Boulevard, zoned APN and APS;

WHEREAS, on December 3, 2010, a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was submitted to the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR), and OPR notified State agencies of the preparation of the EIR and directed that they make comments on the proposed project, in addition, the City of Burlingame sent the Notice of Preparation to local agencies requesting comment; and

WHEREAS, the City retained an independent consultant to prepare an EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the scoping of the EIR on December 13, 2010, and provided direction on the issues to be covered in the EIR; and

WHEREAS, a Water Supply Assessment has been prepared by Atkins in accordance with the requirements of California Water Code Sections 10910 et seq., and the Water Supply Assessment indicates that water supplies are acceptable as to quality, quantity, and reliability and that based on the entire record the projected water supplies will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the project in addition to existing and planned future uses; and

WHEREAS, on December 1, 2011, following staff review and comment on the Administrative Draft of the EIR, the City duly noticed the availability and completion of the Draft EIR (DEIR) and the public comment period on the DEIR; and

WHEREAS, a public comment period of forty-five (45) days was opened from December 1, 2011 to January 17, 2012, during which all written public comments were welcomed; and

WHEREAS, during the public comment period, this Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 9, 2012, to receive any oral or written comments that the public might wish to offer on the DEIR; and

WHEREAS, in response to the comments received during the comment period, the City consultant prepared responses to each of the comments made in the form of a Response to Comments document; and

WHEREAS, on May 4, 2012, the Response to Comments Document was made available to the public; and

WHEREAS, the Final Environmental Impact Report, consisting of the DEIR and the Response to Comments document, all supporting information and any responses to late comments (Final EIR), clearly presents the issues involved in the development of this property and identifies appropriate alternatives as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Chapter 13 of the California Code of Regulations); and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR provides the City Council, the City and the public with sufficient and thorough information regarding the potential significant environmental impacts of the project; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR has been prepared and considered in conformance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, with independent preparation by a City-retained consultant and application of the independent comment and judgment of both City staff and the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation measures required by the Final EIR have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project as outlined in the attached Exhibit D; and

WHEREAS, on May 14, 2012, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the Final EIR and the proposed project, at which time the Planning Commission considered the staff report and all written materials, and received all testimony and documentation presented by all interested persons; and

WHEREAS, as described in Planning Commission Resolution No. 22-2012, on May 14, 2012, the Planning Commission found that the Final EIR for the project was complete pursuant to CEQA, and made a recommendation to the City Council to certify the Final EIR and approve the project; and

WHEREAS, on June 18, 2012, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the Final EIR and the proposed project as reviewed and recommended for approval by the Planning Commission, at which time the City Council considered the staff report and all other written materials and all testimony and documentation presented at said hearing by all interested persons; and

B. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

WHEREAS, the Final EIR clearly outlines the proposed project, presents the issues involved in the development of the property, analyzes all potentially significant environmental impacts, and identifies appropriate mitigation measures and alternatives as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Chapter 13 of the California Code of Regulations); and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR provides sufficient disclosure of the issues involved as required by CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the extensive public participation in the development of this Final EIR has provided valuable information and analysis, as well as important changes and alterations to the original project; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR addresses the significant potential environmental effects of the project in the areas of: (1) Land Use, Plans and Policies, (2) Visual Quality, (3) Transportation, (4) Air Quality, (5) Climate Change, (6) Noise, (7) Biological Resources, (8) Hydrology and Water Quality, (9) Population and Housing, (10) Parks and Wind Effects on Recreation, and (11) Utilities and Service Systems, a summary of the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures is outlined in Exhibit A to this resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR identifies and analyzes seven potentially significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts that would probably occur from development of the project, these

potentially significant and unavoidable adverse impacts and findings regarding these impacts are outlined in Exhibit B to this resolution; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit B also outlines findings regarding the feasibility of the identified alternatives to the project that could mitigate some of the potential significant and unavoidable impacts; and

WHEREAS, the proposed project will provide an economic asset to the City and will provide amenities for recreation along the Bayfront which will benefit the community so it is appropriate to override for the specific economic, social and other considerations noted in the Statement of Overriding Considerations contained in Exhibit C; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR, consisting of the Draft EIR and the Response to Comments Document, provides the Council, the City, the public and responsible agencies with sufficient and thorough information regarding the potentially significant environmental impacts of the project; and

Whereas, the Final EIR has been prepared and considered in conformance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, with independent preparation by a City-retained consultant and application of the independent comment and judgment of City staff, the Planning Commission and the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation measures required by the Final EIR have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project as outlined in the attached Exhibit D; and

C. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered the seven potentially significant and unavoidable environmental impacts identified by the Final EIR and the mitigation measures proposed by both the City and the applicant; and

WHEREAS, the project will contribute to impacts to the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar/US 101 intersection in the City of San Mateo, and the City of San Mateo is exploring options to improve circulation in the vicinity of this intersection. A mitigation measure has been included requiring that the applicant contribute a fair share towards this solution. However, since the City of San Mateo has not yet chosen an alternative and the improvement is outside the jurisdiction of the City of Burlingame, the impact must be considered significant and unavoidable; and

WHEREAS, project generated traffic will have an impact on the operation of six freeway segments and would have a cumulative impact on ten freeway segments. Mitigation of these impacts would require freeway widening to construct additional through lanes to increase freeway capacity. The project has incorporated all feasible transportation demand management measures to reduce the number of trips generated. However, it is not feasible for an individual project to bear responsibility to implement such extensive transportation system improvements due to constraints in acquisition and cost of right-of-way. In addition, no comprehensive project to add through lanes has been developed by Caltrans or the City and County Association of Governments for individual projects to contribute to, and there is no other mechanism for making a fair share contribution. Therefore, the significant impacts to freeway segments would be considered significant and unavoidable; and

WHEREAS, given the stricter standards imposed for air quality impacts, mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to the extent feasible have been applied to the project, but it is not possible to reduce the potentially significant, unavoidable impacts on air quality to less than significant; and

WHEREAS, the project would result in a significant impact from both direct and indirect generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions. However, the nature of the project is such that mitigation cannot fully address the associated emissions. Mitigation measures proposed would reduce these impacts to the extent feasible, but would not reduce the GHG emissions below the BAAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable; and

WHEREAS, the findings regarding the potentially significant, unavoidable effects identified in the Final EIR and Exhibit B detail and summarize the analysis of those effects and their possible mitigation; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit B also contains the findings regarding the feasibility of the identified alternatives to the project that could mitigate some of the potential significant and unavoidable impacts; and

WHEREAS, the Statement of Overriding Considerations contained in Exhibit C hereto weighs the benefits of the proposed development against the unavoidable environmental impacts as defined in CEQA; and

WHEREAS, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, these benefits and considerations make the unavoidable environmental impacts acceptable.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is RESOLVED and DETERMINED by the City Council that:

1. The City Council was presented and has reviewed and considered the documents constituting the Final EIR and received testimony regarding the Final EIR at the June 18, 2012 public hearing. The City Council finds that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the Final EIR is the independent judgment and analysis of the City. The Final EIR contains additions, clarifications, modifications and other information in its Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR, and such additions, clarifications, modifications and other information are not significant new information that would require recirculation of the EIR as defined under CEQA. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that mitigate, avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects identified in the Draft EIR, as described in the mitigation measures incorporated as project conditions in Exhibit D, except for the identified significant and unavoidable impacts described in Exhibit B. On the basis of the Final EIR documents and comments received and addressed by this Council, it is hereby certified that the Final EIR, consisting of the Draft EIR, the Response to Comments document, and all supporting information including any response to late comments, is complete pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15090.
2. The findings contained in the resolution and those attached hereto as Exhibits A, B, and C are adopted pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091, 15092 and 15093.
3. The City Council further finds and determines that the Water Supply Assessment prepared by Atkins was included in the EIR for the project as Appendix J and in Section 3.12 Utilities and Service Systems, and was prepared in accordance with the California Water Code and the Public Resources Code. The City Council hereby adopts the Water Supply Assessment and, based on substantial evidence in the record as a whole, finds and determines that the total projected water supplies of the City will meet the projected water demand associated with the project in addition to existing and planned future uses in normal, single dry, and multiple dry years.
4. By separate resolution and ordinances, the Council is concurrently approving a development agreement, amendments to the Bayfront Specific Plan to increase the maximum floor area ratio for office uses and commercial recreational facilities, to amend the Design Guidelines related to setbacks and heights of buildings and to reflect the proposed roadway realignment, rezoning of a portion of the site from the APS to the APN zoning district, and amendments to the APN zoning regulations to increase the FAR for office and commercial recreation facilities, add incidental food establishments and retail services in business campuses as permitted uses, changes to required setbacks and height regulations, design guidelines criteria, allowing for a reduction in parking requirements when a Transportation

Demand Management (TDM) plan is implemented, and allowing additional freestanding monument signs on parcels with frontages exceeding 300 feet in length.

5. As provided in the Final EIR and supporting information, staff reports, minutes, and recording of hearings for the project, the vesting tentative subdivision map application for the project is consistent with requirements of Government Code Section 66410 et seq. and Title 26 of the City's Municipal Code;
6. As provided in the Final EIR and supporting information, staff reports, minutes, and recording of hearings for the project, the daycare use proposed in the project amenities building would not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity and, as conditioned, will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, general welfare or convenience, and the daycare use is otherwise located and conducted in a manner in accord with the Burlingame general plan and Zoning Code;
7. As provided in the Final EIR and supporting information, staff reports, minutes, and recording of hearings for the project, the project is consistent with design review requirements of the Specific Plan and Burlingame Municipal Code;
8. As such, the applications for Vesting Tentative Parcel Map, Commercial Design Review, and Conditional Use Permit for Day Care Use are hereby approved subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit "D" attached hereto.
9. Conditions of Approval 24 to 69 represent the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR for the project and constitute the mitigation monitoring plan for development of the proposed project.

Mayor

I, MARY ELLEN KEARNEY, City Clerk of the City of Burlingame, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was introduced and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council held on the 18th day of June, 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:
NOES:	COUNCILMEMBERS:
ABSENT:	COUNCILMEMBERS:

City Clerk

EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION
300 AIRPORT BOULEVARD PROJECT

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
3.2 Land Use			
LU-1 Conflicts with Adopted Land Use Plans and Policies. Implementation of the Project would be generally consistent with the City's Bayfront Specific Plan Land Use Designations and goals, the Municipal Code zoning, and BCDC, ABAG, and ALUP plans. Redesignation, rezoning, and changes to the existing Zoning Ordinance as proposed under the Project would remove potential inconsistencies with adopted land use plans and policies. As such, the impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
LU-2 Cumulative Land Use Impacts. The Project, in combination with other foreseeable development, would have no cumulative impacts regarding adopted land use plans and policies.	NI	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
3.3 Visual Quality			
VQ-1 Alteration of Scenic Vistas. The Project would have a less-than-significant impact on scenic vistas as viewed from the Coyote Point Recreation Area.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
VQ-2 Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway. The Project would not damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway.	NI	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
VQ-3 Degradation of Existing Visual Character or Quality. The Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Project Site and its surroundings, resulting in less-than-significant impacts.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
VQ-4 New Sources of Light and Glare. The Project would create a new source of light and glare. However, light and glare	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
impacts would be buffered by proposed design features, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.			
VQ-5 Cumulative Visual Impacts. The Project, in combination with surrounding development, would result in less-than-significant cumulative visual, light, or glare impacts.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
3.4 Transportation			
TR-1 Intersection Operations. With the addition of trips generated from the development of the 300 Airport Boulevard Site and the potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, all study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service. However, the Project would add traffic to the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar Avenue intersection in the city of San Mateo. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	MITIGATION MEASURE. The City of San Mateo is considering a range of potential improvements at the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar Avenue intersection to provide sufficient capacity for existing and future traffic volume. However, a specific improvement project has not been identified at this time. It would be appropriate for the Project Sponsor, and any future project sponsor for development of the 350 Airport Boulevard site, to make a fair share contribution toward the cost of improvements at this intersection for each project's respective impacts. However, since no specific improvement project has been identified and because this intersection is under the control of an agency other than the City of Burlingame (Caltrans and San Mateo), the impact must be considered significant and unavoidable.	SU
TR-2 Freeway Ramp Operations. Project-generated traffic would have a less-than-significant impact on freeway ramp operations.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
TR-3 Freeway Segment Operations. Project-generated traffic would have a significant impact on the operation of six freeway segments.	S	MITIGATION MEASURE. Mitigation of significant Project impacts on freeway segments would require freeway widening to construct additional through lanes, thereby increasing freeway capacity. However, it is not feasible for an individual development project to bear responsibility for implementing such extensive transportation system improvements due to constraints in acquisition and cost of right-of-way. In addition, no comprehensive project to add through lanes has been developed by Caltrans or C/CAG for individual projects to contribute to, and no other mechanism exists for making a fair share contribution. Therefore, the significant impacts on the freeway segments identified above would be significant and unavoidable.	SU
TR-4 Air Traffic Patterns. The Project would have no impact on air traffic patterns in the vicinity of the Project Site.	NI	No Mitigation Required.	N/A

Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
TR-5 Transit Service, Pedestrian Facilities, and Bicycle Facilities. The Project would have a beneficial or less-than-significant impact on transit service, pedestrian facilities, and bicycle facilities in the Project area.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
TR-6 Site Access, Circulation, and Parking. Based on the 300 Airport Boulevard Site Plan, the Project would have less-than-significant transportation impacts associated with site access, circulation, and parking.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
TR-7 Cumulative Intersection Operations. Under cumulative conditions, all study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service. However, the Project would add traffic to the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar Avenue intersection in the city of San Mateo. This would be a potentially significant cumulative impact to study intersections.	PS	MITIGATION MEASURE. The City of San Mateo is considering a range of potential improvements at the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar Avenue intersection to provide sufficient capacity for existing and future traffic volume. However, a specific improvement project has not been identified at this time. It would be appropriate for the Project Sponsor, and any future project sponsor for development of the 350 Airport Boulevard site, to make a fair share contribution toward the cost of improvements at this intersection for each project's respective impacts. However, since no specific improvement project has been identified and because this intersection is under the control of an agency other than the City of Burlingame (Caltrans and San Mateo), the impact must be considered significant and unavoidable.	SU
TR-8 Cumulative Freeway Ramp Operations. Under cumulative conditions, Project-generated traffic would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact on freeway ramp operations.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
TR-9 Cumulative Freeway Segment Operations. Project-generated traffic would have a significant cumulative impact on the operation of ten freeway segments.	S	MITIGATION MEASURE. Mitigation of significant project impacts on freeway segments would require roadway widening to construct additional through lanes, thereby increasing freeway capacity. It is not feasible for an individual development project to bear responsibility for implementing such extensive transportation system improvements due to constraints in acquisition and cost of right-of-way. Further, no comprehensive project to add through lanes has been developed by Caltrans or C/CAG for individual projects to contribute to. Therefore, the significant cumulative impacts on the freeway segments identified above must be considered significant and unavoidable.	SU

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
3.5 Air Quality			
AQ-1 Consistency with Applicable Air Quality Plans. Implementation of the Project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Clean Air Plan. Therefore, impacts would be significant.	S	<p>MITIGATION MEASURE. Since there is no proposed project for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, Mitigation Measure AQ-1.1 would require implementation of TDM measures for the 350 Airport Boulevard Project, similar to those included as a Project component of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project. Inclusion of these measures for future development at the 350 Airport Boulevard Site could reduce air quality impacts; however, the extent of that reduction is unknown at this time. With the extensive TDM measures already included in the 300 Airport Boulevard Project, there are no additional feasible mitigation measures that would further reduce impacts as a result of increased VMT associated with the 300 Airport Boulevard Project. Therefore, because the amount of reduction possible for 350 Airport Boulevard is unknown, and the increase in VMT for the 300 Airport Boulevard Project cannot be further mitigated, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p> <p><i>AQ-1.1 Implement TDM Program as part of 350 Airport Boulevard Project.</i> These measures could include: secure bicycle storage, showers and changing rooms, shuttle service, preferential parking for carpoolers, preferential parking for vanpoolers, commute assistance center, employees' surveys, video conferencing centers, on-site amenities accommodations, on-site bicycles for employees, child care services, guaranteed ride home program, transportation action plan, transportation management association, and coordination of TDM programs.</p>	SU
AQ-2 Violation of Particulate Matter Ambient Air Quality Standards. Fugitive dust (PM ₁₀) from construction activities associated with the Project would result in short-term violations of particulate matter ambient air quality standards. This would be a temporary but potentially-significant impact.	PS	<p>MITIGATION MEASURE. Mitigation Measure AQ-2.1 would require implementation of all appropriate dust control measures recommended by BAAQMD. Inclusion of these measures in the construction contracts for future development at the Project Site would reduce construction-related air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><i>AQ-2.1 Implement Recommended Dust Control Measures.</i> To reduce particulate matter emissions during Project excavation and construction phases, the Project contractor(s) shall comply with the dust control strategies developed by BAAQMD. The Project Sponsor shall include in all construction contracts the following requirements or measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times 	LTS

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>AQ-3 Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursor Emissions Compliance. Equipment used for construction activities associated with the Project would result in short-term emission increases of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that exceed the 2011 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria, thus resulting in a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>per day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. <p>MITIGATION MEASURE. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3.1 would reduce construction-related emissions from the development of the 300 Airport Boulevard Site and potential development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site. Table 3.5-4 and Table 3.5-5, above, both include an estimate of emissions with the application of Mitigation Measure AQ-3.1 and AQ-3.2. As shown, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3.1 and AQ-3.2, construction-related emissions would still have the potential to exceed the 2011 BAAQMD significance thresholds for ROG and NOx with the 300 Airport Boulevard Project, and the significance threshold for ROG with the</p>	SU

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>350 Airport Boulevard Project. Therefore, construction emissions from Project development are considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p><i>AQ-3.1 Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization.</i> To reduce the potential impacts resulting from Project construction activities, the Project Sponsor shall include in contract specifications a requirement for the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes; • The Project shall develop a construction plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction Project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a Project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average (as specified in California Code of Regulations Article 4.8, Section 2449 General Requirements for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets). Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available; • All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM; • Use of Interim Tier 4, if applicable, or equivalent equipment for all uses where such equipment is available; • Use of Tier 3 equipment with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) or alternative fuel vehicles for applications where Tier 4 Interim engines are not available; • Prohibition of diesel generators for construction purposes where feasible alternative sources of power are available; • All construction equipment shall be maintained in proper working condition in accordance with manufacturer's specifications; • Diesel-powered construction equipment shall comply with 	

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>AQ-4 Compliance with BAAQMD CEQA Significance Criteria Regarding Operational Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursor Emissions. Operational emissions associated with the Project would emit criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that exceed 2011 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria, thus resulting in a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>BAAQMD requirements or meet Tier 3 or Tier 4 EPA/CARB standards; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To the extent feasible, the existing electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction sites shall be used rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines. <p><i>AQ-3.2 Application of Low-VOC Coatings.</i> The Project Sponsor shall use low VOC (i.e., ROG) coatings beyond the local requirements as per the BAAQMD Guideline (i.e., Regulation 8, Rule 3: Architectural Coatings)</p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURE. Since there is no proposed project for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, Mitigation Measure AQ-1.1 would require implementation of TDM measures for the 350 Airport Boulevard Project, similar to those which are included as a Project component of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project. Inclusion of these measures for future development at the 350 Airport Boulevard Site could reduce air quality impacts; however, the extent of that reduction is unknown at this time. With the extensive TDM measures already included in the 300 Airport Boulevard Project, there are no additional feasible mitigation measures that would further reduce impacts as a result of increased VMT associated with the 300 Airport Boulevard Project. Therefore, because the amount of reduction possible for 350 Airport Boulevard is unknown, and the increase in VMT for the 300 Airport Boulevard Project cannot be further mitigated, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>In addition, the Project Sponsor for the 300 Airport Boulevard Site has committed to seeking LEED Gold certification or equivalent and to exceed energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements (26 percent energy reduction over Title 24 baseline building), which would further aid in reducing stationary source emissions. Mitigation Measure AQ-4.1 to implement energy efficiency measures for the 350 Airport Boulevard Project could reduce air quality impacts. However, since there is no proposed project for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, the amount of VMT reduction possible for 350 Airport Boulevard is unknown, and the increase in VMT for 300 Airport Boulevard cannot be further mitigated. As such, impacts associated with the 300 Airport Boulevard Project would be significant and unavoidable.</p> <p><i>AQ-4.1 Implement energy efficiency measures with 350 Airport Boulevard Project.</i> These measures could include: LEED certification or to exceed</p>	SU

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>AQ-5 Expose Sensitive Receptors to PM_{2.5} and Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) Concentrations During Operation or Construction. The Project would expose sensitive receptors to PM_{2.5} and TAC concentrations during operation; however, the operational PM_{2.5} and TAC generated by the Project would be below the regulatory threshold. Additionally, the Project could expose sensitive receptors to PM_{2.5} and TAC concentrations above regulatory thresholds during construction, resulting in a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements which would further aid in reducing stationary source emissions.</p> <p><u>300 Airport Boulevard</u></p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURE. If the construction of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project is phased such that the childcare center is operational while subsequent phases of the Project are being constructed, the 300 Airport Boulevard Project would result in cancer risk and PM_{2.5} exposure above the recommended regulatory thresholds at both the individual and cumulative levels. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-5.1a and b, risk for inside the childcare center would be reduced to 8.30 in one million adjacent in the portion of the building associated with the childcare center's location. Therefore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-5.1a and b, potential risk during operation of the daycare center would be reduced to less than significant for both individual and cumulative risk during construction.</p> <p>With implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-5.1a and b, PM_{2.5} exposure risk for inside the childcare center would be reduced to 0.08 and 0.18 µg/m³, well below both the individual and cumulative thresholds. Therefore with the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-5.1, potential impacts from PM_{2.5} exposure from operation of the childcare center would be reduced to less than significant on both an individual and cumulative level during construction.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-5.1c would reduce the risk for the outdoor activity center to a less than significant level for both individual and cumulative risk during construction. If implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-5.1c is not feasible, the childcare center shall not be allowed to open until all construction activities FOR Phase 2 have been completed.</p> <p><i>AQ-5.1 Reduce Risk of Exposure During Construction.</i> If the childcare center is operational during the construction of Phase 2 of the Project, one of the following shall be implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Health Risk Assessment is conducted prior to commencement of construction of Phase II that demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the BAAQMD, that impacts to the children at the childcare center are less than significant during Phase II construction or specific subphases of Phase II construction; or 	LTS

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Implement the following building design and operational restrictions. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The childcare center building shall be designed such that the air intake would be located at the far eastern edge of the building with the air intake facing east. b. A MERV 15 or higher rated filter shall be installed and operated for at least the duration of construction activities. The MERV 15 or higher rated filters have the potential to remove up to 85 percent of particles of 2.5 microns or greater thereby reducing interior levels of pollutants. c. All outdoor activities at the childcare center shall be suspended while construction activities are occurring. 	
		<p>If implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-5.1 is infeasible, then the childcare center would be prohibited from operating during Phase II construction.</p>	
		<p>IMPROVEMENT MEASURES. As indicated above, operation of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project would not result in significant health risks to sensitive receptors. The Project Sponsor has indicated that as part of the operating conditions of the back-up generators, all testing and maintenance operations of the generators would be conducted when the daycare center is not in operation. This would eliminate the potential for these onsite sources to represent an increased health risk for the students of the daycare center. The following improvement measures, which are recommended but not required, are included to further reduce the less-than-significant impact and to ensure implementation of these operating conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the conditions of operation for the onsite back-up generators, all diesel emissions associated with the maintenance and testing of the generators should be conducted at such times as the daycare center is not in operation, particularly nights and weekends. • While not required based on the refined modeling, the Project Sponsor may wish to consider implementing MERV 15 or higher rated filters for the amenities building. This would further reduce exposure of daycare students to emissions from US 101. The MERV 15 or higher rated filters have the potential to remove up to 85 percent of PM_{2.5} and would reduce risk while students were inside 	

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>AQ-6 CO Compliance with State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards. Operational emissions from motor vehicles trips associated with the Project would not cause local concentrations of CO to exceed State and federal ambient air quality standards; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	<p>the building. No Mitigation Required.</p>	N/A
<p>AQ-7 Objectionable Odors. The Project would not be expected to create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. There would be no impact from the Project.</p>	NI	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
<p>AQ-8 Consistency with Applicable Air Quality Plans. The Project, combined with other development within the City, would not be consistent with the Ozone Attainment Plan and the Clean Air Plan. This would be a significant cumulative impact.</p>	S	<p>MITIGATION MEASURE. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1.1 for the 350 Airport Boulevard Project would require TDM as a project component. However, the amount of reduction for the 350 Airport Boulevard Project and the increase in VMT cannot be further mitigated for the 300 Airport Boulevard Project. The combined effect of operation of 300 Airport Boulevard and 350 Airport Boulevard would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts with respect to consistency with regional air quality plans.</p>	SU
<p>AQ-9 Cumulative Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursor Emission - Construction Activities. Construction activity associated with the development of the Project Site, in combination with other development in the area, would generate criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that would exceed the 2011 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. This would be a significant cumulative impact.</p>	S	<p>MITIGATION MEASURE. AQ-3.1 is proposed to reduce criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor emissions from construction of all project components; however, even with implementation of the mitigation measure, construction-related emissions associated with the Project would still have the potential to exceed the 2011 BAAQMD significance thresholds. As such, cumulative construction-related air emissions would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
<p>AQ-10 Cumulative Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursor Emissions - Operational Activities. Operational activities associated with the Project, in combination with other development in the area, would emit criteria pollutants. Although a TDM program is included as a Project component, operational emissions would exceed the 2011 BAAQMD significance thresholds, resulting in a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>MITIGATION MEASURE. Mitigation measures to further reduce VMT would not be feasible because, according to the transportation impact analysis, in order to further reduce VMT, the daily trips would need to be further reduced. The Transportation Impact Analysis and URBEMIS models already reflect the implementation of a TDM program. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>AQ-11 Cumulative Expose Sensitive Receptors to PM_{2.5} and Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) Concentrations During Operation or Construction. The Project would not expose sensitive receptors to PM_{2.5} and TAC concentrations above regulatory thresholds. Therefore cumulative impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
<p>3.6 Climate Change</p>			
<p>CC-1 Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The Project would result in a significant impact from both direct and indirect generation of GHG emissions.</p>	S	<p><u>300 Airport Boulevard</u></p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURES. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CC-1.1 through CC-1.8 would reduce GHG emissions associated with operation of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project. Where sufficient information was available to quantify reductions in GHG emissions associated with implementation of the following mitigation measures, such reductions were either incorporated into BGM or were calculated outside of the model (refer to the assumptions worksheet in Appendix F). Although the 300 Airport Boulevard Project would implement the above described project design features to improve energy conservation and sustainability, in order to quantify the reductions attributed to these design features they were restated as mitigation measures with numeric provisions (see Mitigation Measures CC-1.3 through CC-1.8 below). Mitigated GHG emissions are compared to unmitigated GHG emissions in Table 3.6-3.</p> <p>The nature of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project is such that mitigation cannot fully address the associated GHG emissions. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the operational climate change impacts from the 300 Airport Boulevard Project, but would not reduce GHG emissions below the BAAQMD threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂e/SP. As shown in Table 3.6-3, operation of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project with mitigation and the TDM program would result in approximately 6.00 MT CO₂e per year. Therefore, the GHG emissions of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project, and the Project's contributions to global climate change, would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p><i>CC-1.1 Incorporate GHG Reduction Measures for Maintenance Activities.</i> The Project Sponsor shall provide infrastructure for the use of electric landscape equipment during landscaping activities, where feasible.</p> <p><i>CC-1.2 Incorporate Trees and Vegetation into Project Design.</i> Trees and</p>	SU

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>other shade structures shall be incorporated into the Site Plan to maximize summer shade and to minimize winter shade.</p> <p><i>CC-1.3 Renewable Energy System.</i> The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall offset 10 percent of project electricity demand through implementation of onsite renewable energy systems or through investment in offsite alternative energy systems.</p> <p><i>CC-1.4 Drought Tolerant Landscaping.</i> The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall reduce irrigation-related water demand by a minimum of 10 percent through the implementation of drought tolerant landscaping.</p> <p><i>CC-1.5 Cool Roof Material.</i> The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall incorporate cool-roof materials into project design to reduce electricity demand associated with building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) by a minimum of 7 percent.</p> <p><i>CC-1.6 Water Conservation Measures.</i> The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall implement immediate water conservation measures to reduce building water demand by 33 percent. Building water demand shall ultimately be reduced by 50percent when the City’s recycled water system is implemented.</p> <p><i>CC-1.7 Energy Efficiency beyond Title 24 Standards.</i> The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall reduce building energy demand beyond the 2005 Title 24 Standards by 26 percent.</p> <p><i>CC-1.8 Operation Solid Waste Reduction.</i> The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall implement a solid waste reduction program to reduce operational solid waste by a minimum of 10 percent.</p> <p>IMPROVEMENT MEASURE. The Project should include alternative fueled vehicles in the construction fleet and that building materials come from local sources in order to reduce GHG emissions from construction activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Utilize Alternative Fueled Vehicles and Local Building Materials.</i> In accordance with BAAQMD BMPs, the Project Sponsor shall incorporate into the construction fleet a minimum of 15 percent of construction vehicles and equipment operated by alternative fuels. Further, the Project Sponsor shall ensure that a minimum of 10 percent of building materials are locally sourced, where feasible. 	

350 Airport Boulevard

Mitigation Measures. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CC-1.9

Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>CC-2 Conflict with Applicable Plans, Policies, or Regulations Regarding Reduction of GHG Emissions. The Project would conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The Project would have a significant impact on GHG reduction plans, policies, and regulations.</p>	S	<p>through CC-1.11 would reduce GHG emissions from operational activities associated with development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site with the increased FAR allowed by the planning and zoning changes proposed as a part of the Project. However, the nature of future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site is such that mitigation cannot fully address the GHG emissions associated with its operation. The implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the climate change impacts from the 350 Airport Boulevard Project (as shown in Table 3.6-4), but would not reduce GHG emissions below the BAAQMD significance threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂e/SP/yr. Therefore, the GHG emissions of future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, both independently and when combined with the 300 Airport Boulevard Project, would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p><i>CC-1.9 Incorporate Mitigation Measures CC-1.1 through CC-1.8 as described under 300 Airport Boulevard.</i> The Project Sponsor shall ensure that implementation of the 350 Airport Boulevard Project comply with Mitigation Measures CC-1.1 through CC-1.8 as described for the 300 Airport Boulevard Project, above.</p> <p><i>CC-1.10 Implement a TDM program.</i> The Project Sponsor shall ensure that future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site implement a TDM program similar to that described for the 300 Airport Boulevard Project, to reduce transportation-related GHG emissions.</p> <p><i>CC-1.11 Pursue LEED Certification.</i> Future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site shall seek LEED Gold certification or equivalent for development per the recommendations of the City’s Green Building Ordinance. The Project Sponsor shall submit draft LEED (or equivalent) checklists to the City Sustainability Coordinator for review and consultation.</p> <p><u>300 Airport Boulevard</u></p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURE. The 300 Airport Boulevard Project would exceed BAAQMD’s threshold for operational GHG emissions, even with implementation of the mitigation measures identified under CC-1 above, operation of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project would not comply with BAAQMD’s interpretation of AB 32. Implementation of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to regional GHG reduction plans, policies, and regulations.</p>	SU

Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
---------	--	---------------------------------	-------------------------------------

350 Airport Boulevard

SU

MITIGATION MEASURE. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures CC-1.9 through CC-1.11, the 350 Airport Boulevard Project would result in significant and unavoidable operational GHG emissions; and therefore, would have a significant and unavoidable impact on regional GHG reduction plans, policies, and regulations.

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>3.7 Noise</p> <p>NO-1 Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels during Construction. Construction of the Project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project. However, ambient noise levels may temporarily increase. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>MITIGATION MEASURE. Implementation of the BMPs listed below in Mitigation Measure NO-1.1 would reduce temporary construction noise impacts to less-than-significant levels.</p> <p><i>NO-1.1 Implement Best Management Practices to Reduce Construction Noise.</i> The following BMPs shall be incorporated into the construction documents to be implemented by the Project contractor.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maximize the physical separation between noise generators and noise receptors. Such separation includes, but is not limited to, the following measures: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Use heavy-duty mufflers for stationary equipment and barriers around particularly noisy areas of the site or around the entire site; ii. Use shields, impervious fences, or other physical sound barriers to inhibit transmission of noise to sensitive receptors; iii. Locate stationary equipment to minimize noise impacts on the community; and iv. Minimize backing movements of equipment. b. Use quiet construction equipment whenever possible. c. Impact equipment (e.g., jack hammers and pavement breakers) shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically-powered tools. Compressed air exhaust silencers shall be used on other equipment. Other quieter procedures, such as drilling rather than using impact equipment, shall be used whenever feasible. d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines. e. Select routes for movement of construction-related vehicles and equipment in conjunction with the Burlingame Planning Division so that noise-sensitive areas, including residences and schools, are avoided as much as possible. f. The project sponsor shall designate a “disturbance coordinator” for construction activities. The coordinator would be responsible for responding to any local complaints regarding construction noise and 	LTS

Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>NO-2 Exposure of Persons to Excessive Ground-Borne Vibration Levels during Construction. Implementation of the Project may result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. This would be considered a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>vibration. The coordinator would determine the cause of the noise or vibration complaint and would implement reasonable measures to correct the problem.</p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURES. Mitigation Measure NO-2.1 would require the notification of nearby businesses of potential impacts to vibration-sensitive equipment, in order to identify any vibration-sensitive equipment in the Project vicinity, and implement BMPs, as described in Mitigation Measure NO-2.2, to help reduce impacts to any buildings identified with vibration-sensitive equipment. Mitigation Measure NO-2.3 would require the use alternative pile driving methods (e.g., drilled or steel piles) for piles driven within proximity of existing vibration receptors in order to reduce vibration levels at the receptors to meet significance thresholds. Implementation of these measures would reduce construction-related impacts to vibration-sensitive equipment to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><i>NO-2.1 Notify Nearby Businesses of Construction Activities that Could Affect Vibration-Sensitive Equipment.</i> The Project Sponsor shall provide notification to adjacent property owners and occupants, prior to the start of construction, informing them of the estimated start date and duration of vibration-generating construction activities during site preparation, grading, and pile driving, if required. This notification shall include information warning about the potential for impacts related to vibration-sensitive equipment. The Project Sponsor shall identify a phone number for the property owners and occupants to call if they have vibration-sensitive equipment on their site.</p> <p><i>NO-2.2 Implement Construction BMPs to Reduce Construction Vibration.</i> The Project Sponsor shall implement the following measures during construction of all Project components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the extent feasible, construction activities that could generate high vibration levels at any identified vibration-sensitive locations shall be scheduled during times that would have the least impact on nearby land uses. This could include restricting construction activities in the areas of potential impact to the early and late hours of the work day, such as from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. or 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Friday. • Stationary sources, such as construction staging areas and temporary 	LTS

Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>NO-3 Exposure of People to Excess Traffic Noise. Implementation of the Project would not result in a substantial increase in the exposure of people to noise in excess of the General Plan <i>criteria as a result of the increase in traffic</i>. This would be considered less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	<p>generators, shall be located as far from nearby vibration-sensitive receptors as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trucks shall be prohibited from idling along streets serving the construction site where vibration-sensitive equipment is located. • Avoid pile driving when possible within 100 feet of an existing structure. <p><i>NO-2.3 Implement Alternative Pile Driving Methods.</i> The Project Sponsor shall use alternative pile driving methods (e.g., drilled or steel piles) for piles driven in proximity to existing vibration receptors such that vibration levels at vibration-sensitive equipment shall not exceed 65 VdB.</p>	N/A
<p>NO-4 Increase in Ambient Noise Levels during Operation. Operation of the Project could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project as a result of human activities and mechanical HVAC equipment. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p><u>350 Airport Boulevard</u> MITIGATION MEASURE. Mitigation measure NO-4.1 would reduce potential impacts related to HVAC systems at the 350 Airport Boulevard Site to a less than significant level.</p> <p><i>NO-4.1 Placement or Screening of HVAC Mechanical Equipment.</i> All HVAC mechanical equipment shall be located more than 60 feet from the nearest property line. Alternatively, HVAC mechanical equipment may be installed in a noise enclosure sufficient to reduce ground-level noise levels at the nearest property boundary to 70 dBA CNEL or less.</p>	LTS
<p>NO-5 Airport Noise. The Project Site is located within an airport land use plan; however, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels. The Project Site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip. This would result in no impact.</p>	NI	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
<p>NO-6 Cumulative Construction Noise. Construction activities associated with project-related development and other future development in the City would not expose sensitive receptors to</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise level. The Project's cumulative impact would be less than significant.			
NO-7 Cumulative Vibration Impacts. Construction activities associated with Project-related development and other future development in the City would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration. The Project's cumulative impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
NO-8 Cumulative Operational Noise. Cumulative development would result in a substantial increase in exposure of persons to noise in excess of the standards established by the General Plan for traffic noise. The Project's contribution would be less than significant.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
NO-9 Cumulative Airport Noise. Operation of the Project, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not result in the cumulative exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive airport noise.	NI	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
3.8 Biological Resources			
BR-1 Effects on Sensitive Natural Communities. The Project would have a less-than-significant impact (either directly or through habitat modifications) on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species or on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
BR-2 Loss of Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States. The Project would have a potentially-significant impact on wetlands and other waters of the United States.	PS	<p><u>300 Airport Boulevard</u> MITIGATION MEASURE. Mitigation Measures BR-2.1 and BR-2.2, below, to be implemented by the Project Sponsor, would reduce the 300 Airport Boulevard Project's impact on any potential wetlands and other waters of the United States to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><i>BR-2.1 Conduct a Wetland Delineation.</i> The Project Sponsor shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a wetland delineation of the Project Site. This delineation shall be submitted to the Corps for verification prior to the issuance of any grading permits for the Project. If the Corps determines that</p>	LTS

Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
BR-3 Loss of Nesting Migratory Birds. The Project would have a potentially significant impact on nesting migratory birds.	PS	<p>the features in the Project Site are not jurisdictional, then no further mitigation would be required.</p> <p><i>BR-2.2 Obtain Applicable Permits and Certifications.</i> If the Corps determines that these features are jurisdictional, then the Project Sponsor must obtain a CWA Section 404 permit from the Corps, and a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB prior to issuance of any grading permits for the Project. A requirement of the permits will be compensation such that there is no net loss of wetlands. This compensation requirement can be satisfied through avoidance, onsite and/or offsite construction and preservation of wetlands or by purchase of mitigation credits at an approved mitigation bank. At certified mitigation banks, the Corps typically requires a minimum 1:1 ratio, but may require higher ratios for certain wetland types.</p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURES. Mitigation Measures BR-3.1 and BR-3.2, below, to be implemented by the Project Sponsor(s), would reduce the Project's impact on nesting migratory birds to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><i>BR-3.1 Bird Nest Pre-Construction Survey.</i> The Project Sponsor(s) shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction breeding-season surveys (approximately March 15 through August 30) of the Project Site and immediate vicinity during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin, in consultation with the CDFG as discussed below.</p> <p>If phased construction procedures are planned for the Project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted.</p> <p>A report shall be submitted to CDFG, following the completion of the bird nesting survey that includes, at a minimum, the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of methodology including dates of field visits, the names of survey personnel with resumes, and a list of references cited and persons contacted. • A map showing the location(s) of any bird nests observed on the Project Site. <p>If the above survey does not identify any nesting bird species on the Project Site, no further mitigation would be required. However, should any active bird nests be located on the Project Site, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented.</p>	LTS

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
BR-4 Protection of Biological Resources. Construction of the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
BR-5 Habitat Conservation Plans. Construction of the 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.	NI	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
BR-6 Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts. The Project, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would have a cumulatively considerable impact regarding sensitive natural communities, loss of wetlands, loss of nesting migratory birds.	S	MITIGATION MEASURES. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BR-3.1 and BR-3.2, above, would mitigate the Project's contribution to this potentially significant cumulative impact to less than cumulatively considerable. Moreover, the same mitigation measure, or an equivalent measure, would likely be imposed on other development projects, since this measure is recommended as a means to comply with existing State and federal laws. Therefore, the cumulative impact on nesting birds and bats would be reduced to less than significant.	LTS
3.9 Hydrology			
HY-1 Violation of Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements. Construction of the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements resulting in a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
HY-2 Construction-related Water Quality Degradation, Erosion, and Sedimentation. Construction of the Project would not create or contribute runoff that would be an additional source of water quality degradation or result in substantial erosion or sedimentation on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
HY-3 Operational Water Quality Degradation, Erosion, and Sedimentation. Operation of the Project would not create or contribute runoff that would be an additional source of water quality degradation or result in substantial erosion or sedimentation on- or off-site. Impacts would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
HY-4 Drainage Systems. The Project would not create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. There would be less-than-significant impacts to stormwater drainage systems.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
HY-5 Groundwater Supplies. Construction of the Project could involve dewatering, but there would be no long-term demand on groundwater supplies because Project water demand would be met through existing SFPUC entitlements and deliveries. There would be a less-than-significant impact on groundwater.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
HY-6 100-Year Flood Hazard. The Project would not place structures in areas subject to 100-year flood hazard and no impact would occur.	NI	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
HY-7 Sea Level Rise. The Project would be subject to potentially significant flooding risks resulting from sea level rise.	PS	300 Airport Boulevard MITIGATION MEASURES. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HY-7.1 would ensure that potential underground structures are adequately protected to reduce risks from 100-year or tsunami flooding in combination with sea level rise. Mitigation Measure HY-7.2 would ensure that the storm drainage system has adequate conveyance capacity and surface discharges to off-site properties do not occur. Mitigation Measure HY-7.3 would ensure that	LTS

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>embankments, sea walls, levees, and shoreline features are adequately protected from higher tide conditions. Implemented together, these measures would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level for the 300 Airport Boulevard Site.</p> <p><i>HY-7.1 Provide Flood Protection up to the 100-Year Flood Event plus Sea Level Rise for Underground Structures.</i> To protect underground structures from sea level rise flood risks, prior to approving grading and/or building permits the City shall ensure that the project design incorporates its floodplain development requirements into all applicable project features using a flood elevation of at least 7.1 feet. All below-ground structures, including storm drains, sewers, equipment facilities, and others, shall be flood proofed and designed to withstand hydrostatic forces and buoyancy from water surface elevations up to 7.1 feet in elevation. Certain portions of the shoreline open space may not be protected at the ultimate level of flooding, given proposed heights. However, developed areas of the Project would be protected. For the shoreline areas, an adaptive strategy would be developed to address end-of-century conditions.</p> <p><i>HY-7.2 Provide Adequate Storm Flow Conveyance Capacity for Sea Level Rise Conditions.</i> To ensure that the storm drain system conveyance capacity is not constricted by sea level rise at the outlets, the Project Sponsor shall design the storm drain system to adequately convey stormwater runoff at outlet water surface elevations equivalent to the 100-year flood event base elevation plus sea level rise of 55 inches (water surface elevation of 11.6 feet at the outlet). Prior to receiving a grading permit, the City shall review project designs and studies for adequacy of storm flow conveyance with an outlet surface water elevation of 11.6 feet and in accordance with City design standards. The City shall prepare Conditions of Approval, where necessary, to ensure that the design criteria are met. The Project Sponsor shall incorporate applicable City Conditions of Approval into project designs, prior to receiving a grading permit.</p> <p><i>HY-7.3 Provide Protection of Shoreline and Flood Protection Features from Hydrodynamic Forces from Sea Level Rise Conditions.</i> Prior to receiving a grading permit, in order to ensure that the shoreline and flood protection features associated with the proposed project provide protection under sea level rise hydrodynamic and/or hydrostatic conditions, the Project Sponsor shall prepare engineering studies to identify expected hydrodynamic forces</p>	

Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>for under storm surge conditions (at least 2 percent wave run-up) and a base flood elevation of at least 11.6 feet and hydrostatic forces from a water surface elevation of 8.1 feet (mean higher high water plus 55-inch sea level rise). For the shoreline areas, an adaptive strategy would be implemented to address end-of-century conditions.</p> <p>The Project Sponsor shall design shoreline and flood protection features that could accommodate hydrodynamic forces from sea level rise conditions along wherever flood protection features are identified under Mitigation Measure HY-7.1 and at shoreline protection features for stability and integrity under storm surge conditions (at least 2 percent wave run-up) and a base flood elevation of at least 11.6 feet. The Project Sponsor shall also design flood protection features for protection against hydrostatic forces from a water surface elevation of 8.1 feet (mean higher high water plus 55-inch sea level rise). The City shall review designs and associated studies for conformance with City requirements and adequacy of design measures to withstand hydrodynamic and hydrostatic forces associated with the design criteria.</p> <p>The Project Sponsor shall also design erosion protection along the shoreline set-back area for protection under storm surge conditions (at least 2 percent wave run-up) and a base flood elevation of at least 11.6 feet. The City shall review designs and associated studies for adequacy in protecting the shoreline set-back area under these conditions.</p> <p>The City shall prepare Conditions of Approval, where necessary, to ensure that the design criteria are met. Prior to receiving a grading permit, the Project Sponsor shall incorporate applicable City and BCDC Conditions of Approval into project designs.</p> <p><u>350 Airport Boulevard</u></p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURES. It is reasonable to assume that the assumptions for increasing the final elevation and shoreline protection identified for 300 Airport Boulevard would apply to 350 Airport Boulevard. These requirements are identified in Mitigation Measure HY-7.4. In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measures HY-7.1, HY-7.2, and HY-7.3 for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, would reduce the impacts associated with underground structures, storm flow conveyance capacity, and shoreline protection, as described for the 300 Airport Boulevard Site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HY-7.4 could result in a minor increase in the</p>	

LTS

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>magnitude of environmental effects identified elsewhere in this EIR. Secondary effects from implementation of Mitigation Measures HY-7.1, 7.2, and 7.3 would be as described for 300 Airport Boulevard. Implementation of the mitigation measures described below would reduce potentially-significant impacts related to sea level rise to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><i>HY-7.4 Provide Flood Protection up to the 100-Year Flood Event plus Sea Level Rise for Above-Ground Structures.</i> To protect structures and people from sea level rise risks at the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, prior to approving grading permits, the City shall ensure project design incorporates its floodplain development requirements for a flood depth of the identified 100-year flood hazard water surface elevation plus a 4.6-foot (55-inch) rise in sea level. At a minimum, the Project Site shall be graded to over 10 feet above msl and the finished floor elevation of all building finished floors shall be constructed to 14.5 feet (i.e., 2.9 feet above the 11.6-foot potential flood elevation), or as otherwise determined as grading plans are developed.</p>	
<p>HY-8 Tidal and Wave Action Flooding. Prevailing winds combined with high tides or 100-year tides could flood the Project Site. This would result in potentially-significant impacts to the 300 Airport Boulevard Site and the 350 Airport Boulevard Site.</p>	PS	<p>MITIGATION MEASURES. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HY-7.1, HY-7.2, HY-7.3, and HY-7.4 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by ensuring the elevation of the Project Site and shoreline protection are adequate to protect against flooding associated with wave action.</p>	LTS
<p>HY-9 Cumulative Drainage Systems. The Project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development, would not create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, resulting in less-than-significant cumulative impacts.</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
<p>HY-10 Cumulative Flood Hazards. The Project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development, would not place structures in areas subject to 100-year floor hazards, resulting in less-than-significant cumulative impacts.</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
<p>HY-11 Cumulative Sea Level Rise and Tides. The Project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development, would be subject to potentially significant cumulative flooding</p>	PS	<p>MITIGATION MEASURE. Mitigation measures have been identified (Mitigation Measures HY-7.1, HY-7.2, HY-7.3, and HY-7.4) to protect subgrade features that could be affected through groundwater/surface water interactions.</p>	LTS

Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
risks resulting from sea level rise.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
HY-12 Cumulative Tsunami/Seiche Impacts. The Project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development, would not result in direct changes in tsunami and/or seiche risk, resulting in a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
3.10 Population and Housing			
PH-1 Population Growth. The increase in on-site employment due to the Project could have secondary growth effects that could increase employment, population, and housing demand in the City or the region. However, these secondary growth effects would be less than significant.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
PH-2 Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts. Cumulative development in the City would increase employment in the City, but the projected growth from the Project, in combination with surrounding projects, would not result in adverse impacts to the physical environment. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
3.11 Parks and Wind Effects on Recreation			
RW-1 Effects on Windsurfing and Kiteboarding Recreational Resources. The 300 Airport Boulevard Project would have a less-than-significant impact on windsurfing and kiteboarding recreational resources. However, there is currently no project application for development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site; therefore, future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site could not be accurately modeled. As such, wind impacts as a result of the 350 Airport Boulevard Project could be potentially significant due to a reduction in wind speed.	PS	<p><u>350 Airport Boulevard</u></p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURE. Implementation of Mitigation Measure RW-1.1 would require future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site undergo wind tunnel analysis to ensure that site design minimize wind shadow effects at the surrounding windsurfing recreation areas. Implementation of Mitigation Measure RW-1.1 would ensure that future development at 350 Airport Boulevard would not substantially impair windsurfing in prime windsurfing areas and would not substantially hinder access to or from the windsurfing launch sites at Coyote Point Recreation Area. Development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Project would therefore result in a less-than-significant impact on windsurfing recreational resources.</p> <p><i>RW-1.1 Future Wind Tunnel Analysis.</i> To reduce potential impacts associated with future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, a wind tunnel analysis shall be conducted in order to ensure that future development</p>	LTS

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>RW-2 Existing Recreational Facilities. Implementation of the Project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities as a result of increased use, nor would the Project require expansion of existing facilities which could have adverse environmental effects. The Project would have a less-than-significant impact on recreational facilities and the environment.</p>	LTS	<p>of the Site is designed in a way to minimize wind shadow effects at surrounding windsurfing areas.</p> <p>No Mitigation Required.</p>	N/A
<p>RW-3 Cumulative Effects on Windsurfing Recreational Resources and Recreational Facilities. The Project, in combination with other foreseeable development, would not result in significant recreation or wind impacts.</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
3.12 Utilities			
<p>UT-1 Water Supply and Facilities. The Project would not have a significant impact on available water supplies and would not require new or expanded water entitlements, resulting in a less-than-significant impact on water supplies.</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
<p>UT-2 Water Treatment Facilities. The Project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact on water supply facilities.</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
<p>UT-3 Wastewater Treatment Facilities. The Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board or require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities. However, the Project would require the expansion and rehabilitation of existing wastewater infrastructure. Therefore, this impact would potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>MITIGATION MEASURE. In order to reduce significant impacts to the City's wastewater conveyance and treatment system associated with the Project, the Burlingame Point Wastewater Study provides recommendations for mitigation measures. Adherence to either of the two mitigation measures identified below would reduce potential wastewater impacts associated with the Project to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS
		<p><i>UT-3.1 Upgrade Pump Capacity at the Existing 399 Rollins Road Pump Station and Reduce Inflow and Infiltration within the Wastewater System.</i></p>	

Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>The Project Sponsor(s) shall contribute fair-share funds toward the upgrade of the 399 RRPS capacity to accommodate the increased PWWF that would result from implementation of the Project. Additionally, the Project Sponsor(s) shall rehabilitate the existing wastewater system, where necessary, to reduce inflow and infiltration that contributes to PWWFs at the WWTP in an amount concomitant with increases in flows contributed by the 300 Airport Boulevard Project.</p> <p><i>UT-3.2 Upgrade to the Existing Airport Boulevard Conveyance System Variant to Rollins Road Pump Station Upgrade.</i> The Project Sponsor(s) shall coordinate with the City of Burlingame Public Works Department to upgrade the capacity of the City’s wastewater conveyance and treatment system to accommodate the increased PWWF that would result from implementation of development of the 300 and 350 Airport Boulevard Sites. Such measures could include, as necessary, installation of a new pump station within public right of way or other area near the Sanchez Channel Bridge on the Project Site, upgrade the capacity of the existing Airport Boulevard Pump Station, extension of wastewater lines across Sanchez Channel, via attachment to the Sanchez Channel Bridge, to tie into existing wastewater lines under Airport Boulevard west of the Project Site, and increasing, as required, the capacity of existing gravity lines between the Project Site and the Airport Boulevard Pump Station and existing force main between the Airport Boulevard Pump Station and the WWTP. The Project Sponsor shall construct the necessary improvements to serve the Project Site and one additional vacant property along Airport Boulevard that would connect to this sewer line.</p>	
<p>UT-4 Stormwater Drainage Facilities. The Project would not require the construction of new public stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing City facilities; no impact would result.</p>	NI	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
<p>UT-5 Cumulative Water Supply Impacts. The Project, in combination with other foreseeable development, would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements under normal water supply years. Therefore, this cumulative impact is less than significant.</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A

**Table S-3
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>UT-6 Cumulative Water Treatment Facilities. The Project, in combination with other development within the City of Burlingame, would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A
<p>UT-7 Cumulative Wastewater Treatment Facility Impacts. The Project, in combination with other development within the service area, would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, nor result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves the project area that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's expected demand in addition to the provider's existing entitlements. Therefore this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No Mitigation Required.	N/A

EXHIBIT B
300 AIRPORT BOULEVARD PROJECT
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH ARE UNAVOIDABLE

FINDINGS REGARDING FEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS

BACKGROUND

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that should an agency choose to approve a project for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been certified that identifies one or more significant effects of the project, the agency shall make one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. These findings shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record. Possible findings are:

- 1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*
- 2) *Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*
- 3) *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

(Public Resources Code 21081; 14 Cal. Code Regs (CEQA Guidelines) Section 15091).

CEQA requires that if the agency finds that an alternative to the project considered in an EIR is infeasible, the agency is required to explain the specific reasons for rejecting the identified alternative. An alternative is considered feasible if it is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, technological and other considerations, as well as considerations for employment of highly trained workers (Public Resources Code Sections 21061.1, 21081(a)(3); CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3); 15364). Under CEQA case law, the concept of "feasibility" encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project; and (ii) the question of whether an alternative is "desirable" from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

300 AIRPORT BOULEVARD PROJECT

The proposed 300 Airport Boulevard Project (Project) would include the construction on the 300 Airport Boulevard Site of approximately 767,000 square feet of new uses including office space or life science uses, retail uses, food services, and an amenities building with child care, an exercise facility and a food service area, as well as parking to support these uses, rezoning of a small portion of the 300 Airport Boulevard Site from the Anza Point South (APS) to Anza Point North (APN) district, as well as attendant amendments to the Bayfront Specific Plan (Specific Plan) and Burlingame Zoning Code to accommodate the Project.

The proposed amendments to the Specific Plan and Zoning Code would also apply to the remainder of the APN area not subject to the Project development proposal. The remainder, an 8.58-acre parcel north of the 300 Airport Boulevard Site is referred to herein as the 350 Airport Boulevard Site. No specific development proposal has been presented for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, and any such development proposal would undergo further project-specific environmental review, as necessary.

*EXHIBIT B - 300 AIRPORT BOULEVARD PROJECT
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH ARE UNAVOIDABLE
FINDINGS REGARDING FEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS*

The Final EIR (as defined herein) analyzed the potential environmental effects of the Project, as well as the environmental effects of the potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments as applicable to that Site. The Final EIR also considered three alternatives to the Project (and development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments): the No Project Alternative, the Existing Zoning Alternative and the Office/Hotel Alternative.

Listed below are the significant effects identified in the Final EIR for the Project (including potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with applicable proposed planning and zoning amendments), the mitigation measures incorporated in the Final EIR to reduce these effects and the findings for the selected alternatives for consideration. Included by reference are the 300 Airport Boulevard Project Draft EIR, SCH #2010122012, December, 2011 and 300 Airport Boulevard Project Response to Comments Document, May, 2012 (together, the Final EIR).

FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, it is hereby found and determined that, where feasible, changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to reduce the significant environmental impacts as identified in the Final EIR and in Exhibit A – Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures, accompanying these Findings. It is further found, however, that certain mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and as described in these Findings have been required of the Project (and where applicable, potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site), pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, which may lessen, but do not avoid (i.e., reduce to less-than-significant levels), the potentially significant environmental effects associated with implementation of the Project. These are described below in this Exhibit B. Although all of the mitigation measures set forth in Exhibit D – Conditions of Approval accompanying these Findings (which implements all feasible mitigation measures required of the Project in the Final EIR) are adopted, for some of the impacts listed below, the effects remain significant and unavoidable despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures.

It is further found, as described below, based on the analysis contained within the Final EIR, other considerations in the record, and the significance criteria identified in the Final EIR, that because some aspects of the Project (including potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site) could cause potentially significant impacts for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, those impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Thus, the following significant impacts on the environment, as reflected in the Final EIR, are unavoidable. As more fully explained in Exhibit C – Statement of Overriding Considerations accompanying these Findings, under Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and (b), and CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, it is found and determined that legal, environmental, economic, social, technological and other benefits of the Project override any remaining significant adverse impacts of the Project (including potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed planning and zoning amendments applicable to that site) for each of the significant and unavoidable impacts described below. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT – Intersection Operations:

Impacts TR-1 & TR-7: Traffic contributions from the Project (and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments) to the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar Avenue intersection in the City of San Mateo would exacerbate the existing intersection condition, which currently operates at a Level of Service "F". This would be a significant transportation impact.

MITIGATION MEASURE

The City of San Mateo is considering a range of potential improvements at the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar Avenue intersection to provide sufficient capacity for existing and future traffic volume. The Amphlett/Poplar intersection would be operating at LOS "D" or better with implementation of any of the options, both under existing conditions and the 2030 time horizon, which takes into account future development of the Project, and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with planning and zoning amendments applicable to that Site. However, the City of San Mateo has not identified a specific improvement project at this time. Accordingly, the Final EIR includes the following mitigation measure to address impacts to the Amphlett/Poplar intersection:

TR-1 Fair Share Contribution.

The Project Sponsor shall make a fair-share contribution toward the construction costs of the alternative selected by the City of San Mateo to address the Amphlett/Poplar intersection, which will be based on the net additional traffic contributed to the intersection by development of the Project. The effects of potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed planning and zoning amendments as applicable to that Site would be mitigated by requiring sponsor(s) of such development to make a similar contribution.

No further feasible mitigation measures exist to address this impact because the affected intersection is not within the jurisdiction of the City of Burlingame.

FINDING REGARDING SIGNIFICANT EFFECT

As discussed in more detail in the Final EIR, the Project-related and cumulative impacts to the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar Avenue intersection would be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of a traffic solution by the City of San Mateo. However, since no specific improvement project has been identified and because the range of proposed solutions for this intersection is under the control of an agency other than the City of Burlingame (Caltrans and San Mateo), implementation must be considered uncertain, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT – Freeway Segment Operations:

Impacts TR-3 & TR-9: Traffic generated by the Project (and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site) would have a significant impact on the operation of six US 101 freeway segments, and would have a significant cumulative impact on the operation of ten US 101 freeway segments.

MITIGATION MEASURE

Mitigation of significant Project impacts on freeway segments would require freeway widening to construct additional through lanes, thereby increasing freeway capacity. It is not feasible for an individual development project to bear responsibility for implementing extensive transportation system

improvements due to cost constraints and constraints in acquisition of right-of-way. In addition, no comprehensive project to add through lanes by Caltrans or C/CAG exists for individual projects to contribute to, and no other mechanism exists for making a fair share contribution to such improvements. As such, no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce the Project's impacts on the specified freeway segments to less than significant levels.

FINDING REGARDING SIGNIFICANT EFFECT

As discussed in more detail in the Final EIR (pages 3.4-24 and 3.6-17 and Appendix C), construction of bicycle pathways and multi-use trails to encourage travel to and from the Project site by non-motorized modes, and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program incorporated into the Project includes all feasible measures to reduce impacts to US 101 freeway segment operations. Effects of potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed planning and zoning amendments applicable to that Site would be mitigated, though potentially not to below a significant level, by requiring a similar TDM program. Despite implementation of these measures, individual and cumulative impacts from Project traffic contributions to US 101 freeway segments would remain significant and unavoidable.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT – Consistency with Applicable Air Quality Plans:

Impact AQ-1 & AQ-8: The Project (and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site), would increase individual and cumulative Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) at a rate greater than that assumed in Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) 2010 Clean Air Plan (which incorporates and updates BAAQMD's 2005 Ozone Attainment Plan), and therefore would result in a conflict with the 2010 Clean Air Plan.

MITIGATION MEASURE

As discussed previously, all feasible measures to reduce VMT have been incorporated in the TDM program to be implemented as part of the Project.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1.1 would require implementation of TDM measures for any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site similar to those included as a component of development of the 300 Airport Boulevard Site:

AQ-1.1 Implement TDM Program as Part of Any Future Development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site. These measures could include: secure bicycle storage, showers and changing rooms, shuttle service, preferential parking for carpoolers, preferential parking for vanpoolers, commute assistance center, employees' surveys, video conferencing centers, on-site amenities accommodations, on-site bicycles for employees, child care services, guaranteed ride home program, transportation action plan, transportation management association, and coordination of TDM programs.

This measure is included for potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments as they apply to that Site. Inclusion of this measure for any future development at the 350 Airport Boulevard Site could reduce VMT from the Site, however, there is no current development proposal for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, so the extent of that reduction is unknown at this time. Any future development proposal will undergo further project-specific environmental review, as necessary.

FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT EFFECT

With the extensive TDM measures included in the Project (and with similar measures required of any future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site), there are no additional feasible mitigation measures that would further reduce impacts as a result of increased VMT. For the reasons set out in the Final EIR, Project-related impacts resulting from conflict with assumptions of the 2010 Clean Air Plan would be significant and unavoidable.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT – Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursor Emissions Compliance (Construction-Related Emissions):

Impacts AQ-3 & AQ-9: Equipment used for construction activities associated with the Project would result in short-term emission increases of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors (ROGs and NOx), and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site would result in short-term construction-related ROG emissions, that exceed the 2011 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria for these pollutants, resulting in an individual and cumulatively significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-3.1 and AQ-3.2, implementing BAAQMD's Basic and Optional Control Measures for construction emissions would reduce construction-related emissions of ROGs and NOx from the development of the Project (and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site):

AQ-3.1 Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization. To reduce the potential impacts resulting from Project construction activities, the Project Sponsor shall include in contract specifications a requirement for the following measures:

- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes;
- The Project shall develop a construction plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction Project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a Project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average (as specified in California Code of Regulations Article 4.8, Section 2449 General Requirements for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets). Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available;
- All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM;
- Use of Interim Tier 4, if applicable, or equivalent equipment for all uses where such equipment is available;
- Use of Tier 3 equipment with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) or alternative fuel vehicles for applications where Tier 4 Interim engines are not available;
- Prohibition of diesel generators for construction purposes where feasible alternative sources of power are available;

- All construction equipment shall be maintained in proper working condition in accordance with manufacturer's specifications;
- Diesel-powered construction equipment shall comply with BAAQMD requirements or meet Tier 3 or Tier 4 EPA/CARB standards; and
- To the extent feasible, the existing electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction sites shall be used rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines.

AQ-3.2 Application of Low-VOC Coatings. The Project Sponsor shall use low VOC (i.e., ROG) coatings beyond the local requirements as per the BAAQMD Guideline (i.e., Regulation 8, Rule 3: Architectural Coatings)

These measures are included in connection with the Project and the proposed planning and zoning amendments as they apply to the 350 Airport Boulevard Site. Inclusion of these measure for any future development at the 350 Airport Boulevard Site could reduce near-term construction-related emissions of ROG's from the Site; however, there is no current development proposal for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, so the extent of that reduction is unknown at this time. Any future development proposal will undergo further project-specific environmental review, as required.

FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT EFFECT

As discussed in more detail in the Final EIR, even with the implementation of the foregoing mitigation measures, which would reduce near-term construction-related emissions of ROG's and NO_x, emissions of these pollutants associated with the Project would still have the potential to exceed the 2011 BAAQMD significance thresholds for ROG and NO_x emissions, and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments applicable to that Site could also exceed the 2011 BAAQMD significance threshold for ROG emissions. No additional feasible mitigation measures beyond those set forth in Mitigation Measures AQ-3.1 and AQ-3.2, above, are available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, near-term construction-related emissions of ROG's and NO_x from Project development (and ROG emissions from potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accord with the proposed planning and zoning amendments) are considered significant and unavoidable.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT – Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursor Emissions Compliance (Operational Emissions).

Impact AQ-4 and AQ-10: The Project would result in operational emissions of PM₁₀ in excess of the 2011 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria, and together with any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed planning and zoning amendments applicable to that Site, would result in emissions of ROG's and NO_x, as well as PM₁₀, in excess of the significance criteria.

MITIGATION MEASURE

The Project would reduce stationary source emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors by seeking Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification or equivalent for Project buildings and exceeding energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements, as discussed in more detail in the Final EIR at page 3.5-25. Furthermore, the Project includes all feasible mitigation measures for

reduction of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ attributable to mobile sources through the TDM program included in the Project.

For any future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site based on the application of the proposed planning and zoning amendments to that Site, implementation of AQ-4.1 would further reduce stationary source operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors:

AQ-4.1 Implement Energy Efficiency Measures for Any Future Development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site. LEED Gold or equivalent certification and to exceed energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements which would further aid in reducing stationary source emissions.

This measure is included in connection with the proposed planning and zoning amendments as they apply to the 350 Airport Boulevard Site. Inclusion of these measure for any future development at the 350 Airport Boulevard Site could reduce air quality impacts from the Site; however, there is no current development proposal for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, so the extent of that reduction is unknown at this time. Any future development proposal will undergo further project-specific environmental review, as required.

FINDING REGARDING SIGNIFICANT EFFECT

As explained in more detail in the Final EIR at pages 3.5-23 to 3.5-25, operational emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀, primarily attributable to mobile sources, would not be reduced to below the 2011 BAAQMD CEQA thresholds for these pollutants even with the extensive TDM measures already included in Project (and required of any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site). Stationary source emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ would be reduced through LEED Gold or equivalent certification of Project buildings, but not sufficiently to reduce emissions to below the 2011 BAAQMD thresholds when combined with mobile source emissions. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures that would further reduce impacts as a result of increased VMT (mobile sources) or stationary sources associated with the Project (or potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments applied to that Site). Therefore, the impact of operational PM₁₀ emissions from the Project (and cumulative operational ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions from the Project and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments applied to that Site) would be significant and unavoidable.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT – Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

Impact CC-1: The Project, and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site, would result in generation of GHG emissions that exceed 2011 BAAQMD CEQA thresholds for land development projects.

MITIGATION MEASURES

300 Airport Boulevard

As discussed in more detail in the Final EIR at pages 3.6-19 to 3.6-20, implementation of Mitigation Measures CC-1.1 through CC-1.8, below, would reduce GHG emissions associated with operation of the Project by approximately 18%, but would not reduce GHG emissions to below BAAQMD CEQA thresholds for such emissions:

CC-1.1 Incorporate GHG Reduction Measures for Maintenance Activities. Provide infrastructure for the use of electric landscape equipment during Project landscaping activities, where feasible.

CC-1.2 Incorporate Trees and Vegetation into Project Design. Trees and other shade structures shall be incorporated into the Project site Plan to maximize summer shade and to minimize winter shade.

CC-1.3 Renewable Energy System. Offset 10 percent of Project electricity demand through implementation of onsite renewable energy systems or through investment in offsite alternative energy systems.

CC-1.4 Drought Tolerant Landscaping. Reduce irrigation-related water demand of the Project by a minimum of 10 percent through the implementation of drought tolerant landscaping.

CC-1.5 Cool Roof Material. Incorporate cool-roof materials into Project design to reduce electricity demand associated with building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) by a minimum of 7 percent.

CC-1.6 Water Conservation Measures. Implement immediate water conservation measures to reduce Project building water demand by 33 percent. Building water demand shall ultimately be reduced by 50 percent when the City's recycled water system is implemented.

CC-1.7 Energy Efficiency beyond Title 24 Standards. Reduce Project building energy demand beyond the 2005 Title 24 Standards by 26 percent.

CC-1.8 Operation Solid Waste Reduction. Implement a solid waste reduction program to reduce operational solid waste from the Project by a minimum of 10 percent.

350 Airport Boulevard

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CC-1.9 through CC-1.11 would also reduce GHG emissions from operational activities associated with any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments applied to that Site:

CC-1.9 Incorporate Mitigation Measures CC-1.1 through CC-1.8 as described Above. Any future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site shall comply with Mitigation Measures CC-1.1 through CC-1.8 as described for the Project, above.

CC-1.10 Implement a TDM program. Any future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site shall implement a TDM program similar to that included in the Project, to reduce transportation-related GHG emissions.

CC-1.11 Pursue LEED Certification. Any future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site shall seek LEED Gold certification or equivalent for development per the recommendations of the City's Green Building Ordinance, and shall submit draft LEED (or equivalent) checklists to the City Sustainability Coordinator for review and consultation.

*EXHIBIT B - 300 AIRPORT BOULEVARD PROJECT
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH ARE UNAVOIDABLE
FINDINGS REGARDING FEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS*

These measures are included in connection with the proposed planning and zoning amendments as they apply to the 350 Airport Boulevard Site. Inclusion of these measure for any future development at the 350 Airport Boulevard Site could reduce GHG emissions from that development of Site by up to 18%; however, there is no current development proposal for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, so the extent of that reduction is unknown at this time. Any future development proposal will undergo further project-specific environmental review, as required.

FINDING REGARDING SIGNIFICANT EFFECT

The implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce GHG emissions from the operation of the Project and from operation of any future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, but would not reduce GHG emissions below the BAAQMD significance thresholds either individually or cumulatively. No further feasible mitigation measures are available for reduction of operational GHG emissions from the Project (or potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site. Therefore, the impact of operational GHG emissions from the Project and operational GHG emissions from potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments applied to that Site, individually and cumulatively, would be significant and unavoidable.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT – Conflict with Applicable Plans, Policies, or Regulations Regarding Reduction of GHG Emissions:

Impact CC-2: The Project, and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site, would conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions since it is not consistent with the BAAQMD's implementation of the State's GHG reduction goals pursuant to AB 32. This conflict with GHG reduction plans, policies, and regulations would be a significant impact.

FINDING REGARDING SIGNIFICANT EFFECT

Even with implementation of applicable mitigation measures CC-1 through CC-11 above, the Project, and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments as applied to that Site, would not comply with BAAQMD's implementation of AB 32. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to bring the Project, or potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, into compliance with BAAQMD's implementation of state plans for reduction of GHG emissions. Therefore, this conflict with regional GHG reduction plans, policies, and regulations would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

FINDINGS REGARDING FEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS

BACKGROUND

This Section describes the reasons for approving the proposed Project and the reasons for rejecting the alternatives identified in the Final EIR. CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project or the project location that substantially reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts of the proposed project. CEQA requires that every EIR also evaluate a "No Project" alternative. Alternatives provide the decision maker with a basis of comparison to the proposed project in terms of their significant impacts and their ability to meet project objectives. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable, potentially feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the proposed project.

The Alternatives set forth in the Final EIR and listed below are hereby rejected based upon substantial evidence in the record, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Exhibit B, in addition to those described in Exhibit C – Statement of Overriding Considerations accompanying these Findings, that make these alternatives infeasible. These determinations are made with the awareness that CEQA defines "feasibility" to mean capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, technological and other considerations. Pub. Resources Code 21081(a)(3); CEQA Guidelines § 15364. Under CEQA case law, the concept of "feasibility" encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project; and (ii) the question of whether an alternative is "desirable" from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES

Tables 5-9 and 5-10 in the Final EIR show that, except for the No Project Alternative which would not change the environment from the present, all of the alternatives considered would have significant and unavoidable impacts on intersection operations (Amphlett/Poplar), Freeway Segments, Cumulative Transportation Impacts, and impacts from operational GHG emissions similar to the Project (and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan and Zoning amendments as applied to that Site). For the Project, the Existing Zoning Alternative would have a less than significant impact on Compliance with the 2010 Clean Air Plan and operational air quality emissions; for potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, the Existing Zoning Alternative would have a less than significant impact on Compliance with the 2010 Clean Air Plan. For the proposed Project, and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, the Office/Hotel Alternative would have comparable significant and unavoidable impacts.

No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it is not satisfactory at achieving the basic project objectives. The No Project Alternative would not meet the primary objective of providing a corporate campus of multiple office buildings and an amenities center at the 300 Airport Boulevard Site. The No Project Alternative would not include construction of buildings; therefore, office/life science and amenity uses would not be able to function at the Site. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not allow for the realignment of Airport Boulevard through the Site, which is intended to provide traffic-

EXHIBIT B - 300 AIRPORT BOULEVARD PROJECT

FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH ARE UNAVOIDABLE

FINDINGS REGARDING FEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS

calming and safety in the area. Further, Bay waterfront access would not be improved, construction of an improved Bay Trail segment along the shoreline would not be accomplished, and public access to the eastern shoreline of Sanchez Channel would continue to be limited. As such, the No Project Alternative does not meet the specified project objectives.

In addition, the No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because the present state of the land, a vacant site with paving from a former drive-in theater and car parking operation, is underutilized and fails to capture potential economic and social value from its designation as a development parcel under the City's adopted land use plans for the Bayfront area, and limits public use of the adjacent San Francisco Bay shoreline at Sanchez Channel contrary to goals of the City's adopted land use plans.

Existing Zoning Alternative

Under the Existing Zoning Alternative, the 300 Airport Boulevard Site would be developed in accordance with the existing Bayfront Specific Plan Design Guidelines and Anza Point North (APN) Zoning Code regulations (and Anza Point South (APS) designations for the 0.4-acre Rezone Parcel at the southern edge of the Project site). The office/life science buildings on the 300 Airport Boulevard Site would be constructed at 0.6 FAR and the amenities center could be constructed at 0.5 FAR, which would result in approximately 474,000 square feet of development. In addition, the buildings at the 300 Airport Boulevard Site would not exceed 30 feet in height along the Bay and 50 feet along Sanchez Channel. Up to 1,529 workers could be employed under the Existing Zoning Alternative. Airport Boulevard would not be realigned through the 300 Airport Boulevard Project site and as a result, shoreline and Bay Trail improvements would be less extensive. Lastly, since no amendments would be made to the Specific Plan or Zoning Code, one less significant and unavoidable impact – conflict with the 2010 Clean Air Plan – would occur from any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with applicable planning and zoning requirements.

The Existing Zoning Alternative would meet or partially meet four of the project objectives. The Existing Zoning Alternative would still develop the 300 Airport Boulevard Site, but not to the extent identified in the project objectives. It would develop a waterfront corporate campus of multiple office buildings, potentially including an amenities center as called for in the project objectives. Since the alternative would be in the same location at 300 Airport Boulevard, the campus would still be located in a prominent location proximate to major transportation corridors. The Existing Zoning Alternative would be LEED or equivalent certified and designed in a sustainable manner.

The Existing Zoning Alternative would result in fewer significant and unavoidable impacts compared with the proposed Project, and from potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard in accordance with planning and zoning amendments as applicable to that Site, and as such is identified as the environmentally superior alternative in addition to the No Project Alternative, as required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). In comparison to the Project, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not conflict with the 2010 Clean Air Plan because it would result in a proportional percentage increase in both population and vehicle miles traveled, consistent with the assumptions of the Clean Air Plan. Also, the Existing Zoning Alternative would meet 2011 BAAQMD thresholds of significance for ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions on a Project basis, resulting in a less than significant impact related to operational emissions of those pollutants. As discussed in more detail in the Final EIR at pages 3.5-23 to 3.5-26, these emissions are predominately attributable to mobile sources, so the lesser total development under the Existing Zoning Alternative would result in fewer total vehicle trips and thus fewer total emissions. However, the Existing Zoning Alternative would result in cumulatively significant impacts from operational NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions greater than the 2011 BAAQMD CEQA Thresholds.

*EXHIBIT B - 300 AIRPORT BOULEVARD PROJECT
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH ARE UNAVOIDABLE
FINDINGS REGARDING FEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS*

Lastly, potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site under the Existing Zoning Alternative would not conflict with the 2010 Clean Air Plan.

The Existing Zoning Alternative is rejected, however, because, although it would have fewer significant and unavoidable impacts and meet or partially meet four of the project objectives, it would completely or partially fail to meet the majority of the project objectives and would not result in a project that meets commercial office market demand in the vicinity of the Project, and is thus considered infeasible.

The Existing Zoning Alternative would not achieve the primary project objective for the Project to "develop an approximately 800,000-sf waterfront corporate campus." The Existing Zoning Alternative would include only 474,000 sf of development (compared to 767,000 sf under the Project), which is significantly less than the stated objective. As such, this alternative would not include the desired development intensity.

Furthermore, to provide approximately 474,000 sf of development at the 300 Airport Boulevard Site within the existing zoning setback and height limits, the buildings under the Existing Zoning Alternative would be less dense, spread out more extensively over the Site. A less dense building pattern would occupy what could otherwise be intracampus open space and connections, and necessitate placement of buildings closer to the Sanchez Channel shoreline, reducing the amount of public shoreline open space available. This would conflict with the project objective of developing the campus "with sufficient building height and density to provide usable public open space among the buildings that connects to the improved waterfront edges of the site."

Also, as discussed above, the Existing Zoning Alternative design calls for smaller buildings spread throughout the Project site that conform to the existing height limitations of 30 feet along the Bayshore and 50 feet along Sanchez Channel. The smaller floor plate buildings, of two to three stories and between 20,000 and 85,000 total square feet, would not meet the project objective of "individual buildings of sufficient density and floor-plate size to allow flexibility in user make-up, particularly focused on life science and information technology users." In the vicinity of the Project Area, market demand for commercial office uses from these users is greatest for buildings with larger floor plates (approximately 30,000 sf) and sufficient total building area that allows for larger (greater than 100,000 square feet) blocks of leasable (or saleable) space. The Existing Zoning Alternative would not meet this project objective, and would also be insufficient to address current market demand, putting the Alternative at an economic disadvantage in obtaining tenants and meeting City revenue projections for the development of the Project site.

The Existing Zoning Alternative also would fail to meet the project objective of realigning Airport Boulevard through the Project site. Since the Existing Zoning Alternative proposes a less dense building pattern, it would not provide sufficient land to permit 474,000 sf of development and realignment of Airport Boulevard in a manner that would provide the traffic calming benefits of realignment through the Project site. This would be inconsistent with the project objective of "realignment of Airport Boulevard through the site in a manner that provides traffic-calming effects to maintain a pedestrian-friendly atmosphere within the campus and additional access to the Bay shoreline."

Lastly, maintaining the existing Airport Boulevard alignment would prevent rehabilitation and expansion of the Bay Trail in place of the existing roadway alignment, and would permit far less restored and improved shoreline open space along the Bay. This would be inconsistent with the project objective of

"improving and enhancing public access to and within the site, including the waterfront, by extending the Bay Trail through the site and by expanding and improving the waterfront edges of the site."

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, it is found that the Existing Zoning Alternative is infeasible based on economic and social considerations, failure to promote the underlying goals and objectives of the Project and provision of less desirable policy outcomes for the Anza Point North area, which, on balance, outweigh the reduced environmental impacts of the Alternative.

Office/Hotel Alternative

The Office/Hotel Alternative would include offices in Buildings B3 and B4, an amenities center, and a parking structure, as proposed under the 300 Airport Boulevard Project. However, Buildings B1 and B2 would be replaced by a 226,338-sf hotel. The Zoning Code would be amended as per the 300 Airport Boulevard Project; however, the existing requirements and limitations for hotel uses would still be applicable. Up to 1,786 workers would be employed under the Office/Hotel Alternative.

The Office/Hotel Alternative would not result in fewer significant and unavoidable impacts compared to the proposed Project.

The Office/Hotel Alternative would meet or partially meet the majority of the project objectives. The 300 Airport Boulevard Site would be developed with a 447,000-sf office campus with a 37,000-sf amenities center in the West Campus and a 226,338-sf hotel in the East Campus, for a total of 710,338 sf. Although the hotel complex would make the proposed square footage of the alternative almost equal to the proposed Project, the corporate campus would be significantly less than proposed under the 300 Airport Boulevard Project. The Office/Hotel Alternative would build out the site to almost the full development potential allowed under the revised zoning, but with a much reduced office campus.

The Office/Hotel Alternative would also permit development of a waterfront corporate campus of multiple office buildings with an amenities center. Since the alternative would be in the same location at 300 Airport Boulevard, the campus would still be located in a prominent location proximate to major transportation corridors. The Office/Hotel Alternative would be LEED certified or equivalent and would design the office and hotel uses to function in a sustainable manner. In addition, Airport Boulevard would be realigned to bisect the site and adequate parking would be provided to meet the demand. Further, this alternative would allow public access to the shoreline along the Bay and Sanchez Channel and would extend and rehabilitate the existing Bay Trail. Since the Office/Hotel Alternative would include amendments to the Specific Plan and Zoning Code, the buildings would be able to be constructed at a greater height than currently permitted. As such, the taller building heights would allow for more open space between the buildings.

The Office/Hotel Alternative is rejected because it would not result in fewer significant and unavoidable environmental impacts and hotel development is inconsistent with the primary project objective of a corporate office campus of approximately 800,000 square feet.

Furthermore, current market demand for hotel space in the vicinity of the Project site is insufficient to justify the construction of a hotel as called for in the Office/Hotel alternative. Thus, the hotel component of the Alternative is economically infeasible under current market conditions.

EXHIBIT C

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that in the event an agency chooses to approve a project that includes significant and unavoidable impacts which can not be reduced to acceptable levels the agency must adopt a written Statement of Overriding Considerations which identifies why the local agency is willing to accept the significant unavoidable effect(s). 14 Cal. Code Regs (CEQA Guidelines) Section 15043. The purpose of the statement of overriding considerations is defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 (a and b):

- (a) *CEQA requires the decision-maker to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."*
- (b) *When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.*

The statement of overriding considerations should be read in conjunction with the findings under Section 15091 (attached herewith as Exhibit B) and should be used in decision making to balance the benefits of the project against the unavoidable environmental risks. CEQA also requires that the statement of overriding considerations be included in the record of project approval and mentioned in the Notice of Determination.

Significant and Unavoidable Effects

The proposed 300 Airport Boulevard Project (Project) would include an office/life sciences campus development, rezoning of a small portion of the 300 Airport Boulevard Site from the Anza Point South (APS) to Anza Point North (APN) district, as well as attendant amendments to the Bayfront Specific Plan (Specific Plan) and Burlingame Municipal Code to accommodate the Project.

The proposed amendments to the Specific Plan and Municipal Code would also apply to the remainder of the APN subarea not subject to the Project development proposal. The remainder is a 8.58-acre parcel north of the 300 Airport Boulevard Site referred to herein as the 350 Airport Boulevard Site. No specific development proposal has been presented for the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, and any such development proposal would undergo further project-specific environmental review, as necessary.

The Project, and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed planning and zoning amendments as applied to that Site, would result in environmental impacts in the following seven categories which are significant and unavoidable and cannot be reduced to levels acceptable to the community:

Statement of Overriding Considerations 300 Airport Boulevard Project

Impacts TR-1 & TR-7: Traffic contributions from the Project, and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site, to the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar Avenue intersection in the City of San Mateo would exacerbate the existing intersection condition, which currently operates at a Level of Service "F".

Impacts TR-3 & TR-9: Traffic generated by the Project, and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site, would have a significant impact on the operation of six US 101 freeway segments, and would have a significant cumulative impact on the operation of ten US 101 freeway segments.

Impacts AQ-1 & AQ-8: The Project, and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site, would increase individual and cumulative Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) at a rate greater than that assumed in Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) 2010 Clean Air Plan (which incorporates and updates BAAQMD's 2005 Ozone Attainment Plan), and therefore would result in a conflict with the 2010 Clean Air Plan.

Impacts AQ-3 & AQ-9: Equipment used for construction activities associated with the Project would result in short-term emission increases of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors (ROGs and NO_x), and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site would result in short-term construction-related ROG emissions, that exceed the 2011 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria for these pollutants, resulting in an individual and cumulatively significant impact.

Impacts AQ-4 and AQ-10: The Project, and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site, would result in operational emissions of PM₁₀, ROGs and NO_x, in excess of the 2011 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.

Impact CC-1: The Project, and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site, would result in generation of GHG emissions that exceed 2011 BAAQMD CEQA thresholds for land development projects.

Impact CC-2: The Project, and potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan and Zoning Code amendments as applied to that Site, would conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions since it is not consistent with the BAAQMD's implementation of the State's GHG reduction goals pursuant to AB 32. This conflict with GHG reduction plans, policies, and regulations would be a significant impact.

Statement of Overriding Considerations

While the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), composed of the 300 Airport Boulevard Project Draft EIR, SCH #2010122012, December, 2011 and 300 Airport Boulevard Project Response to Comments Document, May, 2012, notes that development of the Project, and any potential future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site in accordance with proposed

Statement of Overriding Considerations 300 Airport Boulevard Project

planning and zoning amendments as applied to that Site, may result in the generation of significant traffic, air quality and climate change impacts, the City Council hereby finds that, for the reasons set forth below, the economic, social and other considerations prompted by the Project outweigh the unavoidable traffic, air quality and climate change impacts identified in the findings.

First, the Project is consistent with the adopted goals and policies of the Burlingame General Plan by providing office development consistent with the Plan. The General Plan recognizes that, given the generally developed nature of the City west of US 101, development of the Specific Plan area east of US 101 generates additional revenue for services to the west side of US 101, while providing San Francisco Bay access amenities for city residents and visitors. Revenue generated by commercial development in the Specific Plan area is a significant contributor to the City's capacity to provide the quality of life that residents enjoy, such as recreational facilities, libraries and community parks and open space. The thoughtful integration of new office and hotel uses throughout the Specific Plan area continues to give the City additional revenue and foundation to provide expanded community services and facilities in the Bayfront area and throughout the City, which benefit the entire community.

Second, the Project would generate net positive revenue to the City in accordance with Specific Plan policies that any development in the Specific Plan area should yield a high revenue to cost ratio. The applicant has provided a Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Project, prepared by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. dated April 23, 2012, which discusses the economic benefits to Burlingame. Overall, the Project will result in approximately \$500,000 annually in general fund revenues above the costs of providing services to the Project.

According to the Fiscal Impact Analysis, the fiscal impact of the Project on the City's General Fund at Project buildout will be positive, with the revenues generated by the Project estimated to be greater than the costs of providing additional public services. By buildout, the Project is expected to generate annual revenues of approximately \$1.1 million. General Fund costs will be \$582,000 annually, resulting in a net positive annual impact on the General Fund of approximately \$500,000. This surplus is driven primarily by the property tax generated by the Project. The Project will be able to cover its service costs and provide surplus revenues to increase levels of service in other parts of the City, consistent with the goals and policies of the Specific Plan.

Third, development of the Project in the Specific Plan area will benefit the City through increased hotel occupancy and collection of increased transient occupancy taxes. The Specific Plan encourages such beneficial integration of commercial land uses to maximize future revenue opportunities. See, e.g., Specific Plan Policy D-3. The Fiscal Impact Analysis demonstrates that the Project would provide such beneficial integration by adding office/life science uses which support existing hotels located in the Specific Plan area. Also, hoteliers in the area have expressed to the City a need for a strong office community nearby to support and complement the area hotels, and have requested that the City encourage office use to provide a more diverse customer base and better economic stability. Thus, increased hotel occupancy generated by the Project will benefit the City.

Fourth, the Project proposes to construct two major transportation improvement projects outlined in the Specific Plan as being necessary to provide a safe, efficient transportation system within the Specific Plan area and connecting to US 101 and other parts of the community.

**Statement of Overriding Considerations
300 Airport Boulevard Project**

- A. The Project will realign Airport Boulevard through the Project site to alleviate capacity constraints and safety issues presented by the existing, substandard roadway alignment as identified in the Specific Plan. See Specific Plan, pp. III-10, IV-7. Airport Boulevard would be realigned through the Project site in a manner that provides for more efficient flow of traffic through the site, eliminating the problematic curve at the northeast edge of the Project. In addition, the Project would widen Airport Boulevard to four lanes through the site, except where it moves offsite to the southeast of the Project site because Airport Boulevard narrows to two lanes as it moves offsite to the southeast. However, the Project provides additional dedicated right of way in the southeastern portion of the Project site to accommodate any potential future widening of Airport Boulevard offsite to the southeast. The realigned and widened roadway will also provide signed bicycle routes to facilitate increased and safer bicycle travel through the Specific Plan area.
- B. The Project will widen the existing Airport Boulevard Bridge over Sanchez Channel to provide full pedestrian access across the channel and to the Bay Trail. Currently, Trail users are required to cross the existing pedestrian bridge at the western edge of Sanchez Channel, which alights onto Beach Road. Beach Road is traveled by vehicles serving warehouse/industrial uses along the one-block road, has no marked bicycle lanes and has narrow sidewalks that are substandard compared to Bay Trail improvements in the remainder of the Specific Plan area. Lastly, users must cross Airport Boulevard at an unsignalized intersection to continue on the Bay Trail that leaves the Plan area towards Coyote Point Recreation Area. The Project proposes to remedy this condition by widening the existing Airport Boulevard bridge to provide a pedestrian crossing. This improvement will provide a more convenient crossing of Sanchez Channel for users of the Bay Trail and Plan-area trail network. Consistent with the Specific Plan, and in particular Policies E-7 and E-9, the new bridge would an important link in the pedestrian trail system throughout the Specific Plan area and to the Bay Trail as it moves through and away from the Project site.

Fifth, the Project would realign Airport Boulevard through the interior of the site. This realignment permits an improved Bay Trail within the existing Bayfront road right of way, and permits the Project to greatly expand and improve public shoreline access at the eastern end of the Specific Plan area beyond what would otherwise be provided. This is consistent with Specific Plan Policies E-4 and E-6, which respectively call for relocation of arterial roadways away from the Bay edge, and construction of Bay Trail improvements in a manner that allow for multiple modes of recreational travel.

Sixth, proposed Project density would provide additional and enhanced public access to the Bay. Continuous public access to the shoreline of San Francisco Bay (and the use of recreation facilities) is an important local community and social value. See, e.g., Specific Plan Goal B, Policies B-2, B-3, Goal C, Policies D-1 and F-7. The Project's building density permits concentration of development of the Project site, thus opening of the entire eastern Sanchez Channel shoreline to public access and recreational use, and providing sufficient area to relocate Airport Boulevard through the Project site (the open space benefits of which are discussed in the previous paragraph). The Project will build, maintain permanently, and provide for use of public access pathways and landscaped open space along the edge of Sanchez Channel and along the San Francisco Bay at the eastern edge of the Specific Plan area, as well as an improved segment of the Bay Trail through the Project site. Free public parking for

Statement of Overriding Considerations 300 Airport Boulevard Project

shoreline access will also be provided on site clearly signed and close to the Bay shorelines. These proposed improvements are extensive, are consistent with the quality of the newer portions of the Bay Trail through the Plan area. They meet the bay access standards of the Bay Conservation and Commission (BCDC) and further the vision of the Specific Plan for integration of hotel, commercial, and park and recreation uses along the Bayfront.

Additionally, proposed Project density permits greater public and community opportunity for recreational use in the interior of the Project site. In portions of the Project site not used for buildings, the Project provides a significant public open space network, including a pedestrian promenade which will connect the improvements along Sanchez Channel to the Bay Trail amenities along the eastern edge of the Project site. Retail and restaurant uses are proposed along this promenade, which will have outdoor seating areas and plazas, benefiting users and drawing visitors to the Project site.

Seventh, by taking into consideration the wind effects of the Project on recreation through designing and orienting Project buildings in a manner that minimizes reduction in winds important to Bay recreation, the Project complies with Specific Plan Goal B and Policy B-1, to respect the unique environmental characteristics of the Specific Plan area, including wind characteristics.

Eighth, the Project will provide needed upgrading of public wastewater infrastructure serving development in the Bayfront area. The Project will also contribute funds to assist the City in reaching its funding obligation for the planned Broadway/US 101 Interchange Reconstruction Project that, once constructed, will provide regional transportation benefits.

Findings

It is hereby found, after consideration of the FEIR and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project as set out above independently and collectively outweighs the significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. The reasons for approval cited above are not unitary, so that even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, this determination is that the remaining reasons would be sufficient to justify approval of the Project. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the FEIR and the preceding Exhibit B – CEQA Findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Exhibit C, and in the documents found in the administrative record.

On the basis of the Findings made in Exhibits A and B included herewith, and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, it is specifically found that there are significant benefits of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts. It is further found that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are found to be acceptable due to the above-discussed specific overriding economic, technical, legal, social and other considerations.

EXHIBIT "D"
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

300 Airport Boulevard and, where applicable, future development of 350 Airport Boulevard

Conditions of approval for Amendments to the Bayfront Specific Plan, amendments to the zoning code related to the Anza Point North and parking regulations, amendment to the sign code, rezoning of a portion of the site from the APS zone district to the APN zone district, tentative parcel map, development agreement, commercial design review, and conditional use permit for day care use.

CONDITIONS:

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division and date stamped May 8, 2012, Sheets: Cover Sheet; 1 Project Notes, Vicinity Maps and Sheet Index; 2 Building Code Analysis; 3 Preliminary Landscape Plan, 4 Building Perspectives – Building B1 – South face, 5 Building Perspectives – Building B1 – North Face, 6 Building Perspectives – Building B2 – North Face, 7 Building Perspectives – Building B3 – South Face, 8 Building Perspective – Building B3 – North Face; 9A North Campus Gateway; 9B Airport Boulevard and East/West Promenade Intersection; 9C Retail Promenade; 9D Retail along East-West Promenade; 9E Street Retail along Airport Boulevard; 9F Overlook to Bay; 9G Building 1 Restaurant with view to the Bay; 9H Amenities Center with Sidewalk Café; 9J Streetscape of the Campus; 9K looking out from the Office; 9L Amenities at New Bay Trail; 10 Site and Vicinity Plan; 11a Podium Parking/Site Layout Plan; 11b Podium Parking/Site Layout Plan (Retail Alternate); 12 Podium Parking/Site Dimension Plan; 13 Basement Parking Plan; 14 Site and Building Sections (1); 15 Site and Building Sections (2); 16 Building B1/B2 Typical Floor and Roof Plans; 17 B3/B4 Typical Floor and Roof Plans; 18 Building B1 Elevations; 19 Building B2 Elevations; 20 Building B3 Elevations (1); 21 Building B3 Elevations (2); 22 Building B4 Elevations (1); 23 Building B4 Elevations (2); 24a Parking Structure – Floor Plans; 24b Parking Structure – Elevations; 25 Amenities Center – Floor Plans; 26 Amenities Center – Elevations; 27 Site Analysis and Neighborhood Photos; 28a Site Area Diagram; 28b Landscaped Parking Area Diagram; 28c Landscaped Front Setback Diagram; 29 Site Circulation Diagram; 30 Site and Building Exit Path Plan; 31 Building Materials/Finishes Examples; 32 Landscape Section and Images; 33 Landscape Design Details (1); 34 Landscape Design Details (2); 35 Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan; 36 Preliminary Utility Plan; 37 Preliminary Parcelization Plan; and 38 Site Survey;
2. that any changes to the size or envelope of building, which would include changing or adding exterior walls or parapet walls, shall require an amendment to this permit;
3. that any changes to building materials, exterior finishes, windows, architectural features, roof height or pitch, and amount or type of hardscape materials shall be subject to Planning Division or Planning Commission review (FYI or amendment to be determined by Planning staff);
4. that the project shall include installation and maintenance of the Bay Trail and Sanchez Channel improvements as shown in the submitted plans and shall obtain approval from the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) for the work within BCDC jurisdiction;

5. that the project shall include approximately 13,000 square feet of retail use and 13,400 square feet of food service use that may be located in buildings B1, B2 and the amenities building, and Developer shall use its best commercial efforts to lease this space for retail or food service, including recreation-related uses such as bike rentals, and interactive educational space, as the case may be, for two years following issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for each building. Thereafter, any change to the use of the space designated for retail, recreation-related or food service use shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission using the process set out in Municipal Code Sections 25.16.040 through 25.16.085, using the conditional use permit findings as the standard of review;
6. that the following items agreed to by the applicant shall be included as a part of the project:
 - a. Drinking fountains shall be provided as a part of the Bay Trail improvements, and shall include ground-level spouts for dogs.
 - b. The educational nodes provided within the Bay Trail improvements shall include interactive features such as binocular/telescope stands and pictographic educational elements regarding local flora, fauna, marine and wind phenomena.
 - c. The Sanchez Channel open space shall include an area for active use (e.g. frisbee or catch);
7. that the conditions of the Chief Building Official's February 7, 2012 memo shall be met, which includes the following comments:
 - a. an application for a building permit for this project received after December 31, 2013 must comply with the 2013 California Building Codes and adopted City of Burlingame Ordinances unless specific land use provisions for the project were approved by the City of Burlingame prior to 5:00 p.m. on December 31, 2013. If the Planning Commission has approved the project then the building permit application for that project may use the provisions found in the 2010 California Building Codes including all amendments as adopted in Ordinance 1856 2010. This project must comply with the City of Burlingame Green Building Ordinance in effect at the time of building permit applications.
 - 1) On the plans specify that this project will comply with the 2010 California Building Codes (CBC) which will be employed by the City of Burlingame beginning January 1, 2011.
 - 2) Comply with the City of Burlingame Green Building Ordinance in effect at the time of Planning Commission approval for this project.
 - 3) Anyone who is doing business in the City must have a current City of Burlingame business license.
 - 4) Provide fully dimensioned plans.
 - 5) Indicate on the plans that all work shall be conducted within the limits of the City's Noise Ordinance. See City of Burlingame Ordinance Municipal Code, Section 13.04.100 for details.
 - 6) Specify on the plans that this project will comply with the 2008 California Energy Efficiency Standards or standards in effect at the time of building

permit application. Note: All projects for which a building permit application is received on or after January 1, 2010 must comply with the 2008 California Energy Efficiency Standards. Go to <http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2008standards/> for publications and details.

- 7) Indicate on the plans that all roofing systems will comply with Cool Roof requirements of the 2008 California Energy Code. 2008 CEC §151 (f) 12. The 2008 Residential and Non-Residential Compliance Manuals are available on line at <http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2008standards/>.
- 8) Show the distances from all exterior walls to property lines or to assumed property lines.
- 9) Show the dimensions to adjacent structures.
- 10) Obtain a survey of the property lines.
- 11) Indicate on the plans that, at the time of Building Permit application, plans and engineering will be submitted for shoring as required by 2010 CBC, or applicable Building Code, regarding the protection of adjacent property and as required by OSHA. On the plans, indicate that the following will be addressed:
 - a. The walls of the proposed basement shall be properly shored, prior to construction activity. This excavation may need temporary shoring. A competent contractor shall be consulted for recommendations and design of shoring scheme for the excavation. The recommended design type of shoring shall be approved by the engineer of record or soils engineer prior to usage.
 - b. All appropriate guidelines of OSHA shall be incorporated into the shoring design by the contractor. Where space permits, temporary construction slopes may be utilized in lieu of shoring. Maximum allowable vertical cut for the subject project will be five (5) feet. Beyond that horizontal benches of 5 feet wide will be required. Temporary shores shall not exceed 1 to 1 (horizontal to vertical). In some areas due to high moisture content / water table, flatter slopes will be required which will be recommended by the soils engineer in the field.
 - c. If shoring is required, specify on the plans whose sole responsibility it is to design and provide adequate shoring, bracing, formwork, etc. as required for the protection of life and property during construction of the building.
 - d. Shoring and bracing shall remain in place until floors, roof, and wall sheathing have been entirely constructed.
 - e. Shoring plans shall be wet-stamped and signed by the engineer-of-record and submitted to the city for review prior to construction. If applicable, include surcharge loads from adjacent structures that are within the zone of influence (45 degree wedge up the slope from the base of the retaining wall) and / or driveway surcharge loads.

- 12) Indicate on the plans that an OSHA permit will be obtained for the shoring* at the excavation in the basement per CAL / OSHA requirements. See the Cal / OSHA handbook at: http://www.ca-osha.com/pdfpubs/osha_userguide.pdf. *Construction Safety Orders : Chapter 4, Subchapter 4, Article 6 , Section 1541.1.
- 13) Indicate on the plans that a Grading Permit, if required, will be obtained from the Department of Public Works.
- 14) Provide guardrails at all landings. NOTE: All landings more than 30" in height at any point are considered in calculating the allowable lot coverage. Consult the Planning Department for details if your project entails landings more than 30" in height.
- 15) Provide handrails at all stairs where there are four or more risers.
- 16) Provide lighting at all exterior landings.
- 17) Prior to applying for a Building Permit the applicant must obtain an address for each structure on the site, acceptable to the Fire Marshal, from the Engineering Department. Note: The correct address must be referenced on all pages of the plans.
- 18) On your plans provide a table that includes the following:
 - a. Occupancy group for each area of the building
 - b. Type of construction
 - c. Allowable area
 - d. Proposed area
 - e. Allowable height
 - f. Proposed height
 - g. Proposed fire separation distances
 - h. Exterior wall and opening protection
 - i. Allowable
 - ii. Proposed
 - i. Indicate sprinklered or non-sprinklered
- 19) Illustrate compliance with the minimum plumbing fixture requirements described in the 2010 California Plumbing Code, Chapter 4, Table 4-1 Minimum Plumbing Facilities and Table A - Occupant Load Factor.
- 20) Show compliance with all accessibility regulations found in the 2010 CBC for commercial buildings including:
 - a. Accessible paths of travel
 - b. A level landing must be provided on each side of the door at all required entrances and exits.
 - c. Accessible countertops
 - d. Accessible bathrooms

- e. Accessible parking
- 21) Per CBC 3003.5, all structures four or more stories in height must have at least one elevator that can accommodate a stretcher. See the referenced code section for dimensions (80" x 54") and other details.
 - 22) Provide an exit plan showing the paths of travel
 - 23) In Assembly occupancies specify aisle widths that comply with Section 1025.9.
 - 24) Specify the total number of parking spaces on site
 - 25) All NEW non-residential buildings must comply with the requirements of AB-2176 Sec. 42911 (c) [2003 – 2004 Montanez] as follows:
 - a. Space for recycling must be a part of the project design in new buildings.
 - b. A building permit will not be issued unless details are shown on the project plans incorporating adequate storage for collecting and loading recycled materials.
 - 26) Include with your Building Division plan check submittal a complete underground fire sprinkler plan. Contact the Burlingame Water Division at 650-558-7660 for details regarding the water system or Central County Fire for sprinkler details.
 - 27) Sewer connection fees must be paid prior to issuing the building permit.
8. that the conditions of the NPDES Coordinator's February 8, 2012 memo shall be met, which includes the following comments:
- a. The project will need to comply with additional and new Low Impact Development (LID) requirements under the Municipal Regional Permit, C.3 Provisions, which became effective on December 11, 2011. For details and technical guidance on these C.3 requirements visit the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP) at http://www.flowstobay.org/bs_new_development.php.
 - b. The following C.3 forms/worksheets have been updated and project proponents will need to use and submit these forms as part of the final construction documents and associated building permits:
 - 1) NPDES Permit Impervious Surface Data Collection Worksheet*
 - 2) C.3 and C.6 Development Review Checklist*.

*both forms are available for download at http://www.flowstobay.org/bs_new_development.php.
 - c. When submitting plans for a building permit include a list of construction stormwater pollution prevention Best Management Practices (BMPs) as project notes and include them as a separate full size plan sheet, preferably 2' x 3' or larger. Project proponents may use the attached Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) plan sheet to comply with this requirement. Electronic file is available for download at http://www.flowstobay.org/bs_construction.php (scroll about half-way down the page and click on Construction BMP Plan Sheet).

9. that the conditions of the Parks Supervisor's February 6, 2012 memo shall be met, which includes the following comments:
 - a. Submit a Landscape Project Application to the Parks Division in compliance with the Water Conservation in Landscape Ordinance.
 - b. New trees in the Airport Boulevard islands shall be *Platanus acerfolia* 'Columbia'.
10. that the conditions of the Fire Marshal's April 26, 2010 memo shall be met, which includes the following comments:
 - a. All buildings shall be equipped with fire alarms, fire sprinklers and standpipes where required by the California Fire Code and the Burlingame Municipal Code.
 - b. Fire Flow and Fire Hydrants shall conform to Appendix B and C of the International Fire Code 2006 Edition.
 - c. Fire apparatus access shall be provided for all buildings in accordance with §503 of the International Fire Code.
 - d. Fire Control Room as required by the California Building Code shall be placed to the exterior of the building with exterior access. Rooms shall be positioned facing fire apparatus access. This requirement may negate exterior remote annunciators and key boxes intended to house HMIS/HMMP as required for Burlingame Municipal Code.
 - e. Please see Burlingame Municipal Code specific to Addressing Requirements and Key Boxes associated with Hazardous Materials.
 - f. The fire department shall request HMIS/HMIP in accordance with the California Fire Code. All inventory lists shall at minimum indicate the hazardous material class and quantities consistent with Table 2703.1.1(1), Title 24 CFC classes and units (i.e.: pounds, gallons, cubic feet at NTP, etc.).
 - g. Space shall be provided within each Highrise for installation of a repeater/receiver antenna and supporting equipment for City Communications. An electrical supply source shall be provided at the antenna/equipment location. Reasonable access shall be provided to City staff contractors for installation of necessary telephone lines and for purposes of installation, maintenance, adjustment and repair of the antenna/equipment.
11. that the conditions of the Public Works Department, Engineering Division's May 8, 2012 memo shall be met, which includes the following comments:
 - a. With City approval, the Developer proposes to construct a new, realigned Airport Boulevard through the Project and to construct Bay Trail and Bay frontage improvements in the City's right-of-way easement of the original Airport Boulevard. Developer understands that the underlying fee of the original Airport Boulevard ROW, from the existing Sanchez Chanel Bridge East to Fisherman's Park and South from Fisherman's Park to Beach Road, is owned by the State of California, State Lands Commission and that the City only holds a ROW easement over same. Developer shall give the State Lands Commission written notice of its development plans and specifically, notice of the proposed improvements to be constructed in the ROW of the original Airport Boulevard

alignment, within ten (10) days of the Planning Commission's recommendation of the Project to the City Council. At any time, should State Lands have any concerns over said improvements, object to any aspect of the proposed improvements or initiate any type of administrative or judicial action in regard to these proposed improvements, Developer shall hold harmless, defend and indemnify the City, its officers, agents and employees from any and all fees (including attorneys' fees), damages, fines or any other costs of any kind related to such objections, claims or actions.

Additionally, the Developer shall obtain letters of no objection to the proposed realignment of Airport Boulevard from all utility companies. The Project Developer shall relocate all existing utilities from within the existing Airport Boulevard roadway to the proposed realigned Airport Boulevard roadway to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and affected utility companies.

- b. The developer shall prepare necessary engineering drawings and construction documents to construct the Sanchez Channel Bridge widening as identified in the existing BCDC permit to provide the necessary width for pedestrian, bicyclist and vehicular access along Airport Boulevard. The developer shall complete construction of these improvements at his/her expense. These drawings shall be approved by the City Engineer as part of the Building Permit process.
- c. The developer shall be responsible to meet all San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) requirements for the project and provide the City with documentation of all approvals by BCDC for all work within 100 feet of the shoreline band along the San Francisco Bay and Sanchez drainage channel.
- d. The developer shall enter into a Site Maintenance Agreement with the City for maintenance of all landscape, sidewalk, medians, and stormwater improvements as well as roadway improvements that do not conform to city standards, such as the proposed roadway intersections. The Site Maintenance Agreement shall be executed prior to the issuance of the Building permit.
- e. All traffic improvements, including but not limited to traffic signals, pedestrian countdown signals, pedestrian audible signals, signal interconnection hardware, street lights, signage, street markings, etc., shall be approved by the City Engineer and installed at the property owner's expense. The proposed streetlights must conform to current standards which require Beta LED's or equivalent. The developer shall submit and obtain approval of the required engineering drawings and specifications for all public improvements as part of the building permit process.
- f. The project shall reimburse to the City the operation, maintenance and energy costs of the proposed traffic signals. The City will maintain the newly proposed traffic signal operations. The operation cost of the traffic signal will be adjusted annually by the City based on prevailing costs. The electricity costs will be based on direct billing by PG & E.
- g. The developer shall provide at his/her expense shoreline access, adequate erosion protection and site amenities to the standards established by the City and BCDC.
- h. The Bay and drainage channel shorelines located on this property will require stabilization improvements to provide flood protection for the public access trail

and bridge. All shoreline and drainage channel slope protection measures, need to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

- i. The public and facility users shall be safely provided for and protected from the flooding of the site in the event of a disaster. This includes a storm or an earthquake which coincides with a maximum high tide and possible breaching of Sanchez Channel and/or Airport Boulevard levees. The property owner shall employ a qualified engineer to analyze the seismic stability of the Sanchez Channel and Airport Boulevard levees and identify protection against possible earthquake or storm event. The property owner shall submit the structural and seismic stability analysis to the City Engineer for review and approval. If the analysis indicates that improvements are necessary along the project site to provide stability for an event, such improvements shall be installed as approved by the City Engineer prior to occupancy of the first building.
- j. The developer shall be required to incorporate the following measures into project design in order to reduce the potential impacts of flooding:
 - 1) Necessary tide gates shall be installed in the storm drain system on the project site to prevent high water from back flowing into the site during flood periods;
 - 2) Adequate drainage and pump facilities, including a sound-baffled backup power supply, shall be provided in the parking area to prevent water ponding in excess of ten (10) inches in the event of a 100-year flood;
 - 3) Storm drainage facilities shall be designed to accommodate any future settlement of the site, levees and other fill along the site perimeter;
 - 4) A flood contingency plan shall be developed to provide guidelines for management of vehicles in the event of flooding of the parking area; and
 - 5) On-site improvements shall be designed to provide 100-year flood protection. All emergency equipment, generators, controls, and motors shall be located above the 100-year flood elevation.
- k. The developer shall install a six-inch diameter recycled water main with the roadway improvements. This six-inch line shall extend from the existing Sanchez Channel Bridge east to the other end of the new roadway alignment near Beach Road. Initially the line shall be connected to the City water main and serve as the service connection for irrigation. This line and the irrigation system shall convert to a recycled water line once it becomes available. These improvements shall be done at the property owner's cost and shall be completed in concurrence with the roadway improvements.
- l. The project developer shall implement and maintain an appropriate Transportation Demand Management measures in accordance with the San Mateo County Congestion Plan to reduce the number of trips generated by this project.
- m. Detailed grading and drainage plans shall be submitted by the project developer for review by the City Engineer at the time of applying for a building permit.
- n. The project shall comply with the City's NPDES permit requirement to prevent storm water pollution during and after the construction. In addition, the project developer shall provide all documentation relating to compliance with the Regional Municipal Permit from the State of California Water Resources Board.

- o. It is possible that this project may require approvals and permits from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Department of Fish and Game, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The applicant must provide written records of contacting the above agencies demonstrating that a permit has been obtained or is not required.
 - p. All street improvements plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. These improvements include but are not limited to sanitary sewer mains and laterals; water mains and services; storm drain mains and inlets; street structural sections, soils report, etc. Hydrologic and hydraulic calculations are required for all designs associated with the new road alignment. The road structural section shall be designed to a traffic index of minimum 12.0 and shall withstand vertical displacement due to natural subsurface settlement. The structural section shall be designed for a 20-year life based on recommendations of a professional geotechnical engineer and accompanying soils report.
 - q. The project developer shall perform necessary engineering studies to determine the required capacity and improvements to the system to be approved by the City Engineer. At the City's discretion, the sanitary sewer improvements shall be routed along Airport Boulevard to an existing pump station, thence along Airport Boulevard to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. The sanitary sewer system improvements shall be designed and constructed to accommodate the fully built-out conditions of the project and adjacent properties.
 - r. The project shall abandon the existing potable water main located within existing alignment of Airport Boulevard from Fisherman's Park to Beach Road. The project shall evaluate the existing condition of the water main. If necessary and at the City's discretion, the project shall design and construct a new potable water main system along the newly proposed Airport Boulevard from Beach Road to the Sanchez Channel as well as the replace the existing potable water main segment from Sanchez Channel to Fisherman's Park.
 - s. The project shall install purple piping in buildings for future reclaimed water use in building applications.
12. that demolition or removal of any existing structures and any grading or earth moving on the site shall not occur until a building permit has been issued and such site work shall be required to comply with all the regulations of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District;
13. that the project shall comply with the Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance which requires affected demolition, new construction and alteration projects to submit a Waste Reduction plan and meet recycling requirements; any partial or full demolition of a structure, interior or exterior, shall require a demolition permit;
14. Exterior lighting for the project would be designed to meet the requirements of Burlingame Municipal Code Section 18.16.030 (pertaining to light spillage off site in commercial or residential areas), the California Energy Commission, and the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America for illumination levels. Compliance with these performance standards would minimize the dispersion of light in a manner that reduces the glow or aurora effect to acceptable and allowable levels. In addition, the project area already contains numerous sources of exterior lighting, and is not adjacent to uses that would be sensitive to light spillover.

15. that the applicant shall comply with Ordinance 1503, the City of Burlingame Storm Water Management and Discharge Control Ordinance;
16. that the overall height of the buildings as measured from the top of curb at Airport Boulevard (+ 14.5' elevation) shall be no taller than the following heights: Buildings B1 and B2, 97.0', Building B3, 129.0', Building B4, 144.0', Parking Structure, 67.5', and Amenities Building, 49.0'; building heights shall be surveyed at the framing of each floor and at the installation of the parapet screen and shall be reported to the Building Division as each floor is framed and accepted by the City Engineer before framing of the subsequent floor or roof commences. The entire building height of each structure shall be surveyed to confirm conformance with the approved plans and conditions of approval before scheduling the final framing inspection. If the building does not conform at any point in the construction process, it shall be made to conform before construction continues and any further city inspections shall be scheduled (Building Division);
17. that the applicant shall pay the required Bayfront Development Fee based on the square footage of the buildings and the current rate adjusted for inflation, ~~the total fee due is calculated to be \$1,695,070.00. Per the municipal code, one-half of the fee is due at the time of issuance of the first Building Permit, and one-half is due before the final framing inspection is scheduled.~~ ^{development agreement} The fee due shall be offset by the actual costs incurred by Developer in designing, preparing, installing and constructing (a) the realignment and widening of Airport Boulevard but limited to the customary and ordinary costs for such improvements without special pedestrian treatments, and (b) the Sanchez Channel bridge widening as outlined in the Development Agreement (Planning Division); ^{for another part of building}
18. that the applicant shall pay the required public facilities impact fees based on the square footage of the buildings, and that the Parks and Recreation fee (\$131,924.00) and the Storm Drain Fee (\$549,939.00) shall be waived, the total remaining fee due shall be \$1,102,179.00. The remaining fees shall be payable by development phase, and shall be submitted to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of the first building permit for construction of each building as follows: Building B1: \$209,802.00, Building B2: \$209,802.00, Building B3: \$293,722.80, Building B4, \$335,683.20, and Amenities Center: \$53,169.00 (Planning Division);
19. that the property owner shall be responsible to see that small delivery trucks or vans making periodic deliveries are on-site only during office hours; no trucks, recreation vehicles or other vehicles shall be stored or parked on site continuously throughout the day or overnight, and no parking shall be leased to tenants or any other users for any purpose;
20. that the property owner shall comply with the Transportation Demand Management Program prepared by Fehr and Peers for 350 Beach Road, LLC dated April 6, 2011 including the following measures:
- Secure Bicycle Storage:** Secure, indoor bicycle storage for up to 26 bicycles shall be provided in a lobby or garage level room within each of the four office buildings. In addition, bicycle racks for up to 50 bicycles will be located outside of Buildings #1 or #4.

- b. **Showers and Changing Rooms:** Shower facilities with changing rooms shall be provided throughout the site, with access available to all employees. Shower facilities (two men's and two women's) and changing rooms (one men's and one women's) shall be provided in each of the four office buildings, the amenities center shall include 12 showers and two changing rooms.
- c. **Shuttle Service:** Coordinate with the Peninsula Commuter Alliance to add two stops within the project site to the existing commuter shuttle from the Millbrae Intermodal Station. The shuttle provides 10-minute headways during peak periods.
- d. **Carpool Parking:** Provide 15 preferential parking spaces for carpools at each of the four office buildings.
- e. **Vanpool Parking:** Provide two preferential parking spaces for vanpools at each of the four office buildings.
- f. **Commute Assistance Center:**
 - 1) Provide an on-site one-stop shopping for transit and commute alternatives information.
 - 2) Provide a part-time on-site TDM coordinator available to assist building tenants with trip planning.
- g. **Employees' Surveys:** The TDM coordinator shall develop and administer two surveys per year to examine TDM program participation and best practices.
- h. **Video Conferencing Centers:** One video conferencing center shall be installed at each office building for use by the tenants of the facility.
- i. **On-Site Amenities/Accommodations:** On-site amenities, including banking, retail, delivery dry cleaning, exercise facilities, child care center, delivery pharmacy and food service shall be provided at the project site to encourage people to stay on site during the work day;
- j. **On-Site Bicycles for Employee Use:** Bicycles shall be provided at each office building. Employees will have access to bicycles during breaks for personal or business use.
- k. **Child Care Services:** Child care center service shall be provided on site;
- l. **Guaranteed Ride Home Program:** Employees will have access to the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program administered by the Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance) for emergencies. The program provides vouchers for taxicabs or rental cars for this purpose.
- m. **Transportation Action Plan:** The TDM coordinator shall work with the Alliance to create a Transportation Action Plan for each tenant.
- n. **Transportation Management Association:** If the office park has multiple tenants, each tenant shall provide a representative to form a Transportation Management Association and be a liaison to the TDM Coordinator.
- o. **Coordination of Transportation Demand Management Programs:** The TDM coordinator shall coordinate with other TDM programs with existing developments/employers in the surrounding area.

- p. **Subsidy for Transit Tickets:** Employers shall offer subsidies to employees to compensate them for the cost of transit tickets.
- q. **Electric Vehicle Stations:** The applicant shall provide plug-in stations for electric vehicles.
- r. **House Car for Employee Use:** Each building will provide employees with access to a “house car” for use during the day

THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS SHALL BE MET DURING THE BUILDING INSPECTION PROCESS PRIOR TO THE INSPECTIONS NOTED IN EACH CONDITION:

- 21. that prior to scheduling the framing inspection, the project architect, engineer or other licensed professional shall provide architectural certification that the architectural details such as window locations and bays are built as shown on the approved plans; if there is no licensed professional involved in the project, the property owner or contractor shall provide the certification under penalty of perjury. Certifications shall be submitted to the Building Department;
- 22. that prior to scheduling the roof deck inspection, a licensed surveyor shall shoot the height of the roof ridge and provide certification of that height to the Building Division; and
- 23. that prior to final inspection, Planning Division staff will inspect and note compliance of the architectural details (trim materials, window type, etc.) to verify that the project has been built according to the approved Planning and Building plans.

Mitigation Measures from Environmental Impact Report:

Measures Applicable to 300 Airport Boulevard Project as well as future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard site:

- 24. *Amphlett Poplar Intersection: The City of San Mateo is considering a range of potential improvements at the Amphlett Boulevard/Poplar Avenue intersection to provide sufficient capacity for existing and future traffic volume. However, a specific improvement project has not been identified at this time. The Project Sponsor, and any future project sponsor for development of the 350 Airport Boulevard site, shall negotiate an agreement with the City of San Mateo to make a fair share contribution toward the cost of improvements at this intersection for each project's respective impacts (Transportation, Planning, Public Works, City of San Mateo);*
- 25. *Implement Recommended Dust Control Measures. To reduce particulate matter emissions during Project excavation and construction phases, the Project contractor(s) shall comply with the dust control strategies developed by BAAQMD. The Project Sponsor shall include in all construction contracts the following requirements or measures:*
 - *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 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. (Air Quality; (Planning and Building Divisions);*

26. *Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization.* *To reduce the potential impacts resulting from Project construction activities, the Project Sponsor shall include in contract specifications a requirement for the following measures:*

- *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes;*
- *The Project shall develop a construction plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction Project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a Project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average (as specified in California Code of Regulations Article 4.8, Section 2449 General Requirements for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets). Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available;*
- *All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM;*
- *Use of Interim Tier 4, if applicable, or equivalent equipment for all uses where such equipment is available;*
- *Use of Tier 3 equipment with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) or alternative fuel vehicles for applications where Tier 4 Interim engines are not available;*
- *Prohibition of diesel generators for construction purposes where feasible alternative sources of power are available;*

- *All construction equipment shall be maintained in proper working condition in accordance with manufacturer's specifications;*
 - *Diesel-powered construction equipment shall comply with BAAQMD requirements or meet Tier 3 or Tier 4 EPA/CARB standards; and*
 - *To the extent feasible, the existing electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction sites shall be used rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines. (Air Quality; Planning and Building Divisions)*
27. *Application of Low-VOC Coatings.* *The Project Sponsor shall use low VOC (i.e., ROG) coatings beyond the local requirements as per the BAAQMD Guideline (i.e., Regulation 8, Rule 3: Architectural Coatings) (Air Quality; Planning and Building Divisions);*
28. *Implement Best Management Practices to Reduce Construction Noise.* *The following BMPs shall be incorporated into the construction documents to be implemented by the Project contractor.*
- a. *Maximize the physical separation between noise generators and noise receptors. Such separation includes, but is not limited to, the following measures:*
 - i. *Use heavy-duty mufflers for stationary equipment and barriers around particularly noisy areas of the site or around the entire site;*
 - ii. *Use shields, impervious fences, or other physical sound barriers to inhibit transmission of noise to sensitive receptors;*
 - iii. *Locate stationary equipment to minimize noise impacts on the community; and*
 - iv. *Minimize backing movements of equipment.*
 - b. *Use quiet construction equipment whenever possible.*
 - c. *Impact equipment (e.g., jack hammers and pavement breakers) shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically-powered tools. Compressed air exhaust silencers shall be used on other equipment. Other quieter procedures, such as drilling rather than using impact equipment, shall be used whenever feasible.*
 - d. *Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.*
 - e. *Select routes for movement of construction-related vehicles and equipment in conjunction with the Burlingame Planning Division so that noise-sensitive areas, including residences and schools, are avoided as much as possible.*
 - f. *The project sponsor shall designate a "disturbance coordinator" for construction activities. The coordinator would be responsible for responding to any local complaints regarding construction noise and vibration. The coordinator would determine the cause of the noise or vibration complaint and would implement reasonable measures to correct the problem. (Noise, Planning and Building Divisions);*
29. *Notify Nearby Businesses of Construction Activities that Could Affect Vibration-Sensitive Equipment.* *The Project Sponsor shall provide notification to adjacent property owners*

and occupants, prior to the start of construction, informing them of the estimated start date and duration of vibration-generating construction activities during site preparation, grading, and pile driving, if required. This notification shall include information warning about the potential for impacts related to vibration-sensitive equipment. The Project Sponsor shall identify a phone number for the property owners and occupants to call if they have vibration-sensitive equipment on their site. (Noise, Planning and Building Divisions);

30. Implement Construction BMPs to Reduce Construction Vibration. The Project Sponsor shall implement the following measures during construction of all Project components:
- To the extent feasible, construction activities that could generate high vibration levels at any identified vibration-sensitive locations shall be scheduled during times that would have the least impact on nearby land uses. This could include restricting construction activities in the areas of potential impact to the early and late hours of the work day, such as from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. or 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Friday.
 - Stationary sources, such as construction staging areas and temporary generators, shall be located as far from nearby vibration-sensitive receptors as possible.
 - Trucks shall be prohibited from idling along streets serving the construction site where vibration-sensitive equipment is located.
 - Avoid pile driving when possible within 100 feet of an existing structure. (Noise, Planning and Building Divisions);
31. Implement Alternative Pile Driving Methods. The Project Sponsor shall use alternative pile driving methods (e.g., drilled or steel piles) for piles driven in proximity to existing vibration receptors such that vibration levels at vibration-sensitive equipment shall not exceed 65 VdB. (Noise, Planning and Building Divisions);
32. Bird Nest Pre-Construction Survey. The Project Sponsor(s) shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction breeding-season surveys (approximately March 15 through August 30) of the Project Site and immediate vicinity during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin, in consultation with the CDFG as discussed below.

If phased construction procedures are planned for the Project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted. A report shall be submitted to CDFG, following the completion of the bird nesting survey that includes, at a minimum, the following information:

- A description of methodology including dates of field visits, the names of survey personnel with resumes, and a list of references cited and persons contacted.
- A map showing the location(s) of any bird nests observed on the Project Site.

If the above survey does not identify any nesting bird species on the Project Site, no further mitigation would be required. However, should any active bird nests be located on the Project Site, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented. (Biological Resources, Planning Division);

33. Bird Nest Buffer Zone. The Project Sponsor(s), in consultation with CDFG, shall delay construction in the vicinity of active bird nest sites located on or adjacent to the Project Site during the breeding season (approximately March 15 through August 30) while the nest is occupied with adults and/or young. If active nests are identified, construction activities should not occur within 500 ft of the nest. A qualified biologist shall monitor the active nest until the young have fledged, until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or if it is reasonable that construction activities are not disturbing nesting behaviors. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing. (Biological Resources, Planning and Building Divisions);
34. In order to reduce significant impacts to the City's wastewater conveyance and treatment system associated with the Project, the Project Sponsor shall adhere to either of the two following mitigation measures:
- a. Upgrade Pump Capacity at the Existing 399 Rollins Road Pump Station and Reduce Inflow and Infiltration within the Wastewater System. The Project Sponsor(s) shall contribute fair-share funds toward the upgrade of the 399 RRPS capacity, or equivalent project to increase capacity in the system, to accommodate the increased PWWF that would result from implementation of the Project. Additionally, the Project Sponsor(s) shall rehabilitate the existing wastewater system, where necessary, to reduce inflow and infiltration that contributes to PWWFs at the WWTP in an amount concomitant with increases in flows contributed by the 300 Airport Boulevard Project.
 - b. Upgrade to the Existing Airport Boulevard Conveyance System Variant to Rollins Road Pump Station Upgrade. The Project Sponsor(s) shall coordinate with the City of Burlingame Public Works Department to upgrade the capacity of the City's wastewater conveyance and treatment system to accommodate the increased PWWF that would result from implementation of development of the 300 and 350 Airport Boulevard Sites. Such measures could include, as necessary, installation of a new pump station within public right of way or other area near the Sanchez Channel Bridge on the Project Site, upgrade the capacity of the existing Airport Boulevard Pump Station, extension of wastewater lines across Sanchez Channel, via attachment to the Sanchez Channel Bridge, to tie into existing wastewater lines under Airport Boulevard west of the Project Site, and increasing, as required, the capacity of existing gravity lines between the Project Site and the Airport Boulevard Pump Station and existing force main between the Airport Boulevard Pump Station and the WWTP. The Project Sponsor shall construct the necessary improvements to serve the Project Site and additional properties along Airport Boulevard that would connect to this sewer line. (Utilities, Public Works Department);

MITIGATION MEASURES APPLICABLE ONLY TO THE 300 AIRPORT BLVD. PROJECT

35. Reduce Risk of Exposure During Construction. If the childcare center is operational during the construction of Phase 2 of the Project, one of the following shall be implemented:
- A. A Health Risk Assessment is conducted prior to commencement of construction of Phase II that demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the BAAQMD, that impacts to the children at the childcare center are less than significant during Phase II construction or specific subphases of Phase II construction; or

B. *Implement the following building design and operational restrictions.*

1. *The childcare center building shall be designed such that the air intake would be located at the far eastern edge of the building with the air intake facing east.*
2. *A MERV 15 or higher rated filter shall be installed and operated for at least the duration of construction activities. The MERV 15 or higher rated filters have the potential to remove up to 85 percent of particles of 2.5 microns or greater thereby reducing interior levels of pollutants.*
3. *All outdoor activities at the childcare center shall be suspended while construction activities are occurring.*

If implementation of this Mitigation Measure is infeasible, then the childcare center would be prohibited from operating during Phase II construction. (Air Quality, Building and Planning Divisions);

36. *Maintenance and Testing of Generators. As part of the conditions of operation for the onsite back-up generators, all diesel emissions associated with the maintenance and testing of the generators should be conducted at such times as the daycare center is not in operation, particularly nights and weekends. (Air Quality, Building and Planning Divisions);*
37. *Implementation of MERV 15 Filters. The Project Sponsor shall consider implementing MERV 15 or higher rated filters for the amenities building. This would further reduce exposure of daycare students to emissions from US 101. The MERV 15 or higher rated filters have the potential to remove up to 85 percent of PM2.5 and would reduce risk while students were inside the building. (Air Quality, Building and Planning Divisions);*
38. *Incorporate GHG Reduction Measures for Maintenance Activities. The Project Sponsor shall provide infrastructure for the use of electric landscape equipment during landscaping activities, where feasible. (Climate Change, Planning Division and Parks Department);*
39. *Incorporate Trees and Vegetation into Project Design. Trees and other shade structures shall be incorporated into the Site Plan to maximize summer shade and to minimize winter shade. (Climate Change, Planning Division and Parks Department);*
40. *Renewable Energy System. The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall offset 10 percent of project electricity demand through implementation of onsite renewable energy systems or through investment in offsite alternative energy systems. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);*
41. *Drought Tolerant Landscaping. The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall reduce irrigation-related water demand by a minimum of 10 percent through the implementation of drought tolerant landscaping. (Climate Change, Planning Division and Parks Department);*
42. *Cool Roof Material. The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall incorporate cool-roof materials into project design to reduce electricity demand associated with building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) by a minimum of 7 percent. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);*

43. Water Conservation Measures. The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall implement immediate water conservation measures to reduce building water demand by 33 percent. Building water demand shall ultimately be reduced by 50 percent when the City's recycled water system is implemented. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);
44. Energy Efficiency beyond Title 24 Standards. The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall reduce building energy demand beyond the 2005 Title 24 Standards by 26 percent. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);
45. Operation Solid Waste Reduction. The 300 Airport Boulevard Project shall implement a solid waste reduction program to reduce operational solid waste by a minimum of 10 percent. (Climate Change, Planning Division);
46. Utilize Alternative Fueled Vehicles and Local Building Materials. In accordance with BAAQMD BMPs, the Project Sponsor shall incorporate into the construction fleet a minimum of 15 percent of construction vehicles and equipment operated by alternative fuels. Further, the Project Sponsor shall ensure that a minimum of 10 percent of building materials are locally sourced, where feasible. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);
47. Conduct a Wetland Delineation. The Project Sponsor shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a wetland delineation of the Project Site. This delineation shall be submitted to the Corps for verification prior to the issuance of any grading permits for the Project. If the Corps determines that the features in the Project Site are not jurisdictional, then no further mitigation would be required. (Biological Resources, Planning and Building Divisions);
48. Obtain Applicable Permits and Certifications. If the Corps determines that these features are jurisdictional, then the Project Sponsor must obtain a CWA Section 404 permit from the Corps, and a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB prior to issuance of any grading permits for the Project. A requirement of the permits will be compensation such that there is no net loss of wetlands. This compensation requirement can be satisfied through avoidance, onsite and/or offsite construction and preservation of wetlands or by purchase of mitigation credits at an approved mitigation bank. At certified mitigation banks, the Corps typically requires a minimum 1:1 ratio, but may require higher ratios for certain wetland types. (Biological Resources, Planning and Building Divisions);
49. Provide Flood Protection up to the 100-Year Flood Event plus Sea Level Rise for Underground Structures. To protect underground structures from sea level rise flood risks, prior to approving grading and/or building permits the City shall ensure that the project design incorporates its floodplain development requirements into all applicable project features using a flood elevation of at least 7.1feet. All below-ground structures, including storm drains, sewers, equipment facilities, and others, shall be flood proofed and designed to withstand hydrostatic forces and buoyancy from water surface elevations up to 7.1 feet in elevation. Certain portions of the shoreline open space may not be protected at the ultimate level of flooding, given proposed heights. However, developed areas of the Project would be protected. For the shoreline areas, an adaptive strategy would be developed to address end-of-century conditions. (Hydrology, Building Division and Public Works Department);

50. Provide Adequate Storm Flow Conveyance Capacity for Sea Level Rise Conditions. To ensure that the storm drain system conveyance capacity is not constricted by sea level rise at the outlets, the Project Sponsor shall design the storm drain system to adequately convey stormwater runoff at outlet water surface elevations equivalent to the 100-year flood event base elevation plus sea level rise of 55 inches (water surface elevation of 11.6 feet at the outlet). Prior to receiving a grading permit, the City shall review project designs and studies for adequacy of storm flow conveyance with an outlet surface water elevation of 11.6 feet and in accordance with City design standards. The City shall prepare Conditions of Approval, where necessary, to ensure that the design criteria are met. The Project Sponsor shall incorporate applicable City Conditions of Approval into project designs, prior to receiving a grading permit. (Hydrology, Public Works Department);
51. Provide Protection of Shoreline and Flood Protection Features from Hydrodynamic Forces from Sea Level Rise Conditions. Prior to receiving a grading permit, in order to ensure that the shoreline and flood protection features associated with the proposed project provide protection under sea level rise hydrodynamic and/or hydrostatic conditions, the Project Sponsor shall prepare engineering studies to identify expected hydrodynamic forces for under storm surge conditions (at least 2 percent wave run-up) and a base flood elevation of at least 11.6 feet and hydrostatic forces from a water surface elevation of 8.1 feet (mean higher high water plus 55-inch sea level rise). For the shoreline areas, an adaptive strategy would be implemented to address end-of-century conditions.

The Project Sponsor shall design shoreline and flood protection features that could accommodate hydrodynamic forces from sea level rise conditions along wherever flood protection features are identified under Mitigation Measure HY-7.1 and at shoreline protection features for stability and integrity under storm surge conditions (at least 2 percent wave run-up) and a base flood elevation of at least 11.6 feet. The Project Sponsor shall also design flood protection features for protection against hydrostatic forces from a water surface elevation of 8.1 feet (mean higher high water plus 55-inch sea level rise). The City shall review designs and associated studies for conformance with City requirements and adequacy of design measures to withstand hydrodynamic and hydrostatic forces associated with the design criteria.

The Project Sponsor shall also design erosion protection along the shoreline set-back area for protection under storm surge conditions (at least 2 percent wave run-up) and a base flood elevation of at least 11.6 feet. The City shall review designs and associated studies for adequacy in protecting the shoreline set-back area under these conditions.

The City Public Works Department shall prepare Conditions of Approval, where necessary, to ensure that the design criteria are met. Prior to receiving a grading permit, the Project Sponsor shall incorporate applicable City and BCDC Conditions of Approval into project designs.

**MITIGATION MEASURES APPLICABLE TO THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
350 AIRPORT BOULEVARD SITE**

52. Implement TDM Program as part of 350 Airport Boulevard Project. These measures could include: secure bicycle storage, showers and changing rooms, shuttle service, preferential parking for carpoolers, preferential parking for vanpoolers, commute assistance center, employees' surveys, video conferencing centers, on-site amenities accommodations, on-site bicycles for employees, child care services, guaranteed ride home program, transportation action plan, transportation management association, and coordination of TDM programs (Air Quality, Planning Division);
53. Implement energy efficiency measures with 350 Airport Boulevard Project. These measures could include: LEED certification or to exceed energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements which would further aid in reducing stationary source emissions (Air Quality; Planning and Building Divisions);
54. Incorporate GHG Reduction Measures for Maintenance Activities. The Project Sponsor shall provide infrastructure for the use of electric landscape equipment during landscaping activities, where feasible. (Climate Change, Planning Division and Parks Department);
55. Incorporate Trees and Vegetation into Project Design. Trees and other shade structures shall be incorporated into the Site Plan to maximize summer shade and to minimize winter shade. (Climate Change, Planning Division and Parks Department);
56. Renewable Energy System. The 350 Airport Boulevard Project shall offset 10 percent of project electricity demand through implementation of onsite renewable energy systems or through investment in offsite alternative energy systems. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);
57. Drought Tolerant Landscaping. The 350 Airport Boulevard Project shall reduce irrigation-related water demand by a minimum of 10 percent through the implementation of drought tolerant landscaping. (Climate Change, Planning Division and Parks Department);
58. Cool Roof Material. The 350 Airport Boulevard Project shall incorporate cool-roof materials into project design to reduce electricity demand associated with building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) by a minimum of 7 percent. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);
59. Water Conservation Measures. The 350 Airport Boulevard Project shall implement immediate water conservation measures to reduce building water demand by 33 percent. Building water demand shall ultimately be reduced by 50 percent when the City's recycled water system is implemented. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);
60. Energy Efficiency beyond Title 24 Standards. The 350 Airport Boulevard Project shall reduce building energy demand beyond the 2005 Title 24 Standards by 26 percent. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);

61. Operation Solid Waste Reduction. The 350 Airport Boulevard Project shall implement a solid waste reduction program to reduce operational solid waste by a minimum of 10 percent. (Climate Change, Planning Division);
62. Implement a TDM program. The Project Sponsor shall ensure that future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site implement a TDM program similar to that described for the 300 Airport Boulevard Project, to reduce transportation-related GHG emissions. (Climate Change, Planning Division and Traffic Engineer);
63. Pursue LEED Certification. Future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site shall seek LEED Gold certification or equivalent for development per the recommendations of the City's Green Building Ordinance. The Project Sponsor shall submit draft LEED (or equivalent) checklists to the City Sustainability Coordinator for review and consultation. (Climate Change, Planning and Building Divisions);
64. Placement or Screening of HVAC Mechanical Equipment. All HVAC mechanical equipment shall be located more than 60 feet from the nearest property line. Alternatively, HVAC mechanical equipment may be installed in a noise enclosure sufficient to reduce ground-level noise levels at the nearest property boundary to 70 dBA CNEL or less. (Noise, Planning and Building Divisions);
65. Provide Flood Protection up to the 100-Year Flood Event plus Sea Level Rise for Underground Structures. To protect underground structures from sea level rise flood risks, prior to approving grading and/or building permits the City shall ensure that the project design incorporates its floodplain development requirements into all applicable project features using a flood elevation of at least 7.1 feet. All below-ground structures, including storm drains, sewers, equipment facilities, and others, shall be flood proofed and designed to withstand hydrostatic forces and buoyancy from water surface elevations up to 7.1 feet in elevation. Certain portions of the shoreline open space may not be protected at the ultimate level of flooding, given proposed heights. However, developed areas of the Project would be protected. For the shoreline areas, an adaptive strategy would be developed to address end-of-century conditions. (Hydrology, Building Division and Public Works Department);
66. Provide Adequate Storm Flow Conveyance Capacity for Sea Level Rise Conditions. To ensure that the storm drain system conveyance capacity is not constricted by sea level rise at the outlets, the Project Sponsor shall design the storm drain system to adequately convey stormwater runoff at outlet water surface elevations equivalent to the 100-year flood event base elevation plus sea level rise of 55 inches (water surface elevation of 11.6 feet at the outlet). Prior to receiving a grading permit, the City shall review project designs and studies for adequacy of storm flow conveyance with an outlet surface water elevation of 11.6 feet and in accordance with City design standards. The City shall prepare Conditions of Approval, where necessary, to ensure that the design criteria are met. The Project Sponsor shall incorporate applicable City Conditions of Approval into project designs, prior to receiving a grading permit. (Hydrology, Public Works Department);
67. Provide Protection of Shoreline and Flood Protection Features from Hydrodynamic Forces from Sea Level Rise Conditions. Prior to receiving a grading permit, in order to ensure that the shoreline and flood protection features associated with the proposed project provide protection under sea level rise hydrodynamic and/or hydrostatic

conditions, the Project Sponsor shall prepare engineering studies to identify expected hydrodynamic forces for under storm surge conditions (at least 2 percent wave run-up) and a base flood elevation of at least 11.6 feet and hydrostatic forces from a water surface elevation of 8.1 feet (mean higher high water plus 55-inch sea level rise). For the shoreline areas, an adaptive strategy would be implemented to address end-of-century conditions.

The Project Sponsor shall design shoreline and flood protection features that could accommodate hydrodynamic forces from sea level rise conditions along wherever flood protection features are identified under Mitigation Measure HY-7.1 and at shoreline protection features for stability and integrity under storm surge conditions (at least 2 percent wave run-up) and a base flood elevation of at least 11.6 feet. The Project Sponsor shall also design flood protection features for protection against hydrostatic forces from a water surface elevation of 8.1 feet (mean higher high water plus 55-inch sea level rise). The City shall review designs and associated studies for conformance with City requirements and adequacy of design measures to withstand hydrodynamic and hydrostatic forces associated with the design criteria.

The Project Sponsor shall also design erosion protection along the shoreline set-back area for protection under storm surge conditions (at least 2 percent wave run-up) and a base flood elevation of at least 11.6 feet. The City shall review designs and associated studies for adequacy in protecting the shoreline set-back area under these conditions.

The City Public Works Department shall prepare Conditions of Approval, where necessary, to ensure that the design criteria are met. Prior to receiving a grading permit, the Project Sponsor shall incorporate applicable City and BCDC Conditions of Approval into project designs. (Hydrology, Public Works Department);

68. Provide Flood Protection up to the 100-Year Flood Event plus Sea Level Rise for Above-Ground Structures. To protect structures and people from sea level rise risks at the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, prior to approving grading permits, the City shall ensure project design incorporates its floodplain development requirements for a flood depth of the identified 100-year flood hazard water surface elevation plus a 4.6-foot (55-inch) rise in sea level. At a minimum, the Project Site shall be graded to over 10 feet above msl and the finished floor elevation of all building finished floors shall be constructed to 14.5 feet (i.e., 2.9 feet above the 11.6-foot potential flood elevation), or as otherwise determined as grading plans are developed. (Hydrology, Public Works Department); and
69. Future Wind Tunnel Analysis. To reduce potential impacts associated with future development of the 350 Airport Boulevard Site, a wind tunnel analysis shall be conducted in order to ensure that future development of the Site is designed in a way to minimize wind shadow effects at surrounding windsurfing areas. (Wind and Recreation, Planning Division).

