

---

## 2. SUMMARY

---

This EIR chapter provides a summary description of the City of Burlingame 2040 General Plan, a list of associated environmental issues to be resolved, a summary identification of significant impacts and mitigation measures associated with the 2040 General Plan, and a summary identification of possible alternatives to the 2040 General Plan (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, Summary).

*This summary should not be relied upon for a thorough understanding of the details of the project, its individual impacts, and related mitigation needs. Please refer to Chapter 3 for a complete description of the project, Chapters 5 through 20 for a complete description of environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures, Chapter 21 for a description and evaluation of alternatives to the project, and Chapter 22 for CEQA-mandated sections.*

### 2.1 PROPOSED 2040 GENERAL PLAN

The City of Burlingame is proposing to adopt the 2040 General Plan, which represents the community's view of its future and expresses the community's conservation and development goals for the next 22 years (2018-2040). The purpose of 2040 General Plan is to: (1) identify land use, transportation, environmental, economic, and social goals and policies as they relate to land use and development; (2) provide a basis for a community's decision-making regarding land use; (3) provide citizens an opportunity to participate in the planning and decision-making process; and (4) inform citizens, developers, decision-makers, and others of the ground rules that guide development in the community.

Based upon community input and decision maker direction, the updated General Plan includes overarching guiding principles for future growth, change, and preservation. These establish the foundation of the entire plan, apply across all topical areas, and describe the future envisioned by the community. Guiding principle are provided for the following topics: balanced and smart growth, community character/urban forest, connectivity, economic diversity and vitality, healthy people/healthy places, education, and civic engagement.

The General Plan accommodates an additional 2,951 housing units more than current conditions, which translates to a projected population at 2040 General Plan buildout of 36,493 residents, or 6,769 residents than the existing population. The 2040 General Plan would allow an increase in dwelling units mostly in the multi-family category. Nonresidential land uses (office, commercial, industrial) would increase by 18 percent, while existing institutional land uses would decrease by almost a third (due to reclassification of uses).

The proposed 2040 General Plan does not significantly alter existing new land use designations, but creates more mixed-use options in existing focused commercial areas, including Downtown, California Drive, Broadway and North Burlingame. The mixed-use designation allows multi-family dwellings to be built close to shopping and regional transportation. The 2040 General Plan also focuses on new and revised policies and implementation programs, consistent with regional forecasts and recently adopted City plans and initiatives, as described in chapter 3 (Project Description) of this EIR.

Implementation of the Burlingame 2040 General Plan would require the following City actions:

1. Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed General Plan;
2. Adoption of the 2040 General Plan itself; and
3. Approval of any associated zoning amendments and any associated amendments to other City regulations to reflect and implement the land uses, goals, policies, and implementation programs specified by the 2040 General Plan.

## 2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

As required by the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR addresses the following areas of potential environmental impact or controversy known to the Lead Agency (the City), including those issues and concerns identified by the City in its Notice of Preparation (NOP) of this EIR (dated August 2, 2017) and by other agencies, organizations, and individuals in response to the NOP. These environmental concerns relate to the following topics (listed in the order that they are addressed in this EIR):

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources
- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Minerals
- Global Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Historic and Cultural Resources
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation and Circulation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems

## 2.3 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

For each of the 16 environmental topics listed above, any "**significant**" project or cumulative impact and associated mitigation measure or measures identified in this EIR are summarized in Table 2-1, the SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES, which follows. The summary chart has been organized to correspond with the more detailed impact and mitigation discussions in chapters 5 through 19 of this EIR. The chart is arranged in five columns: (1) identified impacts, (2) significance without mitigation, (3) recommended mitigation measures, (4) the entity responsible for implementing each mitigation measure, and (5) the level of impact significance after implementation of the mitigation measure(s).

**Table 2-1: Summary of Significant Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>				
<p><b>Impact 10-1: Increases in GHG Emissions.</b>                      The proposed General Plan Update contains a goal and policy that require the development and maintenance of a CAP. Goal HP-2 states it is the intention of the City to achieve greenhouse gas emissions reductions consistent with State goals, and Policy CC-1.1 states the City would maintain up-to-date Climate Action Plan policies and continue to provide annual sustainability reports. Under these guiding standards, the City has set a goal to update its existing CAP and identifies measures that can feasibly (in terms of cost and implementation) reduce GHG emissions to levels consistent with state reduction goals. Although the policies contained within the General Plan Update could reduce emissions of GHG, not all may be feasible in terms of their cost and implementation. The City’s updated CAP would evaluate the feasibility and implementation of General Plan policies in greater detail and identify the potential emissions reductions available from these and, if necessary, additional GHG reduction policies. A few of these policies have already been identified and would be implemented by the City through Mitigation Measure 10-1, as</p>	SU	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 10-1.</b> To help reduce GHG emissions generated by community-wide activities, the City shall implement the following, additional policies as part of the General Plan Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M-3.10: Bicycle Sharing – Implement a bicycle sharing program in Burlingame to provide an alternative to driving, enhance bicycle accessibility, and offer a last mile option to transit.</li> <li>• M-4.7: Increase use of available shuttles in Burlingame by improving signage, outreach, and coordination with co-sponsors.</li> <li>• IF-6.9: ECO100 – Increase ECO100 enrollment by residences and businesses. ECO100 is the 100% renewable and carbon-free electricity rate from Peninsula Clean Energy. Coordinate with community champions and PCE to expand outreach on ECO100.</li> </ul> <p>The reductions associated with implementation of Policy IF-6.9 has been</p>	City	SU

S = Significant  
 LS = Less than significant  
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact  
 NA = Not applicable

**Table 2-1: Summary of Significant Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
<p>presented below.</p> <p>Until these additional reductions have been demonstrated, this would be a <b>significant and unavoidable impact</b> (see criterion [a] under Section 10.3.1, “Significance Criteria”).</p>		<p>quantified and included in the reductions accounted for in Table 10-15. Both M-3.10 and M-4.7 would be quantified in the CAP update.</p> <p>The City cannot at this time conclusively demonstrate that implementation of the Burlingame 2040 General Plan, including Policy CC-1.1, would not generate GHG emissions that exceed the City’s existing Year 2020 and future Year 2030 and Year 2040 GHG reduction goals. Accordingly, this impact is considered <b>significant and unavoidable</b>.</p>		
<p><b>Impact 10-2: Plan Consistency.</b> The proposed General Plan Update would be inconsistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan Update, and the 2017 Clean Air Plan, because community-wide emissions are not in line with state GHG reduction goals. The General Plan Update is also inconsistent with Plan Bay Area 2040, because although there are many features that support a sustainable, transit-oriented Burlingame, the City cannot demonstrate the currently adopted Specific Plans within the Burlingame El Camino Real</p>	SU	<p>There are no measures that would reduce this impact. This impact would be <b>significant and unavoidable</b>.</p>	City	SU

- S = Significant
- LS = Less than significant
- SU = Significant unavoidable impact
- NA = Not applicable

**Table 2-1: Summary of Significant Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
<p>PDA in conjunction with the policies contained in the proposed update would reduce per capita CO2 emissions from passenger vehicles and light duty trucks by 15 percent, by 2035. Accordingly, the proposed General Plan Update would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a plan, policy, or regulation adopted with the intent GHG emissions. Although implementation of general plan policies would be required by the City, until these additional reductions have been demonstrated, this would be a <b>significant and unavoidable impact</b> (see criterion [a] under Section 10.3.2, "Significance Criteria").</p>				
<b>Paleontological Resources</b>				
<p><b>Impact 12-1: Paleontological Resources.</b> Since there is no information on the likelihood of discovering paleontological resources and there are currently no General Plan policies requiring the discovery, monitoring, and protection of paleontological resources, Mitigation 12-1 is recommended to avoid potentially significant impacts on paleontological resources should they occur in the planning area.</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation 12-1. Paleontological Assessment.</b> In areas containing middle to late Pleistocene-era sediments where it is unknown if paleontological resources exist, prior to grading an assessment shall be made by a qualified paleontological professional to establish the need for paleontological monitoring. Should paleontological monitoring be required after recommendation by the professional paleontologist and approval by the Community Development Director, paleontological monitoring shall be implemented.</p>	City	LS
<b>Noise</b>				

- S = Significant
- LS = Less than significant
- SU = Significant unavoidable impact
- NA = Not applicable

**Table 2-1: Summary of Significant Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
<p><b>Impact 15-1: Short-Term Construction Noise Levels.</b> Implementation of projects under the proposed GPU would involve construction that would result in temporary noise generation primarily from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Based on modeling for typical construction activities, short-term construction-generated noise could exceed applicable standards. This would represent a <b>potentially significant impact</b>.</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation 15-1.</b> To ensure that future development projects implement appropriate construction noise controls, General Plan Policy CS-4.10 shall be revised to state:</p> <p><i>Policy CS-4.10 Construction Noise Study: All development projects shall be subject to the applicable construction hour limitations established by the City's Municipal Code. Development projects that are subject to discretionary review and that are located near noise-sensitive land uses shall assess potential construction noise levels and minimize substantial adverse impacts by implementing feasible construction noise control measures that reduce construction noise levels at sensitive receptor locations. Such measures may include, but are not limited to: 1) Construction management techniques (e.g., siting staging areas away from noise-sensitive land uses, phasing activities to take advantage of shielding/attenuation provided by topographic features or buildings, monitoring construction n); 2) Construction equipment controls (e.g., ensuring equipment has mufflers, use of electric hook-ups instead of generators); 3) Use of temporary sound barriers (equipment enclosures, berms, walls, blankets, or other devices) when necessary; and 4) Monitoring</i></p>	City	LS

- S = Significant  
 LS = Less than significant  
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact  
 NA = Not applicable

**Table 2-1: Summary of Significant Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		<p><i>of actual construction noise levels to verify the need for noise controls.</i></p> <p>Although specific construction activities and noise levels associated with future development projects are this time is not known, Mitigation Measure 15-1 revises the proposed General Plan to require the implementation of feasible construction noise control measures when development occurs near noise-sensitive land uses and, therefore, would render potential construction noise impacts from future development projects a less than significant impact with mitigation.</p>		
<p><b>Impact 15-3: Increases in Traffic Noise Levels.</b> Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase noise levels along roadways with nearby sensitive receptors. Proposed policies would establish noise standards for new development and require that site-specific noise studies be conducted to reduce noise exposure; however, traffic-related noise increases are predicted to exceed 3 dB, the level typically audible to the human ear and, therefore, considered a substantial increase in noise. The application of the policies and objectives outlined in the City's General Plan update would reduce the amount of future vehicle</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation 15-3.</b> No feasible mitigation is available.</p>	NA	SU

- 
- S = Significant
  - LS = Less than significant
  - SU = Significant unavoidable impact
  - NA = Not applicable

**Table 2-1: Summary of Significant Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
trips generated from implementation of the General Plan, however, the potential level of reduction is uncertain at this time and would be contingent on the characteristic of each individual future development project. Since a reduction in vehicle trips cannot be guaranteed, and future noise levels would increase by 3 dB or more and/or potentially expose noise-sensitive land uses to conditionally acceptable or higher noise levels (e.g., Broadway Avenue between El Camino Real and Bernal Avenue). this would represent a significant unavoidable impact (see criteria [a] and [c] in subsection 15.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above).				
<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>				
<p><b>Impact 18-1: Project Intersection Impacts.</b> While the increased traffic associated with the proposed General Plan at the California Ave/Broadway intersection may be considerable, the proposed General Plan includes policies and implementation programs to reduce the LOS impact by updating the LOS standard to consider other modes, and encourages strategies to enhance travel modes other than the single occupant auto. Table 18-7 identifies these policies and programs. In addition to the General Plan policies, the following mitigation measure is recommended to reduce impacts</p>	S	<p><b>Mitigation 18-1.</b> At the intersection of California Avenue and Broadway, the proposed 2040 GP would worsen the intersection level of service to unacceptable LOS F and add more than 5 seconds of average delay during both the AM and PM peak hours. The draft 2040 GP identifies a policy (M-12.2) to “coordinate with Caltrain and Caltrans to design and construct a grade-separated intersection at Broadway and the rail tracks.” It is assumed that the proposed grade separation project would restore intersection level of service at California Avenue and Broadway to acceptable</p>	City	LS

- S = Significant  
 LS = Less than significant  
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact  
 NA = Not applicable

**Table 2-1: Summary of Significant Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
on the California Avenue and Broadway intersection to less than significant.		conditions.		

---

S = Significant  
 LS = Less than significant  
 SU = Significant unavoidable impact  
 NA = Not applicable

## 2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

To provide a basis for further understanding of the environmental effects of a proposed project and possible approaches to reducing its identified significant impacts, the CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to also "...describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives."

### 2.4.1 Identified Alternatives

Pursuant to these CEQA sections, Chapter 20 identifies and evaluates the following two alternatives to the project:

- **Alternative 1: No Project--Existing General Plan (1969, 1975, 1981).** This Alternative consists of buildout of the Planning Area in accordance with the existing Burlingame General Plan. The existing General Plan consists of elements that were adopted in 1969, with some updated in 1975 and 1981. Because the existing general plan is old, Alternative 1 is, in essence, the existing land use condition of the City. With fewer housing units, less employment, and more auto-oriented development, Alternative 1: No Project--Existing General Plan would be less effective in achieving the project objectives than the proposed project.
- **Alternative 2: Higher Development Density and Intensity in North Burlingame (120 Du/Acre To 140 Du/Acre)** Alternative 2 assumes adoption of a similar 2040 General Plan, but with increased density allowed in the North Burlingame focus area. Under this alternative, the North Burlingame Mixed Use (NBMU) designation would allow densities up to 140 units/acre, an increase of 20 units/acre. The office FAR would remain at 2.0 and the commercial FAR at 1.0.
- **Alternative 3: No Live/Work Designation in the Northerly One-Third of the Rollins Road Corridor** Alternative 3 would remove the Live/Work designation from the General Plan that applies to the northerly one-third of the Rollins Road Corridor. Instead, the designation would be Innovation Industrial, at a maximum FAR of 0.75 for commercial and industrial uses and 3.0 for hospitality uses.

Removal of the Live/Work designation would eliminate the potential for 480 residential units in this area, or about 17% of the total additional multi-family units projected citywide under proposed General Plan land use policy. The Live/Work units are envisioned as providing housing for people who run their own small businesses, such as artists, designers, and small wholesale businesses, among others. Removal of the Live/Work designation would reduce the number of potential new residents in close proximity to the Millbrae multi-modal transit station.

- Under the Innovative Industrial designation, permitted uses would include light industrial and warehouse, limited commercial uses, creative industry businesses, design businesses, indoor sports and recreation, and wholesale uses.

#### **2.4.2 Environmentally Superior Alternative**

The CEQA Guidelines (section 15126[e][2]) stipulate, "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives."

The Proposed Project would result in a significant, unavoidable noise impact on Broadway between El Camino Real and Bernal Avenue due to the roadway providing access to new residential units in the hillside neighborhood west of the road segment. None of the three alternatives analyzed would substantially reduce vehicle trips along this roadway and thus would not eliminate these significant, unavoidable impacts.

Additionally, the project would result in significant, unavoidable impacts related to the increase in greenhouse emissions from future development and from the General Plan Update being inconsistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan Update, the 2017 Clean Air Plan and the Plan Bay Area 2040 as they related to reducing GHG emissions. This is due to the City not being able to conclusively demonstrate that implementation of the Burlingame 2040 General Plan, including Policy CC-1.1, would not generate GHG emissions that exceed the City's existing Year 2020 and future Year 2030 and Year 2040 GHG reduction goals. None of the project alternatives would eliminate these significant, unavoidable impacts.

Since the proposed project and Alternatives 2 and 3 have the same impact levels and none would reduce significant unavoidable impacts, the proposed project is considered the superior alternative as it meets all project objectives and is the blueprint that was generated through significant research on land use trends, a series of public workshops generating a lot of public input, and with significant input from the Planning Commission and City Council.