

EXHIBIT A

Responses to Comments on the Draft General Plan

1. Kris Cannon (August 30, 2017)

Ms. Cannon suggests minor changes to Education and Lifelong Learning chapter. The following revisions to the Implementation Plan are recommended in response to her comments (not all suggestions for revisions are included):

IP-72 Library as an Education and Lifelong Learning Resource

The Library will continue to serve as an education and lifelong learning resource to promote and provide access to local and web-based educational resources, literacy programs, and services for parents, students, and adults.

Ms. Cannon notes a correction to Implementation Program 73 (IP073), indicating it should reference “Burlingame School District,” not Burlingame Unified School District. This revision will be made.

2. Holly Daley (August 29, 2017)

Ms. Daley compliments the treatment of resiliency in Chapter XIII and asks that more information be provided regarding responsibilities for implementation. The Implementation Plan (Chapter XI) indicates responsibilities, funding sources, and time frames.

3. Justin Moresco (August 29, 2017)

In the Community Safety chapter, Mr. Moresco notes that Policy CS-7.2 references “current building codes,” which may not necessarily address all life safety issues, and could also include other items not specifically related to life safety such as plumbing and electrical provisions. Also, the target date of 2020 for completion of a soft-story building assessment is unclear. Staff suggests this policy be reworded as follows, with the target date removed to provide flexibility in implementation:

CS-7.2: Residential Upgrades

Require that any residential facility that is being increased more than 50 percent assessed value or physical size conform to all provisions of the current building code throughout the entire structure. Encourage owners of residential buildings with known structural defects such as unreinforced garage openings, “soft story” construction, unbolted foundations, and inadequate sheer walls to take steps to remedy the problem by retrofitting buildings to meet current, “life-safety” engineering standards ~~and bring buildings up to the current building code~~. Form an ad hoc committee to investigate, ~~before the end of 2020~~, and describe the seismic risk posed by pre-1980 wood frame “soft story” buildings in Burlingame and to

evaluate the costs and benefits of potential actions that could be pursued by the City. The ad hoc committee shall report its findings to the City Council before the end of 2020. [DR]

4. Kris Cannon (August 30, 2017)

Ms. Cannon notes a correction to Implementation Program 73 (IP073), indicating it should reference “Burlingame School District,” not Burlingame Unified School District. This revision will be made.

5. Jennifer Pfaff (September 4, 2017)

Ms. Pfaff submitted a series of corrections and clarifications to the Community Context (Chapter II), Community Character (Chapter IV), Healthy People and Healthy Places (Chapter IX), Engagement and Enrichment (Chapter X), and Implementation (Chapter XI). Staff recommends the corrections and edits to be made as submitted.

Ms. Pfaff also makes some suggestions on content. In Chapter IX, she suggests omission of Policy HP-5.8 (Invasive Plant Species), citing concerns the policy could be overreaching. Staff notes that Bob Disco, City Arborist, cited similar concerns in his letter dated December 29, 2017. Staff suggests the edits proposed by Mr. Disco be incorporated to balance the concerns.

6. Jean Hastie, Sisters of Mercy of the Americas (September 25, 2017)

Ms. Hastie asks that reference to Mercy Center Burlingame (page INT-11) be changed to Sisters of Mercy. This revision will be made.

7-8. Terry Nagel (October 15, 2017)

Ms. Nagel asks that discussion in the Engagement and Enrichment chapter regarding civic engagement be expanded to more fully describe “The Burlingame Way.” This discussion will be expanded per the suggestions in her letter.

In the Community Safety chapter, she suggests mentioning efforts to include school children in safety preparedness programs. Policies CS-2.2 and CS-3.4 as written cover all residents, including school children.

She suggests that Policy CS-2.9 be broadened to include all alleys. Staff suggests this policy be reworded as follows:

CS-2.9: Alley and Emergency Access Ensure access to City alleys in the downtown area, and maintain rear building exits to be clear and unobstructed in accordance with the American with Disabilities Act. Ensure that alleys citywide that provide rear egress ~~from rear exists~~ provide clear and unobstructed access all the way to a public way.

She heartily supports the inclusion of Policy CS-3.5 regarding CERT programs.

Regarding liquefaction zones shown on Figure CS-6, she suggests a policy of notifying people of increased hazards during earthquakes in such zones. Policy CS-3.3 addresses public education regarding all hazards.

9. Jennifer Lee, City of Burlingame Environmental Regulatory Compliance Coordinator (October 26, 2017)

Most of Ms. Lee's comments related to document formatting fixes. These edits will be made as indicated.

Ms. Lee requests that an implementation program be added to Chapter XI indicating that the City will adopt a Green Infrastructure Plan in accordance with the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit. As a Green Infrastructure Plan is a mandate, it should be reflected in the implementation programs and will be added as submitted.

10. Danelle Rienks (October 29, 2018)

Ms. Rienks comments on the scarcity of affordable housing opportunities in Burlingame and neighboring communities. Staff notes that the General Plan Update does not include an update of the Housing Element, which was most recently updated in 2015. The Housing Element includes a number of goals, policies, and programs intended to address housing matters for a range of households and income groups. Implementation actions of the Housing Element include the City's adoption of commercial linkage fees to fund housing resource, involvement in an affordable workforce and senior housing project on City-owned land in Downtown Burlingame, and the inclusion of affordable units in projects that utilize the City's Density Bonus regulations.

11. Timothy Hooker (November 22, 2017)

Mr. Hooker notes that future decisions will be driven by vast volumes of data collected and that Burlingame will need to have the technology infrastructure in place to facilitate this decision-making. This issue is addressed in Chapter XII: Infrastructure under the topic of Telecommunications.

12. Bob Disco, City Arborist (December 29, 2017)

The City arborist suggests revising Policy HP-5.8 as follows:

HP-5.8: Invasive Plant Species Prohibit the use of any invasive plant species in landscaped or natural areas. ~~Work with the California Invasive Plant Council to identify~~ invasive plant species within Burlingame, and Where species have already invaded, establish plans for removal. Ensure that new development obtains appropriate permits and approvals related to invasive species from the Army Corps of Engineers and other relevant agencies.

13. Laurie Graham (no date)

Ms. Graham suggests including policy for bird-safe windows in new development. Staff is familiar with bird-friendly design features and believes they could be practical in new development. While consideration could be deferred to development review, staff suggests the following policy be added to the Bayfront section of the Community Character Chapter:

CC-6.8: Bird-Friendly Design

To minimize adverse effects on native and migratory birds, incorporate design measures to promote bird safety as part of development review. [DR]

14. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) (January 5, 2018)

The SFPUC raises objection to any land use designation change that affects its properties, noting its intergovernmental immunity (that is, ability to regulate its own property no matter the General Plan designation or zoning). The SFPUC also notes that any future use of properties owned by the agency will be subject to the SFPUC's Project Review Process.

The Parks and Recreation and Rail Corridor designations applied via the General Plan update do not preclude SFPUC's use of these properties for public utility purposes, particularly given the statutory authority of SFPUC to regulate how the properties are used and developed.

With regard to any planned redesign of California Drive, at the time such occurs, SFPUC will be consulted to the extent its properties are affected.

With regard to the Francard Eucalyptus Grove, any action by the City or SFPUC affecting the grove could be subject to review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) given the grove's protected status. Regarding tree preservation along California Drive, Policy HP-7.3 promotes such "wherever possible."

15. Sierra Club Loma Prieta et al (January 9, 2018)

The letter addresses a proposed project at 1300 Bayshore Highway with regard to bird-friendly design. However in the last paragraph of the letter, there is a request that the Envision Burlingame General Plan include a bird-friendly design policy for all projects along the Bay.

Staff is familiar with bird-friendly design features and believes they could be practical in new development. While consideration could be deferred to development review, staff suggests the following policy be added to the Bayfront section of the Community Character Chapter:

CC-6.8: Bird-Friendly Design

Incorporate design measures to promote bird safety as part of development review to minimize adverse effects on native and migratory birds. [DR]

16. John A. Matthews, Jr. (February 6, 2018)

Mr. Matthews requests that the property at 1764 Marco Polo Way, which is part of the proposed Peninsula Wellness Community but is not owned by the Peninsula Health Care District, be designated for multi-family use rather than Public/Institutional. The Draft General Plan had anticipated that land use and zoning designations would be determined by the master plan. However in consideration of the ongoing nature of the Peninsula Wellness Community and uncertainty regarding which properties may ultimately be included, staff suggests that properties not currently designated as “Unclassified” (the current General Plan and Zoning designation applied to institutional sites) retain land use designations more consistent with current land use and zoning designations as determined by the current North Burlingame/Rollins Road Specific Plan and Trousdale West (TW) Zoning, respectively.

Meanwhile, in an EIR comment letter (August 20, 2018), the Peninsula Health Care District has indicated interest in a mixed-use land use designation more consistent with its plans for a mix of senior residential, support services, office, and community uses, and has suggested that a “North Burlingame Mixed Use Overlay” be designated for its properties.

Given these requests, staff suggests the following designations for the respective properties rather than the Public/Institutional land use:

Address	Current North Burlingame/Rollins Road Land Use and Zoning Designations	Proposed General Plan Update Designation
Properties fronting Trousdale Drive		
1609 Trousdale Drive 1819 Trousdale Drive 1825 Trousdale Drive 1875 Trousdale Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Land Use: Mixed-Use Office Residential • Current Zoning: Trousdale West (TW) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: North Burlingame Mixed Use
Properties fronting Marco Polo Way		
1720 Marco Polo Way 1730 Marco Polo Way 1740 Marco Polo Way 1764 Marco Polo Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Land Use: Residential – Medium-High Density • Current Zoning: Trousdale West (TW) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: High Density Residential • Alternatives: North Burlingame Mixed Use; or Medium-High Density Residential
Peninsula Health Care District Properties		
1801 Trousdale Drive 1811 Trousdale Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use: Institutional • Zoning: Unclassified 	Recommendation: Public/Institutional with “North Burlingame Mixed Use Overlay”

17. Greg Holtmann (March 28, 2018)

Mr. Holtmann suggests that a new hotel on the Bayfront on the State-owned property would benefit Burlingame and that more intense housing and parking development be permitted in the Broadway/California Drive area. Staff notes that the State Lands Commission is responsible for determining which land use or mix of uses is proposed for its property, but that the land use policy proposed in the General Plan would allow this development choice. Furthermore, the land use policy proposed in the General Plan would allow for increased housing density in the Broadway/California Drive area.

18. Jennifer Pfaff (July 5, 2018)

Ms. Pfaff questions whether Figure CC-3 shows the full extent of the historic El Camino Real zone. The referenced figure is not intended to show the historic zone but instead the general boundaries of particular land use study areas. For clarification, the historic tree grove extends from Ray Drive to Peninsula Avenue, which in the referenced study area diagram corresponds to both the El Camino Real and Downtowns study areas.

19. Kamran Ehsanipour, AIA (July 11, 2018)

Mr. Ehsanipour requests that the proposed land use designation for the property at 1501 El Camino Real be changed from General Commercial to North Burlingame Mixed Use. Staff supports an alternative land use designation to allow mixed use but recommends Broadway Mixed Use, as the development scale is more appropriate and ground-floor commercial would be required.

20. John Kevranian (August 14, 2018)

Mr. Kevranian requests that ferry service be addressed in the Mobility chapter. The General Plan Community Character Chapter includes discussion, goals, and a policy relating to ferry service:

Goal CC-5: Maintain and promote the Bayfront Area as a premier destination along San Francisco Bay for land- and water-based recreation, hospitality uses, creative industries, logistics support, water-based transit service, and local businesses that benefit from proximity to San Francisco International Airport.

Goal CC-6: Establish a cohesive design character for the Bayfront Area that protects views to the waterfront, encourages walking and biking, accommodates water-based recreation and ferry service, and addresses sea level rise.

Policy CC-6.6: Water-based Activities – Accommodate access to the Bay for water-based recreation and transit uses.

However, a specific ferry service proposal is not presented in the General Plan. While ferry service was discussed during development of the General Plan, it was not included as a policy matter in absence of a proposal. Nevertheless, Goal CC-6 could allow consideration of a ferry proposal to be consistent with the General Plan should one be presented.

21. Joseph Baylock (August 30, 2018)

While Mr. Baylock's letter comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), the letter was received after the conclusion of the EIR comment period on August 20, 2018. The comments may be received and responded to as comments on the Draft General Plan, but cannot be included in the Final EIR (FEIR).

Mr. Baylock's letter addresses two areas of concern: water supply and project density. Regarding water supply, the General Plan is obligated to plan for and evaluate water supply within the context of the municipal and water service boundaries; however, overall water availability is a regional concern. The Infrastructure Chapter (Chapter VII) of the Draft General Plan includes a goal to ensure the long-term availability of water through conservation methods and regular maintenance and improvements to the overall water supply delivery system. Policies include maintaining and implementing the Urban Water Management Plan—which outlines water conservation strategies and programs, as required by the State's Water Management Planning Act—and preparing and implementing a Water Shortage Allocation Plan that for periods of system-wide shortage.

Regarding project density, Mr. Baylock suggests that the density of the high-density residential land use (shown as "North Burlingame Mixed Use" on the Land Use Plan/Figure CC-1) should be reduced to 100 du/acre, rather than increased to 140 du/ac as evaluated as an alternative in the EIR. The Draft General Plan specifies 120 du/ac as the maximum for the North Burlingame Mixed Use, with an alternative evaluated in the EIR to allow up to 140 du/ac. This is a policy decision for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider in the public hearing process. The evaluation of a density up to 140 du/ac in the EIR would not preclude the Planning Commission and City Council from specifying a lower density, whether 120 du/ac as specified in the Draft General Plan, or a lower density.

22. Bryan Miranda, Public Storage (August 31, 2018)

Mr. Miranda indicates an interest by Public Storage to maintain and possibly expand its facilities located within the proposed Rollins Road Live/Work area. As such, he has requested that self-storage uses continue to be allowed under the Live/Work land use designation and its respective zoning, and that a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) greater than the 1.0 maximum proposed for the Live/Work land use designation be allowed with a Conditional Use Permit. He suggests that self-storage uses have substantially less impacts than other commercial uses would have (in terms of traffic, water supply, public services), and proposes that a FAR of 1.25 to 1.5 be allowed with a Conditional Use Permit on a case-by-case basis.

Staff notes that the Live/Work land use description in the Draft General Plan allows long-established industrial buildings and uses may remain, provided any new use proposed in an existing industrial building is deemed compatible with live/work uses. Light industrial and warehouse uses are mentioned as allowed uses.

Staff suggests that provisions for increased FAR for less-impactful land uses such as self-storage be considered as a provision in the zoning regulations. Provided the provision incorporates performance standards accounting for the reduced impact of the use, such a provision could be consistent with the assumptions of land use intensity and impacts evaluated in the General Plan EIR.

23. John Bergener, San Francisco International Airport (October 16, 2018)

Mr. Bergener notes three policies in the Community Safety Element of the Draft General Plan that are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport.

First, he notes that the Airport recommends that Policy CS-4-9 be revised to be consistent with the Airport Influence Area (AIA) IP-1 Airport Influence Area A- Real Estate Disclosure Area, of the CALUCP, to read:

Require that all new development, the real estate disclosure requirements of state law apply. Section 11010 of the Business and Professions Code requires people offering subdivided property for sale or lease to disclose the presence of all existing and planned airports within two miles of the property (Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code Section 11010(b)(13). The law requires that, if the property is within an "airport influence area" designated by the airport land use commission, the following statement must be included in the notice of intention to offer the property for sale:

Notice of Airport in Vicinity

This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence areas. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you.

Staff suggests that Policy CS-9 be revised as proposed.

Second, he identifies a conflict with Policy CS-5.4, which proposes identifying setback areas and parklands suitable for a wetland buffer. He notes that locating new wetlands in close proximity to the Airport poses wildlife hazards to arriving and departing aircraft, and that a policy recommending creation of wetlands would be inconsistent with the CALUCP, AP-4 Other Flight Hazards are Incompatible, which states, " ... (f) Any use that creates an increased attraction for wildlife, particularly large flocks of birds, that is inconsistent with FAA rules and regulations, including, but not limited to, FAA Order 5200.5A, Waste Disposal Sites On or Near Airports, FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports, and any successor or replacement orders or advisory circulars.

Staff suggests deleting Policy CS-5.4 as requested. The remaining policies under Goal CS-5 (Protect vulnerable areas and infrastructure from flooding related to rising sea levels in the San Francisco Bay) can address rising sea levels without creating hazards for airport operations.

Third, he recommends that Policy CS-8.3 be revised to clearly state that the Airport Land Use Commission review is to determine whether the proposed action is consistent or not consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), with the Airport Land Use Commission (C/CAG Board) Consistency Determination Process. Staff suggests Policy CS-8.3 be revised to read:

Policy CS-8.3: Airport Land Use Commission Review

Ensure all applicable plans, ordinances, and development applications are reviewed by the City/County Association of Governments for San Mateo County's Airport Land Use Commission as required by State law to determine whether the proposed action is consistent or not consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), with the Airport Land Use Commission (C/CAG Board) Consistency Determination Process.