



City of Burlingame 2040 General Plan

Final Environmental Impact Report
Response to Comments

SCH No. 2017082018

October 2018

Lead Agency:
City of Burlingame
501 Primrose Road
Burlingame, California 94010

This document is designed for double-sided printing to conserve natural resources.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Responses to Comments	3
	Agencies	4
	Response A-1 – San Francisco International Airport	4
	Response A-2 – Airport Land Use Commission	4
	Response A-3 – Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)	4
	Response A-4 – Town of Hillsborough	4
	Response A-5 – California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	5
	Response A-6 – Peninsula Health Care District	6
	Response A-7 – City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County	6
	Individuals	7
	Response I-1 – Otto Miller	7
	Response I-2 – Jeff DeMartini	7
	Response I-3 – John Kevranian	8
	Oral Comments	9
3	Errata	10
	Chapter 2 Summary	10
	Chapters 11, 12, 15, 17, 18 Environmental Impact Analysis	10
	Chapter 21 Alternatives	13
4	Comment Letters	after page 16

List of Tables

Table 1 DEIR Comments	3
-----------------------------	---

This document is designed for double-sided printing to conserve natural resources.

Section 1: Introduction

This Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) has been prepared to comply with Sections 15089 and 15132 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. As noted in §15089 (b) of the Guidelines, the focus of a FEIR should be on responses to comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Accordingly, this document incorporates the City of Burlingame 2040 General Plan DEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2017082018) by reference in its entirety. The DEIR is available for review at the City of Burlingame, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California and on the City's web site (www.envisionbburlingame.com). This FEIR includes the following four sections.

Section 2: Responses to Comments

The City published a Notice of Availability and circulated a DEIR for public review and comment from July 3, 2018 through August 20, 2018. Ten comment letters were submitted to the City during the review period, including seven letters from public agencies and three letters from individuals. This section includes a list of all correspondence submitted to the City of Burlingame, each identified by a letter for later reference, together with the authors and the dates the letters were issued. All comment letters are presented in Section 4, with numbered brackets to highlight specific comments responded to in Section 2. This section also addresses oral comments on the DEIR delivered at the July 11, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting.

Review of Environmental Documents

Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines provides guidance to the public in reviewing CEQA documents. This section is designed not to limit the scope of comments that can be submitted by the public but to focus comments on issues that are substantive to the environmental analysis. Commenting entities should focus on the adequacy of the document in identifying and analyzing impacts to the environment and identify any areas they believe to be inadequate. The guidance indicates that comments should be submitted in a manner that:

- Identifies a specific environmental effect
- Supports the effect and its significance with substantial evidence

Comments should include alternatives or mitigation measures to avoid or reduce identified, specific environmental effects. This section reiterates that the lead agency is bound by "reasonableness" and "good faith" in its analysis and that the lead agency is not required to respond to comments in the FEIR that do not identify significant environmental issues.

Each response provided herein is coded to correspond to the individual comment/author and each of the bracketed comments in that letter. A summary table is included with each response to identify if the response introduces "new significant information" under any of the four categories identified in Section 15088 et seq. of the CEQA Guidelines.

Evaluation of Comments

Section 15088 et seq. of the State CEQA Guidelines provides guidance on the evaluation and response to comments received during circulation of the DEIR. To summarize:

- The lead agency must evaluate all comments received during the public review period and prepare a written response to comments on significant environmental issues.
- The lead agency must provide the response to the commenting entity at least ten days prior to certification of the EIR.
- The response must:

- Identify any significant environmental issues raised in the comment;
 - Explain, if necessary, why any recommendations provided in the comment were not accepted; and
 - Be supported by reasoned analysis.
- Responses may be provided as direct revisions to the DEIR or as a separate section of the FEIR with marginal notes in the DEIR text indicating that it was subsequently revised.

A lead agency is required to recirculate the DEIR if “significant new information” is introduced during the public comment period. “Significant new information” includes:

1. New significant impacts
2. Substantial increases in the severity of impacts
3. Feasible alternatives or mitigation that would reduce significant impacts
4. Identification of inadequacies in the analysis

Recirculation is *not* required when new information is not significant; this includes:

- Revisions that clarify or amplify an adequate analysis
- Insignificant modifications (such as spelling and grammar corrections)

Section 3: Errata

This section identifies revisions to the DEIR to incorporate clarifications developed in response to comments on the DEIR. Additions to the text are underlined and deletions have been stricken through. No substantial revisions were made to the DEIR and recirculation of the document is not required pursuant to CEQA.

Section 4: Comment Letters

This section contains the public comment letters.

2 Responses to Written Comments

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was circulated for a 45-day public review and comment period beginning July 3, 2018 and ending August 20, 2018. The correspondence listed in Table 1 (Draft EIR Comments Received) was submitted to the City of Burlingame concerning the DEIR. Written responses to each comment are subsequently provided. The following responses to comments include a summary to identify if the response will introduce “new significant information” under any of the four categories identified in Section 15088 et seq. of the CEQA Guidelines or if it does not introduce “new significant information.” The four general categories are:

1. New significant impacts
2. Substantial increases in the severity of impacts
3. Feasible alternatives or mitigation that would reduce significant impacts
4. Identification of inadequacies in the analysis

**Table 1
Draft EIR Comments Received**

ID	Commenting Agency	Date
A-1	San Francisco International Airport	8/13/2018
A-2	Airport Land Use Commission	8/16/2018
A-3	Bay Conservation and Development Commission	8/16/2018
A-4	Town of Hillsborough	8/17/2018
A-5	California Department of Transportation	8/20/2018
A-6	Peninsula Health Care District	8/20/2018
A-7	City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County	8/20/2018
Commenting Individual		
I-1	Otto Miller	8/13/2018
I-2	Jeff DeMartini	8/20/2018
I-3	John Kevranian	8/14/2018

Agencies

Response A-1 – San Francisco International Airport

A-1.1. This commenter clarifies that instead of stating “portions of the planning area are located within Area B of the AIA boundaries,” the correct statement is that “all of the planning area is located within Area B of the AIA boundaries.” The City hereby acknowledges that the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) will exercise its statutory duties to review all land use policy actions and land development proposals within the City that lie within airport-influence areas. The City further acknowledges that all areas of the incorporated City of Burlingame are contained within AIA Area A, which requires real estate agents or others offering subdivided property for sale or lease to disclose the presence of all existing and planned airports within two miles of the property. *The response provides a revision that clarifies an adequate analysis.*

A-1.2. This commenter identified a mistake on page 15-6 of the Draft EIR and acknowledges that the correct description of the 65 CNEL area is provided on page 15-15. The commenter also pointed out that while nearly all of the incorporated City of Burlingame is located outside the 65 CNEL noise contour, any new residential or overnight uses nearby may experience some noise disturbance from aircraft departures. Any proposed residential uses therefore should meet the interior noise requirements of the 2016 California Building Code. *The EIR text has been revised accordingly; this response provides a revision that clarifies an adequate analysis.*

Response A-2 – Airport Land Use Commission

A-2.1. Please refer to response A-1.1 for a discussion about the need for real estate disclosure requirements. *The response provides a revision that clarifies an adequate analysis.*

A-2.2. Please refer to response A-1.1 for a discussion of the need for review of projects by the ALUC. An application for review by the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee and C/CAG for a determination of consistency with the SFO ALUP has been submitted to C/CAG. *The response provides a revision that clarifies an adequate analysis.*

Response A-3 – Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)

A-3.1. The BCDC commended the City of Burlingame for including a discussion of sea level rise in the Draft 2040 General Plan. However, BCDC noted that the State’s sea level rise projections have recently been updated (in March 2018) and suggest that prior to finalizing the 2040 General Plan the City should consider incorporating the new projections into the sea level rise discussion. When and if specific development proposals are proposed in areas potentially subject to sea level rise, as recommended by BCDC, the City would utilize the most current science-based and regionally specific projections for future sea level rise. The 2040 General Plan Community Safety Element includes policies related to sea level rise which require the City to use up-to-date sea level planning information and appropriate setback and building elevation requirements in low-lying areas of the City, and to coordinate with San Mateo County on the county-wide Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment. *The language in the General Plan sufficiently addresses the comment; no changes or additional analysis is required in the EIR.*

Response A-4 – Town of Hillsborough

A-4.1. The Town of Hillsborough proposes language to be added to the General Plan that would have the City of Burlingame work with neighboring jurisdictions, including the Town of Hillsborough, to assess drainage, water, and sewer treatment constraints, capacities, needs, and capital projects, and to partner where appropriate. Hillsborough also suggests that the jurisdictions work together to proactively manage project specific and cumulative traffic impacts

associated with schools, increased density, construction, and route changes. The City acknowledges this comment. The suggestions will be considered during the public hearing process. *The comment refers to suggested changes in the 2040 General Plan but does not require changes or additional analysis in the EIR.*

Response A-5 – California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

A-5.1. The commenter requests receipt of the traffic analysis worksheets for intersections and State highway ramps. *The City has provided additional information to the commenter. This comment does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

A-5.2. The commenter requests that descriptions of current conditions and proposed projects described in the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) be corrected. For instance, the description of the improvement mentioned on page 4 of the TIA report “US 101 northbound auxiliary land from Peninsula to Broadway” is incorrect; this project has been completed. *The comment is correct regarding the US 101 northbound auxiliary lane. The TIA inadvertently mentioned this improvement, which has been already completed. Regarding the US 101 express lane project, the Plan Bay Area 2040 indicated that this project is not fully funded (only \$350 out of \$534 million is covered in the Plan period) and is thus not included for evaluation. This comment does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

A-5.3. Please clarify how the tables on Page 17 of the TIA were developed. Hexagon used the citywide travel demand forecast model to generate the VMT numbers. The daily VMT numbers accounted for all trips generated by Burlingame land uses. The residential VMT and employment VMT were generated following SB 743 guidelines. *This comment does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

A-5.4. The commenter requests adding the Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan (2018) to Table 18-1: Relevant Plans and Policies Related to Transportations Systems. The District 4 Bike Plan includes multiple projects fully or partially within Burlingame, including intersection improvement projects for SR 82 intersections and several separated crossing projects for US 101. *This information has been included in the errata. This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

A-5.5. Caltrans encourages Burlingame to adopt Alternative 2: Higher Development Density and Intensity in North Burlingame (120 Dwelling Units/Acre), which will provide more housing units, placing them near the Millbrae BART/Caltrain Station, which could encourage transit use, further address the housing/jobs imbalance in Burlingame, and conform with State and regional policies. *Noted for clarification that the Higher Density and Intensity in North Burlingame Alternative proposes a residential density of 140 Dwelling Units/Acre, compared to 120 Dwelling Units/Acre in the Proposed 2040 General Plan. This is a policy decision for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider in the public hearing process. This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

A-5.6. Caltrans provides clarification that the Howard-Ralston Eucalyptus Tree Row is within the planning area and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The Howard-Ralston Eucalyptus Tree Row is also a State-owned historical resource within Caltrans’ right-of-way (ROW). As such, all projects proposed within the boundaries of the Howard-Ralston Eucalyptus Tree Row are required to comply with the January 2015 Memorandum of Understanding Between the California Department of Transportation and the California State Historic Preservation Office Regarding Compliance with Public Resources Code Section 5024 and Governor’s Executive Order W-26-92 (hereafter the PRC 5024 MOU; found at http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/vol2/5024mou_15.pdf). *This is a standard requirement to be applied to future development projects. This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

Caltrans further clarifies that before a Caltrans encroachment permit can be issued, applicants must demonstrate that the proposed work is in compliance with the PRC 5024 MOU and the Caltrans Standard Environmental Reference

(SER) Chapter 2 (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/vol2/vol2.htm>). Per the PRC 5024 MOU and the SER, all cultural resource technical studies regarding the Howard-Ralston Eucalyptus Tree Row must be reviewed and approved by the Caltrans District 4 Office of Cultural Resource Studies (OCRS). *The City of Burlingame acknowledges these comments and will reflect these clarifications in the 2040 General Plan.*

A-5.7. Caltrans encourages the City of Burlingame to sufficiently allocate fair-share contributions toward multimodal and regional transit improvements to fully mitigate cumulative impacts to regional transportation. Caltrans also strongly supports measures to increase sustainable mode shares, thereby reducing VMT. Caltrans states that it welcomes the opportunity to work with the City and local partners to secure the funding for needed mitigation. *The City acknowledges these comments. This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

A-5.8. The commenter states: “As the Lead Agency, the City of Burlingame is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to the State Transportation Network. The project’s fair-share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities, and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.”

The DEIR includes a mitigation measure for the impact of a decline in LOS at the intersection of California Drive and Broadway. The DEIR states that “under the 2040 General Plan 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 mitigation is to have the City “coordinate with Caltrain and Caltrans to design and construct a grade-separated intersection at Broadway and the rail tracks.” It is assumed and the City’s intent that the proposed grade separation project would restore intersection LOS at California Drive and Broadway to acceptable conditions. This mitigation measure, along with others in the DEIR, will be subject to a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) which the City will implement. *This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

A-5.9. The commenter advises the City of Burlingame that any work or traffic control that encroaches onto the State right-of-way requires an encroachment permit issued by Caltrans. *The City acknowledges this comment, as this is standard practice. This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

Response A-6 – Peninsula Health Care District

A-6.1. The Peninsula Health Care District requests that the North Burlingame Mixed-Use Overlay be established and applied to the District Property and School District Property before the General Plan is finalized and adopted. This would ensure that the future use of the site by the District would be consistent with the General Plan, and by having an overlay rather than a designation the City would maintain the Public/Institutional land use designation. *This is a policy decision for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider in the public hearing process. This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

Response A-7 – City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

A-7.1. The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County requests that the City place conditions on each future development project to reduce the project pro rata share of cumulative CMP traffic impacts. The agency further recommends that the City follow the “Guidelines for Implementing the Land Use Component of the Congestion Management Program,” which requires trip reduction for projects that generate a net 100 or more peak-hour period trip on the CMP roadway network. The 2040 General Plan includes policies that support these recommendations, including Goal Mobility 5, which stresses implementation of TDM strategies that reduce overall vehicle trips and encourage the use of transportation modes that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, Mobility policy 9-2 stresses the establishment of a transportation impact fee for new development that generates funds for improving all modes of transportation. *This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

Individuals

Response I-1 – Otto Miller

I-1.1. Mr. Miller supports the higher density in the North Burlingame alternative. *This is a policy decision for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider in the public hearing process. This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

I-1.2. Mr. Miller cautioned the City that if the higher density alternative moves forward, the City should address parking problems that could result from allowing higher densities. The City notes that all new development is required to provide parking consistent with Municipal Code standards. *This response does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

Response I-2 – Jeff DeMartini

I-2.1. The commenter noted that no school enrollment was included in the EIR and is concerned that in the future school aged children will not be able to attend a school in their neighborhood. The commenter is correct in that no school enrollment data were included in the EIR. The EIR did not include enrollment because it is too speculative to identify where new school facilities would be needed. The EIR does state that “new housing would be constructed over the long term as population growth occurs pursuant to new land use policy. New homes would be occupied by a variety of households, including those with school-aged children. Both the Burlingame School District and San Mateo Union High School District would monitor growth in Burlingame and update their facilities plans as needed to identify new facility needs, including locations, timing, and funding for expanded or new classrooms and related facilities.” *The comment does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

I-2.2. The commenter noted that during the CAC process, the Planning Commission was given information that concluded in writing that the North Rollins area was not appropriate for future residential development, yet the EIR now states that these impacts are less than significant. This statement is not correct. During the CAC process, information was provided regarding potential constraints, such as noise, but at that time technical analysis had not been conducted. The DEIR provides that technical analysis. *The comment does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

I-2.3. The commenter noted that there is no mention of a location for a Burlingame ferry service in the EIR. This is because while the General Plan includes discussion and a goal relating to ferry service (Goal CC-6), it does not include a specific ferry service proposal that could be evaluated in the EIR. The comment suggests transportation policy changes in the 2040 General Plan that may be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council during the public hearing process. *The comment does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

I-2.4. The commenter noted that there is not discussion of large format retailers with frontage along Highway 101 in the General Plan and EIR. This is because proposed land use policy does not specifically support such uses along the frontage. The Innovation Industrial (I/I) land use would allow commercial and light industrial uses, creative industry businesses, design businesses, limited indoor sports and recreation, and wholesale uses, but large format retailers are not specified. The comment refers to suggested land use policy changes in the 2040 General Plan that may be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council during the public hearing process. *The comment does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

I-2.5. The commenter wanted to know the timing of the Broadway grade separation, especially considering that City staff had previously stated that an elevated track was not a good option for Burlingame. According to the DEIR, “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.” The City Council has indicated preference for a split configuration with the rail tracks partially elevated above a partially-submerged roadway. The timing of this project is not known at this time. Thus, the DEIR reflects this circumstance. *This response does not identify any new information relevant to the EIR.*

I-2.6. The commenter asks that the traffic consultant provide a summary of each project that has been assumed in the analysis. Refer to comment and response A-5.2 above. *This response does not identify any new information relevant to the EIR.*

I-2.7. The commenter requests that if any financial impact analyses were conducted by the City, they should be made public. No fiscal impact analysis was performed. *The comment does not identify any new information relevant to the EIR.*

Response I-3 – John Kevranian

I-3.1. The commenter noted that there is no mention of a location for a Burlingame ferry service in the EIR. This is because while the General Plan includes discussion and a goal relating to ferry service (Goal CC-6), it does not include a specific ferry service proposal that could be evaluated in the EIR. The comment suggests transportation policy changes in the 2040 General Plan that may be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council during the public hearing process. *The comment does not identify any new information that has a bearing on the analysis in the EIR.*

Oral Comments

Commissioner Questions/Comments

The following comments were delivered at the July 11, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting. Many comments pertained specifically to the General Plan; the following are those that addressed the DEIR.

EIR page 210 indicates two alternatives, not three. That is a typo, there are three alternatives. It is acknowledged in the Errata below.

Commenter recalled in previous discussions that environmental justice is an emerging element for General Plans. The Legislature has passed legislation to require General Plans to address environmental justice. If there were census tracts that were identified as disadvantaged it would need to be addressed, but Burlingame does not have any of those areas that would be considered impacted due to income or exposure to environmental hazards. As such there is not an explicit addressing of environmental justice in terms of complying with State Law, unless the Commission or Council sees an issue that requires policy to be addressed in the General Plan. As for the EIR, CEQA Regulations do not yet require the assessment of environmental justice.

On page 17-7 of the DEIR Burlingame School District should be abbreviated as "BSD" not "BUSD." This change is acknowledged in the Errata below.

Regarding wastewater collection and treatment, are the cumulative effects of growth in the Town of Hillsborough included? The City's wastewater treatment plant is operated under contract by private company Veolia Water. In addition to serving the City, the plant serves the Town of Hillsborough (Hillsborough) and the San Mateo County Burlingame Hills Sewer Maintenance District (Burlingame Hills). Hillsborough and Burlingame Hills are "satellite collection systems" to the City. These systems discharge directly to the Burlingame system, with each managing their own collection systems. According to the DEIR "no immediate changes to the system are needed to meet the demands of immediate growth, as the water and wastewater master plans anticipate growth consistent with the General Plan. To accommodate the level of long-term development allowed by the General Plan, the City will continue to assess demand and to update water and wastewater master plans as needed" (page 20-6). Given that the treatment plant serves the Town of Hillsborough, updating the wastewater master plan would consider any changes in growth anticipated in the Town of Hillsborough and the Burlingame Hills.

Page 21-11 of the EIR mentions a noise impact on Broadway between El Camino Real and Bernal Avenue, and attributes it to new residential units in the hillside neighborhood west of the road segment. Is that really the reason, the right description? Or is it better described as hillside residents accessing Broadway and the Broadway interchange? The noise impact is caused by hillside residents accessing Broadway and the Broadway interchange and other regional traffic on that segment of the roadway.

3 Errata

This section identifies revisions to the DEIR to incorporate clarifications developed in response to comments on the DEIR. Additions to the text are underlined and deletions have been stricken through. No significant revisions were made to the DEIR, and recirculation of the document is not required pursuant to CEQA.

Chapter 2 Summary

2.4.2 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Page 2-10, Section 2.4.1, Identified Alternatives, first sentence is corrected as follows “Pursuant to these CEQA sections, Chapter 20 identifies and evaluates the following ~~two~~ three alternatives to the project.”

Page 2-11, Section 2.4.2, Environmentally Superior Alternative, second paragraph is corrected as follows:

The Proposed Project would result in a significant, unavoidable noise impact on Broadway between El Camino Real and Bernal Avenue.

Chapters 11, 12, 15, 17, 18 Environmental Impact Analysis

Chapter 11, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Page 11-2 (b) Airport Hazards. First bulleted paragraph is corrected as follows:

~~Portions~~ All of the planning area ~~are~~ is located within Area B of the Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary zones of San Francisco International Airport. Further since all of AIA Area B falls under AIA Area A, real estate disclosures (Section 11010 (b) (13) of the Business and Professions Code) are required for people offering subdivided property for sale or lease to disclose the presence of all existing and planned airports within two miles of the property.

Chapter 12, Historic and Cultural Resources.

Page 12-2, Section 12.1.1, Environmental Setting, after second bullet. The following clarifies the status of the Howard-Ralston Eucalyptus Tree Rows.

The Howard-Ralston Eucalyptus Tree Row is a State-owned historical resource within Caltrans’ right-of-way. As such, all projects proposed within the boundaries of the Howard-Ralston Eucalyptus Tree Row are required to comply with the January 2015 Memorandum of Understanding Between the California Department of Transportation and the California State Historic Preservation Office Regarding Compliance with Public Resources Code Section 5024 and Governor’s Executive Order W-26-92 (hereafter the PRC 5024 MOU; found at http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/vol2/5024mou_15.pdf).

Chapter 15, Noise.

On page 15-6, second bullet, the sentence is corrected as follows:

Burlingame is located within two miles of San Francisco International Airport. According to the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport, a small part of the City’s industrial area located ~~east west~~ of Rollins Road and northwest of Mitten Road is within the 65 CNEL contour associated with airport operations.

The following edits to Table 15-9, Mitigation Measure 15-3A, and Table 15-16 reflect a suggested new General Plan policy (CS-4.2) that would allow new residential develop proposed in areas within a noise contour area of 75 CNEL or greater (clearly unacceptable) to take place if there is a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements and noise insulation features are included in the project design. Policy CS-4.2 relates to those project locations that are primarily exposed to noise from transportation operations. In this case the maximum instantaneous noise level in bedrooms shall not exceed 50dB(A) at night (10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.) and 55 dB(A) during the day with windows closed.

Table 15-2: Proposed Burlingame 2040 General Plan Exterior Land Use Compatibility Standards

Burlingame 2040 General Plan Land Use Category	Community Noise Equivalent Level (in dBA, CNEL)			
	Normally Acceptable	Conditionally Acceptable	Normally Unacceptable	Clearly Unacceptable
Residential – Low Density Single Family, Duplex, Mobile homes	≤ 55	≤ 65	≤ 75	> 75
Residential – Multi Family	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 75	> 75
Transient Lodging – Motels, Hotels	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	> 80
Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	> 80
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters	--	≤ 65	--	> 80
Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports	--	≤ 70	--	> 80
Playground, Neighborhood Parks	≤ 70	--	≤ 80	> 80
Golf Course, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries	≤ 70	--	>70	--
Office Buildings, Business Commercial and Professional	≤ 60	≤ 75	> 75	--
Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture	≤ 70	≤ 75	> 75	--
<i>Land Use Compatibility Definitions:</i>				
<i>Normally Acceptable:</i>	<i>Specific land use is satisfactory based upon the assumption buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.</i>			
<i>Conditionally Acceptable:</i>	<i>New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analyses of noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.</i>			
<i>Normally Unacceptable:</i>	<i>New construction or development should be generally discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.</i>			
<i>Clearly Unacceptable:</i>	<i>New development should generally not be undertaken. <u>If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.</u></i>			

Source: City of Burlingame, 2017. Public Draft Burlingame 2040 General Plan (Figure CS-2)

Mitigation Measure 15-3A. The City shall revise the 2040 General Plan land use and noise compatibility standards (Table CS-2) to better incorporate the City’s existing

ambient noise environment and the Office of Planning and Research’s 2017 General Plan Guidelines, as follows:

Burlingame 2040 General Plan Land Use Category	Community Noise Equivalent Level (in dBA, CNEL)			
	Normally Acceptable	Conditionally Acceptable	Normally Unacceptable	Clearly Unacceptable
Residential – Low Density Single Family, Duplex, Mobile homes	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 75	> 75
Residential – Multi Family	≤ 65	≤ 70	≤ 75	> 75
Transient Lodging – Motels, Hotels	≤ 65	≤ 70	≤ 80	> 80
Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes	≤ 65	≤ 70	≤ 80	> 80
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters	--	≤ 65	--	> 80
Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports	--	≤ 75	--	>75
Playground, Neighborhood Parks	≤ 70	--	≤ 75	> 75
Golf Course, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries	≤ 75	--	≤ 80	> 80
Office Buildings, Business Commercial and Professional	≤ 70	≤ 77.5	> 77.5	--
Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture	≤ 75	≤ 80	> 80	--
<i>Land Use Compatibility Definitions:</i>				
<i>Normally Acceptable:</i>	<i>Specific land use is satisfactory based upon the assumption buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.</i>			
<i>Conditionally Acceptable:</i>	<i>New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analyses of noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.</i>			
<i>Normally Unacceptable:</i>	<i>New construction or development should be generally discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.</i>			
<i>Clearly Unacceptable:</i>	<i>New development should generally not be undertaken. <u>If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.</u></i>			

Table 15-3: Proposed Burlingame Existing Regulations and General Plan Policies to Avoid or Reduce Impacts on Traffic Noise

Regulation/Policy	Description of Regulation/Policy	How Does It Avoid or Reduce Impact?	Applicable Significance Criteria
Community Safety Element			
Policy CS-4.2 Residential Noise Standards	<p>Require the design of new residential development to comply with the following standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The maximum acceptable interior noise level for all new residential units (single-family, duplex, mobile home, multi-family, and mixed-use units) shall be an Ldn of 45 dB with windows closed. For project locations that are primarily exposed to noise from aircraft, Caltrain, and Bart, <u>Highway 101</u>, and <u>Interstate 280</u> operations, the maximum instantaneous noise level in bedrooms shall not exceed 50 dBA at night (10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M) and the maximum instantaneous noise level in all interior rooms shall not exceed 55 dBA during the day (7:00 am to 10:00 pm) with windows closed. 	Requires all new residential development to comply with established interior and exterior noise standards. Compliance with these standards is intended to reduce noise exposure to humans.	<p>(a) Generate or expose people to noise levels that exceed standards in the City's municipal code</p> <p>(c) Result in a substantial, permanent increase in noise</p> <p>(d) Result in a substantial, temporary increase in noise</p>

Chapter 17. Public Services. Section 17.2.3 Environmental Impacts. c) School Services. Both the BUSD BSD and SMUHSD monitor growth in Burlingame and updates its facilities plans as needed to identify new facility needs, including locations, timing, and funding for expanded or new classrooms and related facilities. BUSD will continue to collect development impact fees as provided for in State law to fund expanded facilities.

Chapter 18. Transportation and Circulation, Section 18.1.2. Regulatory Setting

Table 18-1 has been revised as follows to incorporate reference to the recently adopted Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan.

Chapter 21 Alternatives

21.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Page 21-11, Section 21.4, Environmentally Superior Alternative, second paragraph is corrected as follows:

The Proposed Project would result in a significant, unavoidable noise impact on Broadway between El Camino Real and Bernal Avenue.

Table 18-1 Relevant Plans and Policies Related to Transportation Systems

Plan, Year	Overview	Relevant Plans and Policies
County and State Plans		
<u>Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan (2018)</u>	<u>This Plan builds on the California State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, known as "Towards an Active California." It adopts the overall vision, goals, objectives, and strategies of Toward an Active California and represents an important implementing action from the statewide plan.</u>	<u>San Mateo Top Tier Projects identified for Millbrae/Burlingame: Provide new separated crossing on E. Millbrae Avenue.</u> <u>Separated crossings include overcrossings and undercrossings, and adding a bikeway under an elevated freeway, completely separating bicycle and pedestrian travel from automobiles.</u>
San Mateo County Congestion Management Program, Final 2013	The purpose of the CMP is to identify strategies to respond to future transportation needs, develop procedures to alleviate and control congestion, and promote countywide solutions. The CMP is required to be consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) planning process that includes regional goals, policies, and projects for the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The 2013 CMP, which is developed to be consistent with MTC's Plan Bay Area, provides updated program information and performance monitoring results for the CMP roadway system.	Due to their potential safety and delay impacts, 14 signalized intersections have been preliminarily identified as key Burlingame intersections for analysis in the General Plan process, which includes one CMP intersection in Burlingame. Two additional CMP intersections adjacent to Burlingame are also included, as they are considered important in determining the overall capacity of the City's street system. The three CMP intersections are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ El Camino Real and Broadway in Burlingame ▪ El Camino Real and Peninsula Avenue in San Mateo ▪ El Camino Real and Millbrae Avenue in Millbrae

Table 18-1 Relevant Plans and Policies Related to Transportation Systems

Plan, Year	Overview	Relevant Plans and Policies
San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, 2011	<p>Outlines recommendations and design guidelines for “safe, convenient, and universally accessible” bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the county</p> <p>Funded by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority</p>	<p>The plan examines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing bicycle and pedestrian conditions ▪ Connections to transit ▪ Areas with high incidents of collisions ▪ Areas with high demand for more or better facilities. <p>Pedestrian and Bicycle Focus Areas are highlighted to prioritize funding in areas with high demand or need, including roadways with high occurrences of bicycle and pedestrian injuries, and the El Camino Real corridor.</p>
San Mateo County Transportation Authority Short-Range Highway Plan, 2011-2021	<p>Outlines how funding has been and will be allocated to highway improvement projects throughout San Mateo County</p>	<p>Burlingame area projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reconstruction of Broadway at Highway 101 interchange ▪ Modification of the interchange at Peninsula Avenue and Highway 101 <p>The plan also identifies the existing funding gap that limits completion of all desired highway improvements and ranks the proposed and completed projects by funding priority.</p>
San Mateo County Transportation Plan for Low-Income Populations, 2012	<p>Examines mobility needs in transportation-disadvantaged communities in San Mateo County and develops strategies to bridge gaps in service delivery</p> <p>Transportation strategies to address the divide in service include education, free services to low-income persons and auto loan and repair assistance programs</p>	<p>Recommends reinstating emergency transportation assistance through a partnership between San Mateo County Health Services Agency and Burlingame Yellow Cab</p>

Table 18-1 Relevant Plans and Policies Related to Transportation Systems

Plan, Year	Overview	Relevant Plans and Policies
<p>San Mateo County Transportation Authority Draft Strategic Plan 2015-2019, 2014</p>	<p>Policy, investment and service plan to improve bus service and expand ridership throughout the SamTrans service area</p> <p>Identifies five-year goals of increase weekday fixed-route ridership and farebox revenue, reduce debt service, improve organizational performance, and manage workforce change</p>	<p>Outlines trends and forecasts for regional transit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 35% of all system boardings are on El Camino Real ▪ 50% of boardings are in the morning and evening commute peaks ▪ Metropolitan Transportation Commission projects an increasing shift in growth toward El Camino Real that will lead to opportunities for cost-effective increases in service <p>Focused on service and investment strategies to support and expand a transit culture in San Mateo County</p>