2.0 Executive Summary

This section provides an overview of the project and the environmental analysis. For additional detail regarding specific issues, please consult the appropriate sections of the original Draft EIR Chapter 4.0 (Sections 4.1 through 4.13) and the Revised Draft EIR.

2.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides an analysis of the potential environmental effects associated with the adoption and implementation of the San Mateo General Plan Update, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines.

2.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project is the update and adoption of the City of San Mateo General Plan. The General Plan Update comprises newly proposed goals, policies, and implementation actions which will be used to shape future preservation, enhancement, and development-related decisions. The General Plan Update will allow the community to establish its long-term vision for the future over the next ten to twenty years. Implementation of the policies would be used by the Town to guide decision-making toward attainment of the goals in the Plan. The General Plan includes elements required by state law: Land Use, Circulation, Noise, Open Space, Conservation, and Safety, and may include other topics such as sustainability and community design.

The major proposals of the General Plan are:

- Increase housing opportunities while maintaining the character of existing single-family neighborhoods (i.e., housing and employment);
- Maintain the commitment to strengthening the downtown as a major commercial, residential, and cultural center;
- Concentrate major new development near transportation and transit corridors;
- Beautify and improve El Camino Real (SR 82);
- Improve design quality and maintain established height limits;
- Develop a strategy to limit traffic congestion;
- Increase open space and recreational opportunities; and
- Establish and maintain San Mateo as a sustainable city.

2.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

Section 15126(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project that could feasibly accomplish the basic objectives of the project while avoiding or reducing significant environmental effects of the project, and requires that the EIR evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. This alternatives analysis provides a comparative analysis between the project and the selected alternatives. In addition to the proposed General Plan Land Use Policy Map, the EIR qualitatively evaluates the following other land use alternatives, which include:

- ***Alternative 1: No Project Alternative:*** Under Alternative 1, the proposed City of San Mateo General Plan Update would not be adopted and the existing 1990 General Plan policy document with subsequent amendments in 1997, and Housing Element Update in 2009 as well as the existing Land Use Map and Circulation System, would remain in effect ~~(see **Figure 6.0-1**)~~. This alternative would include the Bay Meadows Phase II project. Growth would occur under this alternative as it would under the proposed General Plan Update. The Climate Action Plan would exist but would not be integrated into the General Plan. Additionally, this alternative would not include any changes to the roadway classification system. The City is largely built out, with only a few individual parcels left undeveloped that are not otherwise classified as open space or environmentally preserved lands. The existing land use pattern is generally a mix of low-, medium-, and high-density residential neighborhoods and office and commercial centers, combined with parks and open spaces. The General Plan Update includes minor revisions to many existing goals, policies, and associated text from the current General Plan. The General Plan Update includes a policy (LU1.14) to require a special use permit for residential development on non-residentially zoned properties which do not include a residential overlay designation. This policy would not be approved under Alternative 1. ~~Additionally, revisions to policies in the proposed General Plan Update do not change the Land Use Map designations or include any re-designations.~~ The proposed General Plan Update includes a revision to the Land Use Map for two areas being redesignated from Regional/Community Commercial to Public Facilities. These areas are owned by the City of San Mateo and currently are used in conjunction with the operation of the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Alternative I would result in no redesignation of these areas and they would remain designated as Regional/Community Commercial. The intensity of land uses in San Mateo would not increase under the proposed General Plan Update because no significant changes to the Land Use Map are proposed. The population, housing, and job increases associated with the proposed General Plan Update would be a result of increased infill development and the development of Bay Meadows Phase II. Therefore, Alternative 1 is not substantially different from the proposed General Plan Update. See Table 3.0-1 in Section 3.0, Project Description, in the original DEIR for buildout conditions of the proposed General Plan Update, which are consistent with buildout conditions for Alternative 1.

- ~~***Alternative 2: No Circulation Changes Alternative:*** Alternative 2 would be the same as the proposed General Plan Update (updated policy document and other changes to the Land Use Map) would remain in place under this alternative; however, unlike the proposed General Plan Update, this alternative would not include the reclassification of South Claremont Street (between Third and Ninth avenues), Fifth Avenue (between Humboldt Street and South Amphlett Boulevard), or Edison Street (between Twenty-eighth Avenue and Hillsdale Shopping Center) as collectors to allow for truck traffic. Truck traffic would continue to use these roadways, although new truck traffic would not be specifically routed to these three roadways because they would maintain their local road designations, and road improvements would not be necessary to accommodate truck turning movement at key intersections. Alternative 2 would have the same land use patterns and designations as the proposed General Plan Update. See **Table 3.0-1** in Section 3.0, Project Description, for buildout conditions of the proposed General Plan Update, which are consistent with Alternative 2.~~

- ***Alternative 2A: 9th Avenue as Access to South Amphlett Boulevard Alternative:*** Alternative 2A would be the same as the proposed General Plan Update; however, unlike the proposed General Plan Update, this alternative would not include the reclassification of Fifth Avenue between Humboldt Street and South Amphlett Boulevard as a collector

street. Truck traffic to the South Amphlett Boulevard commercial area would be specifically routed along South Humboldt Street to 9th Avenue, which is currently a collector street, then using 9th Avenue to South Amphlett Boulevard. Alternative 2A would have the same land use patterns and designations as the proposed General Plan Update. See Table 3.0-1 in Section 3.0, Project Description, in the original Draft EIR for buildout conditions of the proposed General Plan Update, which are consistent with Alternative 2A.

- ***Alternative 2B: Both 5th and 9th Avenue as Access to South Amphlett Boulevard Alternative:*** Alternative 2B would be the same as the proposed General Plan Update; however, unlike the proposed General Plan Update, this alternative would designate 9th Avenue as a truck route, as it is currently designated as a collector street. Fifth Avenue between Humboldt Street and South Amphlett Boulevard will be reclassified as a collector street. Alternative 2B would have the same land use patterns and designations as the proposed General Plan Update. See Table 3.0-1 in Section 3.0, Project Description, in the original Draft EIR for buildout conditions of the proposed General Plan Update, which are consistent with Alternative 2B.

- ***Alternative 3: Reduced Density Alternative:*** Alternative 3 involves changing land use designations and zoning for six specific areas (designated as Specific Areas 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, and 11) in the General Plan Planning Area to reduce the density of residential development. The six areas include Specific Area 1 – Area North of Peninsula; Specific Area 3 – North Central Neighborhood East of Idaho; Specific Area 4 – North Central Neighborhood; Specific Area 5 – Downtown Area along 2nd Avenue; Specific Area 9 – Cal Water Site; and Specific Area 11 – Central Neighborhood. Neighborhood association representatives brought forward 14 areas as part of the General Plan Update and asked the City to consider downzoning. Some of the reasons for the request (cited by representatives of the Central Neighborhood Association) for Specific Area 11 were preservation of the character and protection of property values of the single-family neighborhood by prohibiting the construction of new duplex units and allowing the neighborhood to qualify for traffic-calming programs. Public comments also expressed that zoning for multi-family is not consistent with the existing development patterns in certain neighborhoods. Similar reasons were cited for the other areas. City staff recommended against the downzoning of any of the 14 areas for several reasons, including potential impacts to property and land value as a result of density reductions, increases in nonconforming uses of properties, the loss of transitional areas that function as buffers between lower-density residential and commercial uses that is provided by medium- and high-density residential uses through mass, building height and density, existing zoning districts are based on previous downzonings as part of the 1990 General Plan Update and were considered appropriate at that time, and inconsistency between designations and existing uses, and proximity to downtown. Although staff recommended against these downzonings as part of the proposed project, the City wanted to evaluate the requested changes as part of the DEIR alternatives analysis and the list was narrowed down by the City Council to six areas. Alternative 3 involves rezoning Area 1 from R3 (medium density multi-family) to R1 (single-family); rezoning Area 3 from R3 (medium density multi-family) to R2 (low density multi-family); rezoning Area 4 from R2 (low density multi-family) to R1 (single-family); rezoning Area 5 from R3 (medium density multi-family) to R2 (low density multi-family); rezoning Area 9 from R3 (medium density multi-family) to R2 (low density multi-family); and rezoning Area 11 from R2 (low density multi-family), R3 (medium density multi-family) and R4 (high density multi-family) to R1 (single-family). The downzoning of these six areas would result in reduced development potential, primarily through infill, that could occur under the proposed

General Plan Update. Downzoning in Area 1 could impact 27 multi-family dwellings and duplexes by making 38 percent of the properties legal nonconforming uses. If the uses were rebuilt consistent with R1 standards, the new residences would have a reduced floor area ratio from 0.85 to 0.5, and building mass, a reduction of building heights from a maximum of 35 feet to 24 feet, and a potential 32 to 41 percent reduction in the number of housing units on parcels currently dedicated to multi-family uses. Downzoning in Area 3 could impact 18 multi-family dwellings and duplexes by making 40 percent of the properties legal nonconforming uses. If the uses were rebuilt consistent with R2 standards, the new residences would have a reduced floor area ratio from 0.85 to a variable 0.05 and 0.6, and building mass, a reduction of building heights from a maximum of 35 feet to 24 feet, and a potential 30 to 40 percent reduction in the number of housing units on parcels currently dedicated to multi-family uses. Downzoning in Area 4 could impact 107 multi-family parcels and 83 duplex properties by making 40 percent of the properties legal nonconforming uses. If the uses were rebuilt consistent with R1 standards, the new residences would have a reduced floor area ratio from a variable 0.05 and 0.6 to 0.5, and building mass, and a potential 17 percent reduction in the number of housing units on parcels currently dedicated to multi-family uses. Downzoning in Area 5 could impact 6 multi-family uses and a mixed-use duplex and commercial property making 58 percent of the properties legal nonconforming uses. If the uses were rebuilt consistent with R2 standards, the new residences would have a reduced floor area ratio from 0.85 to 0.6, and building mass, a reduction of building heights from a maximum of 35 feet to 24 feet, and a potential 30 to 40 percent reduction in the number of housing units on parcels currently dedicated to multi-family uses. Downzoning in Area 9 could impact development potential of the property from 116 dwelling units to 58 units, which is a 50 percent reduction in the number of housing units on parcels currently dedicated to multi-family uses. Downzoning in Area 11 could impact 19 multi-family properties and 75 duplex properties making 32 percent of the properties legal nonconforming uses. If the uses were rebuilt consistent with R1 standards, the new residences would have a reduced floor area ratio from 2.0, 0.85, and 0.6 to 0.5, and building mass, a reduction of building heights to 24 feet, and a potential 75 percent reduction in the number of housing units on parcels currently dedicated to multi-family uses. See Table 3.0-1 in Section 3.0, Project Description, in the original DEIR for buildout conditions of the proposed General Plan Update.

2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Appendix A of the original Draft EIR provides a summary of issues and areas of concerns presented to the City by agencies and the public regarding the proposed General Plan Update and its associated DEIR during the NOP review period. Based on these concerns and on input received orally and in writing during preparation of the draft Plan and EIR, it is expected that at a minimum the following potentially controversial issues will need to be resolved during the balance of the planning process:

- The effectiveness of policies related to the protection of significant natural resources.
- The promotion of transit and alternative modes of transportation.
- The increasing density and mix of land uses permitted in new developments.

2.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1) provides that the summary shall identify each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect. This information is summarized in **Table 2.0-1**.

TABLE 2.0-1
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
4.1 Land Use				
Impact 4.1.1 Adoption of the proposed General Plan Update would result in changes to the City's land use policies.	Policies: LU 6.1, LU 6.2, LU 6A.1	No Impact	None Required	No Impact
Impact 4.1.2 Adoption of the General Plan Update would not result in any significant changes to Land Use Map designations within the City of San Mateo.	Policies: LU 1.2, LU 1.3, LU 1.4	No Impact	None Required	No Impact
Impact 4.1.3 Adoption of the General Plan Update may result in planned growth within the City of San Mateo.	Policies: LU 1.1, LU 3.4, LU 3.5, LU 8.3, LU 8.4, LU 8.5, LU 8.6	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.1.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not impact land use plans within the Planning Area under cumulative conditions.	Policies: LU 6.1, LU 6.2, LU 6A.1, LU 7.1, LU 7.2	No Impact	None Required	No Impact
4.2 Population/Housing/Employment				
Impact 4.2.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in population, housing, and employment increases that would exceed regional population and growth projections.	Policies: LU 1.15, LU 1.17, LU 3.4, LU 3.5, LU 4.32, LU 8.1, LU 8.2, LU 8.3, LU 8.4, LU 8.5, LU 8.6, LU 8.7, LU 8.8.	LS	None required	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.2.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in housing impacts by creating an imbalance between employment and housing.	Policies: H 2.2	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.2.3 Buildout under the proposed General Plan Land Use Map would include population and housing increases which would not exceed ABAG projections for the Planning Area.	Policies: LU 1.15, LU 1.17, LU 3.4, LU 3.5, LU 3.32, LU 8.1, LU 8.2, LU 8.3, LU 8.4, LU 8.5, LU 8.6, LU 8.7, LU 8.8	LCC	None required	LCC
4.3 Human Health/Risk of Upset				
Impact 4.3.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update may have the potential to expose persons to known and unknown hazardous materials contamination in areas. Additionally, development and other activities anticipated in the General Plan Update may involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, as well as accidents involving the release of hazardous materials.	Policies: S 5.1 through S 5.11	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.3.2 Future development within the City could impair implementation of the existing emergency response plan.	Policies: S 4.1 and S 4.2	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.3.3 The City does not have any designated wildland fire areas but is in close proximity to wildlands.	Policies: S 3.1	LS	None required	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.3.4 Land use and infill development under the proposed General Plan would not result in cumulative hazardous materials and human health risk impacts.	Policies: S 5.1 through S 5.11	LCC	None required	LCC
4.4 Transportation and Circulation				
Impact 4.4.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in increased traffic volumes, delay, and a decrease in LOS on area intersections during peak hours.	Policies: C 2.1 through C 2.12	PS	**MM 4.4.1a** Delaware Street and 19th Avenue: Restriping is called for at the intersection of Delaware and 19th Avenue. Specifically, four turning movements at this intersection will be restriped including (1) traveling south on Delaware, the through and left movements will be replaced with a left only arrow; (2) traveling north on Delaware, the through and right movements will be replaced with a through only movement; (3) traveling east on 19th Avenue, the right turn only will be replaced with a through and right turn movement; and (4) the all-way movement will be replaced with a left only arrow. **MM 4.4.1b** Grant Street and 19th Avenue: Restriping is called for at the intersection of Grant Street and 19th Avenue. Specifically, the right-hand turn lane traveling west on 19th Avenuewill be replaced with a left and right arrow. **MM 4.4.1c** El Camino Real at Crystal Springs: Improvements to the intersection at El Camino Real and Crystal Springs Road include widening the curb lane to allow a right turn movement onto Crystal Springs Road from El Camino Real (southbound).	LS
Impact 4.4.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in an increased demand for transit service.	Policies: C 3.1 and C 3.2	LS	None required	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.4.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in an increased demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	Policies: C 4.1 through 4.12	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.4.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in an increase in traffic volumes, which would increase the potential opportunities for safety conflicts. This impact is considered **less than significant**.	Policies: C 1.1 through 1.4 and C 2.1 through 2.10	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.4.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in an increase in parking demand.	Policies: C 2.10, C 2.11, C 2.12, and C 5.1	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.4.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the reclassification of three street segments from local to collector streets. The three street segments are located on a portion of S. Claremont Avenue, Edison Street, and Fifth Avenue. The reclassification of Fifth Avenue would aggregate existing truck routes onto Fifth Avenue between Humboldt and Amphlett.	Policies: C 1.3, C 1.4, N 2.2	PS	**MM 4.4.6** Twenty (20) feet of on-street parking on the northeast side of Humboldt Street (one space) and 50 feet of on-street parking on the southeast side of Fifth Avenue (two spaces) shall be restricted by painting the curb red to allow adequate space for trucks turning at the intersection of Humboldt Street and Fifth Avenue.	LS
Impact 4.4.7 ~~Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in increased motor vehicle traffic, which would increase the amount of traffic on US 101 and SR 92.~~ Development associated with the proposed General Plan Update would result in substantial increases in traffic delays in the City of Belmont at the intersection of El Camino Real and Ralston Avenue in the PM peak hour.	Policies: C 2.10, C 2.11, C 2.12, C 3.1, C 3.2, ~~C~~LU 3.4, ~~C~~LU 3.5	CC	~~None Required~~ None available.	~~LCC~~SU

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impacts 4.4.8 Development associated with the proposed General Plan Update would result in increased traffic volumes on the eastbound SR 92 on-ramp from southbound El Camino Real, causing it to operate at above capacity levels.	Policies: C 2.10, C 2.11, C 2.12, C 3.1, C 3.2, ~~C~~LU 3.4, ~~C~~LU 3.5	CC	**MM 4.4.8** The SR 92/El Camino Real interchange shall be rebuilt in a manner determined to provide sufficient ramp capacity.	SU
Impact 4.4.9 Development associated with the proposed General Plan Update would result in the substantial worsening of operating conditions on the weaving section of SR 92 between El Camino Real and Delaware Street.	Policies: C 2.10, C 2.11, C 2.12, C 3.1, C 3.2, ~~C~~LU 3.4, ~~C~~LU 3.5	CC	**MM 4.4.9** The SR 92 weaving section shall be rebuilt in a manner determined to provide sufficient capacity and safety.	SU
Impact 4.4.10 Development associated with the proposed General Plan Update would result in the substantial worsening of freeway segments on US 101.	Policies: C 2.10, C 2.11, C 2.12, C 3.1, C 3.2, ~~C~~LU 3.4, ~~C~~LU 3.5	CC	**MM 4.4.10** The City shall require applicants for appropriate projects within the Rail Corridor Plan area to implement a TDM program to minimize traffic associated with their project.	SU
Impact 4.4.11 The proposed General Plan Update would result in the substantial worsening of operating conditions on the eastbound segment of SR 92, east of El Camino Real in the AM peak hour.	Policies: C 2.10, C 2.11, C 2.12, C 3.1, C 3.2, ~~C~~LU 3.4, ~~C~~LU 3.5	CC	**MM 4.4.11** Construct improvements to SR 92, including at least replacement of the weave section between El Camino Real and Delaware Street and rebuilding of the El Camino Real interchange.	

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
4.5 Air Quality				
Impact 4.5.1: Construction activities facilitated by the proposed General Plan Update and associated infrastructure construction activity would generate construction period exhaust emissions and fugitive dust that would affect local air quality.	Policies: None that apply	PS	**MM 4.51a** The City shall include policy provisions in the General Plan that require appropriate dust control measures, based on project size and latest BAAQMD guidance, be applied to all construction activities within San Mateo. **MM 4.51b** The City shall include General Plan policy provisions that require that applicants seeking demolition permits demonstrate compliance with applicable BAAQMD requirements involving lead paint and asbestos containing materials (ACMs) designed to mitigate exposure to lead paint and asbestos. **MM 4.51c** The City shall include General Plan policy provisions that require the utilization of construction emission control measures recommended by BAAQMD that are appropriate for the specifics of the project (e.g., length of time of construction and distance from sensitive receptors). This may include the utilization of low emission construction equipment, restrictions on the length of time of use of certain heavy-duty construction equipment, and utilization of methods to reduce emissions from construction equipment (alternative fuels, particulate matter traps and diesel particulate filters). These measures (as appropriate and feasible) will be made conditions of approval and/or mitigation to projects to ensure implementation.	LS

LS – Less Than Significant *PS – Potentially Significant* *S – Significant*
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable *CC – Cumulatively Considerable* *SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.5.2 Implementation of the General Plan Update may locate new sensitive receptors near existing or future sources of odors. In addition, existing sensitive receptors could be affected by new sources of odors developed under the General Plan Update.	Policies: None that apply	PS	**MM 4.5.2** The City shall include General Plan policy provisions that require that when new development that would be a source of odors is proposed near residences or sensitive receptors, either adequate buffer distances shall be provided (based on recommendations and requirements of the California Air Resources Control Board and BAAQMD), or filters or other equipment/solutions shall be provided to reduce the potential exposure to acceptable levels. Potential mitigation associated with this policy requirement will be coordinated with any required permit conditions from BAAQMD. When new residential or other sensitive receptors are proposed near existing sources of odors, either adequate buffer distances shall be provided (based on recommendations and requirements of the California Air Resources Control Board and BAAQMD), or filters or other equipment/solutions shall be provided to the source to reduce the potential exposure to acceptable levels.	LS
Impact 4.5.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would include sources of criteria pollutants, toxic air contaminants, that may affect surrounding land uses. The reclassification of Fifth Avenue between Humboldt Street and Amphlett Blvd. from a local street to a collector street would increase exposure to diesel particulate for adjacent land uses as a result of increased truck traffic. Sensitive land uses may also be located near existing sources of criteria pollutants, toxic air contaminants, or odors.	Policies: None that apply	PS	**MM 4.5.3** The City shall include General Plan policy provisions that require that when new development that would be a source of TACs is proposed near residences or sensitive receptors, either adequate buffer distances shall be provided (based on recommendations and requirements of the California Air Resources Control Board and BAAQMD), or filters or other equipment/solutions shall be provided to reduce the potential exposure to acceptable levels. Potential mitigation associated with this policy requirement will be coordinated with any required permit conditions from BAAQMD. When new residential or other sensitive receptors	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			are proposed near existing sources of TACs, either adequate buffer distances shall be provided (based on recommendations and requirements of the California Air Resources Control Board and BAAQMD), or filters or other equipment/solutions shall be provided to the source to reduce the potential exposure to acceptable levels.	
Impact 4.5.4 Future growth in traffic could cause increases to carbon monoxide levels at area intersections. However, overall concentration would remain below health-based ambient air quality standards.	No applicable policy provisions	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.5.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter and may conflict with BAAQMD air quality improvement efforts (e.g., Clean Air Plan, BAAQMD thresholds).	Policies: None that apply	LCC	None available	LCC
4.6 Noise				
Impact 4.6.1 Increased vehicle traffic resulting from the proposed General Plan Update land uses will result in increased ambient noise levels on local roadways.	Policies: N 1.1, N 1.2, N 2.2, N 2.3, N 2.4	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.6.2 Increased number of daily trains, from 98 per day to 110 per day, will result in increased ambient noise levels for adjacent receivers during the implementation of the General Plan Update.	Policies: N 2.5	LS	None required	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.6.3 Fixed noise sources (e.g., mechanical equipment) and temporary noise sources such as construction activity and landscaping can cause temporary or periodic increases in noise in excess of City standards as part of implementation of the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, new noise-sensitive land uses could be located adjacent to existing fixed noise sources.	Policies: N 2.1	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.6.4 Increased vehicle traffic resulting from the proposed General Plan Update land uses along with development in adjacent communities will result in increased ambient noise levels on local roadways.	Policies: N 1.1, N 1.2, N 2.2, N 2.3, N 2.4	LCC	None Required	LCC
4.7 Geology and Soils				
Impact 4.7.1 Land uses and development under the proposed City of San Mateo General Plan Update may expose additional people, structures, and development to ground shaking as a result of earthquakes resulting in the risk of loss, injury, or death.	Policies: S 1.1 and S 1.4	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.7.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update may expose additional people, structures, and development to seismic-related ground failures, including lateral spreading, lurching, and liquefaction, as well as potential failure of flood protection features resulting in the risk of loss, injury, or death.	Policies: C/OS 3.1, C/OS 3.2, S 1.1, S 1.2, S 1.3	LS	None required	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.7.3 Land uses and new development or redevelopment under the proposed General Plan Update may expose people, structures, and development to the effects of ground settlement resulting in the risk of loss, injury, or death.	Policies: S 1.1	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.7.4 Land uses and new development or redevelopment under the proposed General Plan Update is not expected to expose substantial numbers of people and structures to hazards associated with seismically induced tsunamis and seiches.	Policies: None that apply.	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.7.8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update along with potential development in the region could result in cumulative impacts to geologic and seismic hazards.	Policies: S 1.1, S 1.2, S 1.3, S 1.4, C/OS 3.1, C/OS 3.2	LCC	None required	LCC
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality				
Impact 4.8.1 Infill development or redevelopment under the proposed General Plan Update would include construction-related activities that could expose soil to erosion during storm events, causing degradation of water quality. Also the proposed General Plan Update could increase impervious surfaces and, as a result, alter drainage patterns and increase drainage rates and runoff over existing conditions. Runoff from urban uses may also contribute to the degradation of water quality in the area.	Policies: S 1.3, C/OS 2.6, and C/OS 3.2	LS	None Required	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.8.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the exposure of additional people and/or structures to potential risks from flooding hazards and sea level rise.	Policies: S 2.1 through S 2.6	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.8.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and rates in the Planning Area, which could contribute to cumulative flood conditions in the City of San Mateo.	Policies: S 2.1 through S 2.6	LCC	None Required	LCC
Impact 4.8.4 Land uses and growth under the proposed General Plan Update, in combination with current land uses in the surrounding cities of Belmont, Burlingame, and Foster City and the Town of Hillsborough and land use activities and development of the cities and other agencies in the county, could introduce additional non-point source pollutants to surface waters.	Policies: C/OS 2.6 and C/OS 3.2	LCC	None Required	LCC

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
4.9 Biological Resources				
Impact 4.9.1 Land uses and development consistent with the proposed General Plan Update could result in the loss of populations or essential habitat for special-status plant and animal species.	Policies: C/OS 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.8	S	**MM 4.9.1a** Add a new policy to state the following: The City shall seek to preserve wetlands, habitat corridors, sensitive natural communities, and other essential habitat areas that may be adversely affected by public or private development projects where special-status plant and animal species are known to be present or potentially occurring based on City biological resource mapping or other technical material. Implementation Measure: The City shall protect sensitive biological resources and habitat corridors through environmental review of development applications in compliance with CEQA provisions, participation in comprehensive habitat management programs with other local and resource agencies, and continued management of open space lands that provide for protection of important natural habitats. Protect wetlands and waters of the United States in accordance with the regulations of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and other appropriate agencies. **MM 4.9.1b** Amend Policy C/OS 5.2 to state the following: The site evaluation required shall determine the presence/absence of these special-status plant and animal species on the site. The surveys associated with the evaluation shall be conducted for proper identification of the species. The evaluation will consider the potential for significant impacts on special-status plant and animal species and will identify feasible mitigation measures to mitigate such impacts to the satisfaction of the City and appropriate governmental agencies (e.g., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			Game). Require adequate mitigation measures for ensuring the protection of sensitive resources and achieving "no net loss" of sensitive habitat acreage, values and functions. In lieu of the site evaluation, presence of special-status plant and animal species may be assumed and mitigation requiring "no net loss" of sensitive habitat acreage may be applied.	
Impact 4.9.2 Land uses and development consistent with the proposed General Plan Update could result in the loss of riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.	Policies: C/OS 2.3, C/OS 2.5, S 2.1, S 2.2	PS	**MM 4.9.2a** Add a new policy to state the following: Restrict or modify proposed development in areas that contain wetlands or waters of the U.S., as defined by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers delineations, as necessary to ensure the continued health and survival of special-status species and sensitive habitat areas. Development projects shall preferably be designed to avoid impacts on sensitive resources, or to adequately mitigate impacts by providing on-site replacement or (as a lowest priority) off-site replacement at a higher ratio. Modification in project design shall include adequate avoidance measures to ensure that no net loss of wetland acreage, function, water quality protection, and habitat value occurs. This may include the use of setbacks, buffers, and water quality, drainage control features, or other measures to maintain existing habitat and hydrologic functions of retained wetlands and waters of the U.S. **MM 4.9.2b** Add a new policy to state the following: Design public access to avoid or minimize disturbance to sensitive resources, including necessary setback/buffer areas, while facilitating public use, enjoyment, and appreciation of wetlands. **MM 4.9.2c** Add a new policy to state the following: Avoid wetlands development where	LS

LS – Less Than Significant *PS – Potentially Significant* *S – Significant*
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable *CC – Cumulatively Considerable* *SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			feasible (as defined under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15364). Where complete avoidance of jurisdictional wetlands is not feasible (as defined under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15364), require provision of replacement habitat on-site through restoration and/or habitat creation that would ensure no net loss of wetland acreage, function, water quality protection, and habitat value. Allow restoration of wetlands off-site only when an applicant has demonstrated that no net loss of wetlands would occur and that on-site restoration is not feasible. Off-site wetland mitigation preferably will consist of the same habitat type as the wetland area that would be lost.	
Impact 4.9.3 Land uses and development consistent with the proposed General Plan Update could restrict aquatic or terrestrial wildlife movement through travel corridors.	Policies: C/OS 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.8	PS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.9.4 Proposed policies in the General Plan Update that affect biological resources may differ from local policies and ordinances currently in effect. However, potential conflicts would be addressed by the revisions of the implementing ordinances to ensure that they conform to the proposed policies.	Policies: C/OS 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.8	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.9.5 Land uses and development consistent with the proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plans.	Policies: C/OS 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.8	LS	None Required	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.9.6 The proposed project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in direct mortality and loss of habitat for special-status species and waters of the U.S., including wetlands.	Policies: C/OS 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.8	CC	None Required	LCC
4.10 Cultural and Paleontological Resources				
Impact 4.10.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in the potential disturbance of cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) and human remains.	Policies: C/OS 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.10.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, in addition to existing, approved, proposed, and foreseeable development in the City, could result in cumulative impacts to cultural resources.	Policies: C/OS 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5	CC	None required	LCC
4.11 Public Services				
Impact 4.11.1.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical service.	Policies: LU 4.20, 4.24, 4.25, 4.26, 4.27, and 4.28	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.11.1.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update along with potential development in the surrounding area could contribute to the cumulative demand for fire protection and emergency medical services.	Policies: LU 4.20, 4.24, 4.25, 4.26, 4.27, and 4.28	LCC	None required	LCC

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.11.2.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in an increased demand for law enforcement services.	Policies: LU 4.29 and LU 4.30	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.11.2.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update along with potential development in the surrounding area could result in the increase of the demand for cumulative law enforcement services.	Policies: LU 4.29 and LU 4.30	LCC	None required	LCC
Impact 4.11.3.1 Land uses and development under the proposed City of San Mateo General Plan Update would increase population and subsequent student enrollment in the districts' schools and may require new or expanded school facilities to serve the increased demand.	Policies: LU 4.14 and LU 4.15	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.11.3.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update as well as potential development in the surrounding area could result in cumulative public school impacts.	Policies: LU 4.14 and LU 4.15	LCC	None required	LCC
Impact 4.11.4.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could increase demand for water supply to the City of San Mateo.	Policies: LU 4.2, 4.4, 4.28, 8.2, 8.6, and 8.7	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.11.4.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with cumulative development in the region, would contribute to an increased demand for water supplies, requiring increased surface water and groundwater production and construction of associated infrastructure.	Policies: LU 4.2, 4.4, 4.28, 8.2, 8.6, and 8.7	LCC	None Required	LCC

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.11.5.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could increase wastewater flows and demand for sanitary sewer conveyance and treatment facilities.	Policies: LU 4.5 and LU 4.7	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.11.5.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update along with growth in the service area would result in cumulative wastewater impacts.	Policies: LU 4.5 and LU 4.7	LCC	None required	LCC
Impact 4.11.6.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could increase solid waste generation and the demand for related services.	Policies: LU 4.31, 4.32, 8.5, and 8.8	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.11.6.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update along with potential development in surrounding communities would result in cumulative solid waste impacts.	Policies: LU 4.31, 4.32, 8.5, and 8.8	LCC	None required	LCC
Impact 4.11.7.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would increase the demand for electric, telephone, and natural gas services.	Policies: LU 4.16 and LU 8.4	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.11.7.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update along with potential development in the surrounding region would result in cumulative electric, telephone, and natural gas service impacts.	Policies: LU 4.16 and LU 8.4	LCC	None required	LCC

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.11.8.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could increase population and subsequently increase the demand for park and recreation related services.	Policies: C/OS 12.1 through 12.7 C/OS 13.1 through 13.4 C/OS 13.6 through 13.7 C/OS 14.1 through 14.10 C/OS 15.1 through 15.3 C/OS 16.4 through 16.6 C/OS 17.3	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.11.8.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update along with potential development in the surrounding region may result in cumulative park and recreation impacts.	Policies: C/OS 12.1 through 12.7 C/OS 13.1 through 13.4 C/OS 13.6 through 13.7 C/OS 14.1 through 14.10 C/OS 15.1 through 15.3 C/OS 16.4 through 16.6 C/OS 17.3	LCC	None required	LCC
4.12 Visual Resources and Aesthetics				
Impact 4.12.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in an alteration of a scenic vista or resource.	Policies: LU 1.2, 3.2, and 3.3 UD 1.1 through 1.8 C/OS 1.3, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, C/OS 6.1 through 6.8 C/OS 8.1 through 8.4 C/OS 9.2 and 10.1	LS	None required	LS

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.12.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in an alteration of visual character.	Policies: LU 1.2, 3.2, and 3.3 UD 1.1 through 1.8 C/OS 1.3, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, C/OS 6.1 through 6.8 C/OS 8.1 through 8.4 C/OS 9.2 and 10.1	LS	None required	LS
Impact 4.12.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in an increase of daytime glare and/or nighttime lighting.	Policies: LU 1.2, 3.2, and 3.3 UD 1.1 through 1.8 C/OS 1.3, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, C/OS 6.1 through 6.8 C/OS 8.1 through 8.4 C/OS 9.2 and 10.1	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.13.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not result in the significant conversion of the City's open space and visual resources.	Policies: LU 1.2, 3.2, and 3.3 UD 1.1 through 1.8 C/OS 1.3, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, C/OS 6.1 through 6.8 C/OS 8.1 through 8.4 C/OS 9.2 and 10.1	LCC		LCC

LS – Less Than Significant ***PS – Potentially Significant*** ***S – Significant***
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable ***CC – Cumulatively Considerable*** ***SU – Significant and Unavoidable***

Impact	General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
4.13 Climate Change				
Impact 4.13.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would implement a number of policies as well as continue the implementation of existing City programs that would complement and be consistent with the early emission reduction strategies contained in the California Climate Action Team's (CAT) Report to the Governor and Executive Order S-3-05 as well as the recommendations from OPR..	Policies: C/OS 3.2, 4.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.8, 9.4, 13.4, 13.6, 14.9, 17.1 UD 2.9 and 2.14 C 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, and 3.10	LCC	None Required	LCC
Impact 4.13.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could substantially increase emissions of GHGs over existing conditions that could result in environmental effects to the City.	Policies: C/OS 3.2, 4.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.8, 9.4, 13.4, 13.6, 14.9, 17.1 UD 2.9 and 2.14 C 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, and 3.10	LCC	None Required	LCC

LS – Less Than Significant *PS – Potentially Significant* *S – Significant*
LCC – Less Than Cumulatively Considerable *CC – Cumulatively Considerable* *SU – Significant and Unavoidable*