

INITIAL STUDY
FOR THE
BRISBANE BAYLANDS
PHASE I SPECIFIC PLAN

CITY OF BRISBANE
LEAD AGENCY

UNIVERSAL PARAGON CORPORATION
APPLICANT

FEBRUARY 22, 2006

1. **Project Title:**
Brisbane Baylands Phase I Specific Plan (Case SP-1-06)
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
City of Brisbane
50 Park Place
Brisbane, CA 94005
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
John Swiecki, AICP, Principal Planner
415/508-2120 FAX 415/467-5547
jswiecki@ci.brisbane.ca.us
4. **Project Location:**
The Phase I *Specific Plan* involves approximately 449-acres within the City of Brisbane, east of US 101 and west of the Union Pacific/Caltrain railroad tracks and south of the Sunset Scavenger waste collection/recycling center and San Francisco City limits.

The larger Specific Plan framework area includes 659 acres between US 101 and Bayshore Boulevard on the east and west and San Francisco city limits on the north, in the City of Brisbane.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Universal Paragon Corporation
150 Executive Park Boulevard, Suite 4200
San Francisco, CA 94134
6. **General Plan Designation:**
The entire project site is within the Baylands subarea as defined in the 1994 Brisbane General Plan. The land use designations for the Baylands subarea are “Planned Development – Trade Commercial, Lagoon, and Bayfront.” The development parameters for the Planned Development -- Trade Commercial portions require a minimum of 25% open space/open area, with development at a 2.4 or lower Floor/Area Ratio (FAR) south of the central drainage channel and a 0 - 4.8 FAR north of the central drainage channel. Lagoon and Bayfront are open space designations.
7. **Zoning:**
C-1 Commercial Mixed Use, Marsh Lagoon Bayfront. The C-1 district requires preparation of a specific plan prior to development within this zoning district.
8. **Description of the Project:**
The Phase I Specific Plan proposes approximately 107 acres of commercial, 68 acres office/institutional, 118 acres of aquatic open space, 99 acres of upland open space/open area and 54 acres of right of way. The plan also includes a framework plan addressing basic parameters associated with circulation, land use, open space, infrastructure and utilities for potential future development of a larger approximately 659 acre area, including the Phase I

Specific Plan area along with adjacent properties generally situated to the west, between the Caltrain rail line and Bayshore Boulevard. The project is described in more detail in the text and drawings found in the Executive Summary from the proposed Phase I *Specific Plan*, which is attached.

9. Surrounding Land uses and Setting:

The proposed project site consists of artificial fill that was placed in the marshlands and tidal flats at the mouth of Visitation Valley beginning about 120 years ago. The upland area east of the railroad corridor was a former solid waste disposal area. The landfilling operations ceased about 40 years ago, and a soil cover of between 20 and 30 feet has been placed over much of the area.

The only existing development within the Phase I area includes two building supply businesses (Sierra Lumber and Van Arsdale-Harris) that are located in the northwest corner. The Specific Plan calls for relocation of these businesses to a new site within the planning area, adjacent to the railroad. Kinder Morgan Energy Partners owns a fuel tank farm on 23.5 acres of inholding land surrounded by UPC land. The Kinder Morgan facilities are expected to remain and are not a part of the Specific Plan.

The north end of the planning area is bounded by the Sunset Scavenger waste collection and recycling center. The Union Pacific/Caltrain tracks bisect the larger Baylands area and form the western boundary of the Phase I planning area. The larger “framework” area is bounded by Bayshore Boulevard and commercial and industrial development, including PG&E’s Martin substation, to the west, central Brisbane to the southwest, and commercial and manufacturing uses within Daly City to the northwest (Daly City’s Bayshore Redevelopment Area). San Francisco’s Visitation Valley area borders the planning area on the north, including the Sunset Scavenger facilities, the former Schlage Lock Facility, other industrial properties and parking for the Bayshore Caltrain Station.

The Phase 1 area is largely undeveloped, comprising mainly disturbed areas that were formerly part of a sanitary landfill, which has been used as a repository for clean fill materials from construction sites in the region for the past 3 decades or longer. Elevations are variable, but no part of the Phase I site is over 30 feet. There is an east-west drainage channel through the site that supports a narrow strip of wetland and riparian vegetation. Brisbane Lagoon occupies the southern end of the Phase I area. Both the General Plan and the Specific Plan call for its preservation.

The western 180-acre portion of the larger site, that is outside the Phase I planning area was a Southern Pacific Railroad switching yard until 1988. The site is generally level, and vacant, except for several remaining buildings from the railroad era.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

Implementation of the Phase I Specific Plan may require permits from a number of agencies, in addition to the City of Brisbane. These may include:

- Caltrans
- Regional Water Quality Control Board

Department of Toxic Substances Control
San Mateo County Health Services Agency
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Department of Fish and Game
San Mateo City/County Transportation Authority
City/County Association of Governments
San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
US Army Corps of Engineers

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Agriculture Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Land Use/Planning
- Population and Housing
- Transportation/Traffic

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation which reflects the independent judgement of the Community Development Department:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures have been added to the project (see attached recommended mitigation measures.) A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Date

John A. Swiecki, Principal Planner

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The project would greatly changes views to the site from many areas in Brisbane, San Bruno Mountain, US 101, Bayshore Boulevard, and other surrounding locations. The EIR should address the visual changes that would result from development of the site, and describe new public views that would be created by the project.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

The site lies adjacent to San Francisco Bay. The potential impacts of the project in regard public views of the bay shall be evaluated in the forthcoming DEIR.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The existing site is primarily open and partially disturbed. The project will result in significant changes to the site's visual qualities, and this should be fully addressed in the forthcoming EIR.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Impacts associated with lighting shall be addressed.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Convert farmland to non-agricultural use or otherwise impact agricultural operations?

The site does not contain agricultural uses or state-designated farmland.

III. AIR QUALITY: Would the

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

project:

a) Conflict with the Bay Area Clean Air Plan?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Potential air quality impacts during construction and operation of the project should be addressed in the EIR.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See response IIIa.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See response IIIa.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Potential air quality impacts on any existing or planned sensitive receptors should be addressed in the EIR, along with any potential effects of the continuing Sunset Scavenger operations on future site land uses.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See response IIIa.

f) Alter wind, moisture or temperature so as to substantially affect public areas or change the climate, either in the community or the region?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not affect climate, but it involves creation of a significant activity center that would bring a number of people from the community and region to a site that is directly exposed to strong seasonal winds blowing through a gap in the coastal hills. The cool winds could adversely affect human comfort levels on many days of the year, and the addition of new structures could increase ground level wind turbulence in some locations. The EIR should include a description of the site's climate and wind patterns, assess potential adverse human comfort constraints and impacts and develop appropriate mitigation measures.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Biological studies completed in 2001 (Wetlands Research Associates) and 2003 (Burns and MacDonnell Engineering) have not identified any special status plant or animal species on the site. These studies may serve as background sources, but the biological section of the EIR should independently confirm their results and conclusions.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Riparian vegetation is found along some of the drainage channels on the site, but the habitat quality is considered low. The Specific Plan calls for improving riparian habitat as part Visitation Creek Park. The EIR should assess the existing riparian habitat value, review the plans for riparian habitat restoration and identify mitigation measures, as appropriate, to assist in its successful implementation.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Intertidal, estuarine wetlands and emergent freshwater wetland have been identified on the Phase I site and in the larger Baylands area. They have been mapped and the jurisdictional wetlands delineation has been accepted by the US Army Corps of Engineers. A Wetlands Mitigation Plan has been prepared by UPC and would be incorporated into Visitation Park (east) as part of the Phase I Specific Plan. The EIR should verify the extent and amount of wetlands, and evaluate plans for wetlands restoration and creation and identify mitigation measures, as appropriate, to assist in their successful implementation.

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

While the drainage channels and upland areas of the site appear to have low habitat value for both fish and wildlife, this issue should be addressed in the forthcoming DEIR. Migratory waterfowl commonly use Brisbane Lagoon, which is proposed to be retained. Potential effects on its habitat value should be assessed in the EIR.

e) Conflict with the City of Brisbane Tree Regulations protecting biological resources?

While it appears unlikely that mature trees to be impacted by this proposal, the DEIR should verify this conclusion.

f) Conflict with the provisions of the San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan?

It is not expected that the project would any direct, or significant indirect effects on the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan, although this should be confirmed in the EIR.

g) Impact wildlife resources pursuant to Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code?

See response IVb.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?

Several historic structures are found within the larger Baylands area, although it is not believed that any are located within the Phase I Specific Plan boundaries. The EIR should inventory all structures that may be potentially affected and identify those on or potentially eligible for the State or National Historic Registers. Mitigation measures, including, as appropriate, guidelines for the adaptive reuse of the historic structures should be included in the EIR.

b.) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

resource?

There are no prehistoric archaeological resources in the project area, because the site is part of a landform that was created by artificial fill in historical times.

c) Impact a unique paleontological resource or site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There are no known unique paleontological resources or geologic features on the project site that could be affected by the proposed project.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No impacts from the disturbance of human remains are anticipated.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The site does not lie within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

The project is in a seismically active area, and could be subject to significant ground shaking in the event of a major earthquake. Seismic risks should be addressed in the EIR and mitigation should be developed.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is characterized as having a high to very high potential for seismic related ground failure, such as liquefaction, and this issue, including mitigation measures to address this risk, should be developed in the EIR.

iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Phase I Specific Plan area is located on flat terrain and is not at risk from landslides. A

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

general assessment of landslides hazards (if any) on Icehouse Hill, which is in the Baylands Framework Plan should be included in the EIR.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Past landfilling operations on the site have involved on-going soil erosion control mitigation. Grading and earthwork for site grading, construction of infrastructure, landscaping and park areas and the new buildings would have the potential for soil erosion impacts and mitigation should be developed in the EIR.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Virtually the entire Phase I Specific Plan site lies within a former municipal landfill and is potentially subject to differential settlement. This issue shall be fully analyzed in the forthcoming DEIR.

d) Be located on expansive soil as defined in the Uniform Building Code?

The EIR should review existing soils data, and recommend mitigation for expansive soils, if present.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:
Would the project:**

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The phase I specific plan is a formal municipal landfill and the larger framework plan area includes separately defined hazardous sites under the jurisdiction of State Department of Toxic Substance Control and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The EIR shall review existing information regarding potential presence of hazardous materials on the site, evaluate the adequacy of existing risk assessment data for purposes of completing CEQA review, identify potential impacts and propose mitigation measures, as appropriate.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

See response VIIa.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The site does not lie within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5?

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The larger site lies on the State's hazardous sites list, and the DEIR shall address impacts associated with hazardous materials.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The site does not lie within an airport influence area.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The specific plan shall be evaluated to ensure that no adverse impacts to emergency response or evacuation plans will result.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The site is not within an area at risk from wildland fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a) Substantially degrade water quality and/or violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

-
-
-
-

Water quality impairments have resulted from leachate emanating from the former landfill areas, from oily contaminants in water running off the former railroad site, and from other sources of water pollution. Water quality investigations have been conducted at the instigation of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and monitoring, remediation and mitigation actions have been implemented, and are continuing. The EIR should assess any potential effects that implementation of the Specific Plan might have on continuing efforts to bring the site into conformance with water quality standards and minimize future water pollution from sources on the site.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies, adversely impact groundwater quality, or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge?

-
-
-
-

The DEIR shall evaluate impacts of the project on groundwater quality.

c) Alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?

-
-
-
-

The project would alter the drainage pattern on portions of the site. The Specific Plan includes a grading plan, a storm drain infrastructure, new wetlands, bioswale areas and other drainage features intended to minimize soil erosion and water pollution in runoff from the site. These features should be described in the EIR and the potential adverse impacts, if any, should be noted, and mitigation should be developed.

d) Alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding?

-
-
-
-

The project would alter the drainage patterns on both the Phase I and larger Specific Plan area. The effectiveness of the proposed drainage system and its consistency and compatibility with Brisbane Storm Drainage Master Plan should be assessed in the EIR and mitigation measures developed, as necessary.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater

-
-
-
-

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

drainage systems?

See response VIIIa.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See response VIIIa.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

No residential uses are proposed within the Baylands.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Specific Plan calls for new or reconstructed bridges, storm sewers and storm sewer outfalls, and other structures along the Visitation Creek channel. The potential for any of these facilities to impede flood flows should be investigated in the EIR.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See response VIIIh.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Because of its location the project site is not subject to risk from seiche or mudflows. Portions of the site may be subject to tsunami inundation, and it would be appropriate to evaluate this issue in the forthcoming DEIR.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project is generally isolated and disconnected from most residential and commercial areas of Brisbane, as well as Daly City and San Francisco to the north and northwest. The DEIR shall evaluate how the specific plan provides a level of connectivity and compatibility with adjacent existing development.

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Conflict with the General Plan or other applicable City land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The conformance of the Specific Plan with the Brisbane General Plan shall be addressed in the EIR

c) Conflict with any applicable regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Portions of the site lie within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). The EIR shall evaluate the consistency of the project with applicable BCDC regulations and policies.

d) Conflict with the San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan?

While the project site does not lie within the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan area, it would be appropriate for the EIR to analyze the project against this document to ensure that no direct or indirect conflicts shall result.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES:
Would the project:**

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be either locally important or of value to residents of the state and region?

No state or locally important designated mineral resources occur on the site.

XI. NOISE: Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan and/or noise ordinance?

The project site is exposed to noise from the adjacent freeway and railroad corridors. The Specific Plan calls for the construction of new buildings, and outdoor areas where people will congregate, which may be located in high noise exposure zones. In addition, some of the proposed new streets may become new sources of environmental noise, potentially requiring

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

mitigation. The EIR should include a comprehensive noise impact assessment, including mitigation measures, as warranted.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The railroad corridor may be a source of groundborne vibration with the potential to have adverse effects on people in structures located nearby. The EIR shall address the potential for vibration impacts, and mitigation proposed, as necessary.

c) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Implementation of the Specific Plan would add new sources of noise that would, in some locations, be higher than existing levels. This shall be fully analyzed in the forthcoming DEIR and mitigated as necessary. This analysis shall also address noise impacts associated with construction activity

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The site does not lie within an airport influence area.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Specific Plan does not propose residential development, and would not directly increase the population of Brisbane. Indirectly, it has growth inducing potential, because it would greatly increase employment opportunities. The growth inducing impacts of the project shall be assessed in the EIR.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or persons, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No housing exists within the project area.

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES:

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following:

i) Fire protection?

The project will result in increased demand for public services such as fire and police protection. The DEIR shall evaluate the potential impacts of the project on the provision of public services.

ii) Police protection?

See response XIIIai.

iii) Schools?

As the project will not directly result in population growth within Brisbane, any indirect impacts on schools resulting with the project shall be analyzed in the forthcoming DEIR.

iv) Parks?

The project proposes additional parklands, and these impacts shall be evaluated in the forthcoming DEIR.

v) Other public facilities?

The project would affect streets, highways, transit systems, and all utilities. These impacts would be addressed in applicable sections of the EIR.

XIV. RECREATION: Does the project:

a) Increase the demand for existing parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

The proposed specific plan is not anticipated to substantially increase demand on existing park and recreational facilities.

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Development of the Visitation Creek Parkway and the recreational and public access areas around Brisbane Lagoon, as proposed in the Specific Plan, could have potential impacts related to water quality, landform alteration, hydrology, biology, and noise. These effects should be addressed in the respective topical sections of the EIR, as noted, and summarized in land use section.

XV.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | ■ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would generate substantial amounts of new traffic, and could adversely affect the service levels of a number of intersections, and highway segments. The EIR should include a comprehensive traffic and transportation evaluation. While the applicant has had a traffic study prepared for use in drafting the specific plan, this will serve as background information for the traffic study to be prepared as part of the EIR.

- | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the City or county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | ■ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Traffic from the Specific Plan area could result in level of service standard exceedances on CMA designated roadway segments. These potential impacts should be addressed in the EIR, and mitigation developed, to the extent feasible.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? | ■ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The DEIR shall analyze the specific plan to ensure that no hazardous design features result.

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

The DEIR shall include an evaluation of whether or not the project as designed provides adequate emergency access.

e) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

The adequacy of parking standards proposed in the Specific Plan should be evaluated in the EIR and mitigation developed, if necessary.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

The standards established in the Specific Plan for non-auto transportation related facilities shall be evaluated in the EIR, and mitigation developed, if necessary.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board?

The adequacy of the project’s proposed wastewater collection and treatment facilities shall be assessed in the EIR.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

See response XVIa.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The adequacy of the project’s proposed storm water drainage facilities should be assessed in the EIR. See also, Hydrology, above.

d) Have insufficient water supplies

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources?

Brisbane’s ability to supply water for the proposed Specific Plan shall be evaluated in the EIR..

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to its existing commitments?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See response XVIa.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Solid waste generation from the proposed project should be estimated, and the ability of existing landfills to accommodate it should be assessed in the EIR. Additionally, the ability of the project to comply with solid waste statutes and regulations shall be evaluated in the EIR.

g) Create a demand for energy that exceeds regional or local capacity, either on a peak or cumulative basis?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The forthcoming DEIR shall address the project's energy demand to ensure that adequate supply is available to serve the project.

h) Comply with adopted resource efficiency standards?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The City of Brisbane is considering the adoption of LEED standards. Compliance of the project with the proposed standards shall be considered in the forthcoming DEIR.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels,	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

ISSUE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

The EIR will address potential impacts on biological and historic resources.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?	■	□	□	□
--	---	---	---	---

The Specific Plan has the potential to result in cumulative impacts, and the EIR shall include a section describing and evaluating the potential cumulative impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	■	□	□	□
---	---	---	---	---

The potential impacts of the project on human beings will be addressed in the recommended EIR.

RECOMMENDATION

- That the project will not have a significant effect on the environment and a Negative Declaration should be adopted by the City Council. The proposed Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgement of the City of Brisbane.

- It has been found that the project may have a significant effect on the environment and an Environmental Impact Report should be required. The EIR shall address the following topics: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Hazards/Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Land Use/Planning, Noise, Population/Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, Utilities, and Mandatory Findings of Significance.

- There is no evidence before the agency that the proposed project will have any potential for adverse effect on wildlife resources, and the impacts of the project are de minimis pursuant to Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game code.

Signature _____ Date _____

Case Number: SP-1-06