2. *Executive Summary*

This chapter presents an overview of the proposed Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan Update (Specific Plan Update) and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) #1 and #2, herein referred to as "proposed Project." This executive summary provides a summary of the proposed Project, a summary of the alternatives to the proposed Project, identifies issues to be resolved, areas of concern, and conclusions of the analysis contained in Chapters 4.0 through 4.14 of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). For a complete description of the proposed Project, see Chapter 3, and for a discussion of alternatives to the proposed Project, see Chapters 5 through 5.3 of this Draft EIR.

This Draft EIR addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed Project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An EIR is a public document designed to provide the public, and local and State governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making.

This Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et seq.) to determine if approval of the identified discretionary actions and related subsequent development under the Specific Plan Update, and the development of the TOD #1 and TOD #2 projects, could have a significant impact on the environment. The City of Millbrae, as the Lead Agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable City technical personnel and review of all technical subconsultant reports. Information for this Draft EIR was obtained from on-site field observations; discussions with affected agencies; analysis of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies, reports, data, and similar literature in the public domain; and specialized environmental assessments (e.g. air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic).

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This Draft EIR has been prepared to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed Project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. The main purposes of this document as established by CEQA are:

- To disclose to decision-makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
- To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.

- To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in the statutes and in the CEQA Guidelines. It provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed Project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

2.1.1 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction.** Provides an overview describing the Draft EIR document.
- **Chapter 2: Executive Summary.** Summarizes the environmental consequences that would result from implementation of the proposed Project, the alternatives to the proposed Project, the recommended mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of environmental impacts with and without mitigation.
- **Chapter 3: Project Description.** Describes the proposed Project in detail, including the site location and characteristics, objectives, and the structural and technical elements of the proposed action.
- **Chapter 4: Environmental Evaluation.** Organized into 14 sub-chapters corresponding to the environmental resource categories identified in Appendix G, Environmental Checklist, of the CEQA Guidelines, this section provides a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed Project as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, from both a local and regional perspective, as well as an analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project, and recommended mitigation measures, if required, to reduce their significance. The environmental setting included in each sub-chapter provides baseline physical conditions from which the Lead Agency determines the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed Project. Each sub-chapter also includes a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed Project; and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Project.
- **Chapter 5: Alternatives to the Proposed Project.** Considers two alternatives to the proposed Project, including the CEQA-required "No Project" Alternative and Lower Intensity Alternative.

- **Chapter 6: CEQA-Mandated Assessment.** Discusses growth inducement, cumulative impacts, unavoidable significant effects, and significant irreversible changes as a result of the proposed Project. Additionally, this chapter identifies environmental issues that were determined not to require further environmental review during the scoping process pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15128.
- **Chapter 7: Organizations and Persons Consulted.** Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR for the proposed Project.
- **Chapter 8: Common Acronyms and Abbreviations.** Lists the common acronyms and abbreviations found in this Draft EIR.
- **Appendices:** The appendices for this document (presented in PDF format on a CD attached to the back cover of the Draft EIR) contain the following supporting documents:
  - Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Scoping Comments
  - Appendix B: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Data
  - Appendix C: Cultural Resources Data
  - Appendix D: Geotechnical Data
  - Appendix E: Hazards and Hazardous Materials Data
  - Appendix F: Noise Data
  - Appendix G: Public Services Data
  - Appendix H: Transportation and Traffic Data
  - Appendix I: Utilities Data
  - Appendix J: Specific Plan Update Policies

2.1.2 PURPOSE OF DRAFT EIR

According to Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of an EIR is to:

> *Inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.*

The Project that is the subject of this EIR includes both the proposed Specific Plan Update, a long-term plan that will be implemented over time as a policy document guiding future development activities, and two specific TOD development projects (TOD #1 project and TOD #2 project). Therefore, this EIR serves as both a program- and project-level EIR. This EIR discloses and evaluates the environmental impacts associated with the policies, development standards, and anticipated buildout of the proposed Specific Plan Update at a program level, and the environmental impacts associated with the two TOD projects at a project level. The programmatic portion of this EIR is generally more qualitative in nature than the project-specific, more quantitative portion of the EIR.

The programmatic portion of this EIR does not evaluate the impacts of future individual projects that may be proposed under the Specific Plan Update. However, if the program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as is reasonably possible, and later activities are within scope of the effects examined in the program EIR, then additional environmental review may not be required for those future projects.

(See CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c] and CEQA streamlining provisions.) When a program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into the subsequent activities (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c][3]). If a subsequent activity would have effects that are not within the scope of the program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR unless the activity qualifies for an exemption. For these subsequent environmental review documents, this program EIR will serve as the first-tier environmental analysis. The program EIR can also serve to streamline future environmental review of subsequent projects.

See Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.3, Type of EIR, of this Draft EIR for a detailed discussion on the environmental review applied in this EIR.

2.2 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT

As previously stated, the proposed Project analyzed by this Draft EIR includes two primary components: (1) the adoption and implementation of the Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan Update and associated General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments;[1] and (2) the approval and construction of two individual TOD projects. The Specific Plan Update contains land use, urban design, and circulation goals, policies, and strategies to guide investment and development in the Specific Plan Area over the next 25 years. Because the Specific Plan is the guiding regulatory document for Specific Plan Area, the associated the General Plan and Zoning Amendments are necessary to ensure that the land use and zoning designations, policies, and development standards in these documents are consistent with the proposed Specific Plan Update. The two individual proposed TOD projects propose new mixed-use development adjacent to the Millbrae Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)/Caltrain Station (Millbrae Station) on the Millbrae Serra Station properties located immediately west of the Millbrae Station and the BART-owned site that is located immediately east of the Millbrae Station. A summary of the buildout projections for the proposed Project are shown in Table 2-1.

This Draft EIR compares the buildout potential[2] of the Specific Plan Area and the development of the proposed TOD #1 and TOD #2 projects with the existing baseline condition, described in detail in each resource section of Chapter 4.0, Environmental Analysis, of this Draft EIR. A detailed description of the proposed Project is provided in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR.

[1] See Sections 3.2.8, 3.3.7, and 3.4.7, Required Approvals, of this chapter, for a discussion on the required approvals for each Project component.

[2] Buildout potential is defined as the maximum theoretical amount of development that could occur within the 25-year horizon of the Specific Plan Update.

TABLE 2-1 PROPOSED PROJECT BUILDOUT PROJECTIONS SUMMARY

	Office SF	Retail SF	Industrial/ Non-Retail[a] SF	Residential Units[b]	Hotel Rooms	Permanent Population[c]	Employees[d]
Existing Specific Plan							
Total Existing[e]	*76,100*	*132,575*	*335,240*	*308*	*39*	*816*	*1,002*
Specific Plan Update							
TOD #1 Project	267,000	32,000	0	500	0	1,325	1,148
TOD #2 Project	164,535	46,935	0	321	116	851	868
Remaining Specific Plan Area[f]	1,213,300	101,700	0	617	124	1,635	5,207
Total Net Increase[g]	*1,577,235*	*142,535*	*-335,240*	*1,440*	*325*	*3,808*	*6,590*
Total Buildout[h]	***1,653,340***	***275,110***	***0***	***1,750***	***370***	***4,640***	***7,600***

Notes: SF = square feet, TOD = transit-oriented development.
a. The proposed Project does not include Industrial/Non-Retail land uses.
b. The proposed residential development would be multi-family units.
c. Population is based on 2.65 persons per dwelling units consistent with U.S. Census Bureau's 2005-2009 American Community Survey 5 year estimates.
d. Jobs are calculated by applying 1 job/250 sf for office; 1 job/400 sf for retail; 1 job/1,000 sf industrial/non-retail; and 1 job per 1.25 hotel rooms.
e. The total existing represents what is currently developed (i.e. built on the ground).
f. The "Remaining Specific Plan Area" includes the projected buildout excluding the TOD #1 and #2 project sites.
g. The total net increase represents the amount of new development beyond what is currently developed and what is proposed to be redeveloped under the Specific Plan Update.
h. Total buildout is the "total existing" development in the Specific Plan Area plus the "total net increase" of the proposed Project. The total buildout numbers are rounded up to the nearest tenth.

2.3 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This Draft EIR analyzes alternatives to the proposed Project that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the proposed Project and feasibly attain some of the proposed Project objectives. There is no set methodology for comparing the alternatives or determining the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative involves weighing and balancing all of the environmental resource areas by the City. The following alternatives to the proposed Project were considered and analyzed in detail:

- No Project Alternative
- Lower Intensity Alternative

Chapters 5 through 5.3, of this Draft EIR, includes a complete discussion of these alternatives and of alternatives that were considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis.

2.4 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed Project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the City of Millbrae, as Lead Agency, related to:

- Whether this Draft EIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the proposed Project.
- Whether the benefits of the proposed Project override those environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
- Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.
- Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
- Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the proposed Project besides those Mitigation Measures identified in the Draft EIR.
- Whether there are any alternatives to the proposed Project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed Project and achieve most of the basic objectives.

2.5 AREAS OF CONCERN

The City issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on September 20, 2014 and held a Scoping Meeting on September 30, 2014 to receive comments on the proposed Project from interested agencies and members of the public. On October 24, the City reissued a NOP to extend the comment period to November 24, 2014. During the 67-day NOP comment period interested agencies and members of the public submitted comments about the proposed Project. In addition to the comments received at the Scoping Meeting, the City received 21 comment letters from 10 agencies, 2 non-profit organizations, and 5 members of the public during the public review period. A summary of the comments received at the Scoping Meeting and copies of the letters received are provided in Appendix A, Notice of Preparation and Scoping Comments, of this Draft EIR.

The following is a discussion of issues that are likely to be of particular concern to agencies and interested members of the public during the environmental review process. While every concern applicable to the CEQA process is addressed in this Draft EIR, this list is not necessarily exhaustive, but rather attempts to capture those concerns that are likely to generate the greatest interest based on the input received during the NOP scoping process.

- Climate Adaptation
- Traffic impacts in and around the Specific Plan Area, including parking, transit access, and safe pedestrian and bicycle safety and connections
- Environmental energy and resource efficiency
- Affordable housing
- Cultural resources
- Consistency with the San Francisco International Airport Land Use Comprehensive Plan (ALUCP) policies and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations

2.6 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the proposed Project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance. The proposed Project has the potential to generate significant environmental impacts in a number of areas; however, as described in Chapter 6, CEQA-Mandated Assessment, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Project would have no significant impact on the following environmental topics due to existing conditions on the Project site and the surrounding area. These issues have therefore not been analyzed further in this Draft EIR.

- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Mineral Resources

Table 2-2 presents a summary of the significant impacts and mitigation measures identified based on the conclusions of the environmental analysis in Chapters 4.1 through 4.14 of this Draft EIR. The table is arranged in three columns: 1) standards of significance; 2) mitigation measures; and 3) significance after mitigation. For a complete description of potential impacts, please refer to the specific discussions Chapters 4.0 through 4.14.

As shown in Table 2-2, some significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level if the mitigation measures identified in this Draft EIR are adopted and implemented. However, pursuant to Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, which requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, as shown in Table 2-2, significant unavoidable impacts were identified in the areas of air quality, land use and planning, transportation and circulation, and utilities and service systems (water supply). For a complete summary of the significant and unavoidable impacts, please see Section 6.3, Significant and Unavoidable Impacts, in Chapter 6 of this Draft EIR.

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATE		
AIR QUALITY		
Impact AQ-SP-2.1: Future projects under the Specific Plan Update could result in fugitive dust (coarse inhalable particulate matter [PM_{10}] and fine inhalable particulate matter [$PM_{2.5}$]) from construction activities that could violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and expose sensitive receptors to elevated concentrations of pollutants during construction activities.	No additional measures are available to reduce emissions beyond those described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality.	SU
Impact AQ-SP-2.2: Operational phase emissions associated with the proposed Specific Plan Update would exceed BAAQMD's regional operational-phase significance thresholds for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs).	No additional measures are available to reduce emissions beyond those described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality.	SU
Impact AQ-SP-3: Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan Update would exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management Districts (BAAQMD's) regional significance thresholds.	No additional measures are available to reduce emissions beyond those described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality.	SU
Impact AQ-SP-4.1: Construction activities associated with future development projects accommodated under the proposed Specific Plan Update could expose nearby receptors to substantial concentrations of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs).	Mitigation Measure AQ-SP-4.1: Prior to future discretionary approval, the City of Millbrae Community Development Department shall require an applicant for a new development project where nearby sensitive land uses (e.g. residences, schools, and day care centers) are within 1,000 feet of the future project site, to prepare and submit a construction health risk assessment (HRA) to evaluate the construction health risk impacts of the project to the sensitive receptors. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e. below ten in one million or a hazard index of	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to: ▪ Use of equipment that meets the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA)-Certified Tier 3 emissions standards for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower. ▪ Use of emissions control device that achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by CARB regulations. Mitigation measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the all construction plans (e.g. demolition and grading plans) and verified by the City of Millbrae Community Development Department.	
Impact AQ-SP-4.2: Risks to sensitive receptors near sources of TACs could exceed the cancer risk and non-cancer hazard index.	Mitigation Measure AQ-SP-4.2: The City shall require applicants for future residential and other sensitive land use projects (e.g. hospitals, nursing homes, and day care centers) within 1,000 feet of a major sources of TACs (e.g. warehouses, industrial areas, freeways, and roadways with traffic volumes over 10,000 vehicle per day), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the source/edge of the nearest travel lane, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds either ten in one million (10E-06) and/or 100 in a million for cumulative sources, $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations exceed 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$, or the appropriate non-cancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e. below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to: ▪ Air intakes located away from high volume roadways and/or truck loading	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	zones. ▪ Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized Maximum Efficiency Rating Value (MERV) filters. Mitigation measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed future project. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City of Millbrae Community Development Department.	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Impact BIO-SP-1.1: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update could result in inadvertent loss of bird nests in active use, which would conflict with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code if adequate controls and preconstruction surveys are not implemented.	Mitigation Measure BIO-SP-1.1: Adequate measures shall be taken to avoid inadvertent take of raptor nests and other nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act when in active use. This shall be accomplished by taking the following steps. ▪ If vegetation removal and initial construction is proposed during the nesting season (March to August), a focused survey for nesting raptors and other migratory birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days prior to the onset of vegetation removal or construction, in order to identify any active nests on the proposed project site and in the vicinity of proposed construction. ▪ If no active nests are identified during the construction survey period, or if development is initiated during the non-breeding season (September to February), vegetation removal and construction may proceed with no restrictions. ▪ If bird nests are found, an adequate setback shall be established around the nest location and vegetation removal and construction activities shall be restricted within this no-disturbance zone until the qualified biologist has confirmed that any young birds have fledged and are able to function outside the nest location. Required setback distances for the no-disturbance zone shall be based on input received from the CDFW, and may vary depending on species and sensitivity to disturbance. As necessary, the no-disturbance zone should be fenced with temporary orange construction fencing if construction is to be initiated on the	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	remainder of the development site. ▪ A report of findings shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to initiation of construction within the no-disturbance zone during the nesting season (March to August). The report shall either confirm absence of any active nests or confirm that any young are located within a designated no-disturbance zone and construction can proceed.	
Impact BIO-SP-1.2: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update could adversely affect the pallid bat if adequate controls are not implemented.	Mitigation Measure BIO-SP-1.2: Measures shall be taken to avoid possible loss of pallid bats and other special-status bat species during construction of future projects allowed by the proposed Specific Plan Update. This shall be accomplished using the following provisions: ▪ Existing buildings should preferably be demolished between February 15 to April 15, or from August 15 to October 15, to minimize the likelihood of removal during the winter roosting period when individual bats are less active and more difficult to detect, and the critical pupping period (April 16 to August 14) when young cannot disperse. ▪ Buildings shall be surveyed by a qualified bat biologist no more than two weeks before demolition to determine whether any signs of bat roosting is present, and to avoid "take" of any bats that may have begun to use the structures for day-roosting. ▪ If the pre-demolition survey reveals bats or bat roosting activity, a plan shall be developed by the qualified bat biologist to provide for exclusion and/or passive relocation, such as leaving all doors and windows open continually until demolition. Additional recommendations may be made by the qualified bat biologist following the pre-demolition survey, including monitoring of demolition, possible restriction on timing and procedures for demolition to allow escape, and other measures to avoid take of individual bats. ▪ A tree roost habitat assessment shall be conducted by a qualified bat biologist for trees to be removed as part of development projects. The habitat assessment shall be conducted no more than two weeks prior to tree removal and vegetation clearing. Additional detailed measures may be required based on the results of the habitat assessment if evidence of bat roosting is observed. This may include restrictions on timing and supervision of tree removal by the qualified bat biologist, and systematic removal of select trees and major limbs to encourage dispersal and avoid	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	"take" of individual bats.	
CULTUAL RESOURCES		
Impact CULT-SP-1: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update could adversely affect current and future historical resources.	Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-1: Prior to the entitlement phase, on a project-by-project basis, buildings and structures over 50 years of age that would be affected by future alteration or demolition should be assessed by a qualified professional that is approved by the Community Development Director, or his/her designee, to determine if further evaluation for potential historical significance is necessary. This initial assessment shall include a review of any future historical resource surveys of the Specific Plan Area, a consideration of the property's architectural integrity and notable features, and other available information. If, based on this preliminary assessment, it is determined that further assessment would be required to determine the property's historical significance as defined by CEQA, an evaluation should be carried out by a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural History, and the results of the evaluation should be submitted as report of findings to the City. Once the report is reviewed and approved by the City, a copy of the report should be submitted to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC).	SU
Impact CULT-SP-2: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update would have the potential to cause a significant impact to an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-2a: If a potentially significant subsurface cultural resource is encountered during ground disturbing activities, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until a qualified archeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. All developers in the Specific Plan Area shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction activities shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria by a qualified archeologist. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses; prepare a comprehensive report complete with methods,	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	results, and recommendations; and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered resources. The report shall be submitted to the City of Millbrae, Northwest Information Center (NWIC), and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), if required. Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-2b: The Community Development Director, or his/her designee, shall notify the Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan tribe at the time final applications for future projects under the Specific Plan Update where future development requires substantial excavation that could reach significant depths below the ground surface where no such excavation has previously occurred.	
Impact CULT-SP-3: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update would have the potential to directly or indirectly affect a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature.	Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-3: In the event that fossils or fossil bearing deposits are discovered during ground disturbing activities, excavations within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. Ground disturbance work shall cease until a City-approved qualified paleontologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed (in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards [Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995]), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction activities are allowed to resume at the location of the find. If avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of construction activities on the discovery. The excavation plan shall be submitted to the City of Millbrae for review and approval prior to implementation, and all construction activity shall adhere to the recommendations in the excavation plan.	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
GEOLOGY, SOILS AND SEISMICITY		
Impact GEO-SP-1: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving surface rupture along a known active fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.	Mitigation Measure GEO-SP-1: Prior to approval of grading permits for a future construction project within the Specific Plan Area, a detailed final geotechnical investigation shall be performed to identify significant geotechnical constraints on the proposed development. The report shall develop formal recommendations for project design and construction, including site grading/soil preparation and foundation design. Among other components, the report shall include a quantitative evaluation of liquefaction susceptibility including projected levels of post-liquefaction settlement; an evaluation of soil shrink-swell potential; and an investigation of compressible soils that may be prone to settlement/subsidence. The report shall be provided by the applicant to the City of Millbrae for review and approval and to ensure that foundations designed for all proposed structures are appropriate and meet code requirements. The geotechnical engineer of record shall also review the final grading, drainage, and foundation plans to confirm incorporation of the report recommendations and field monitoring during project construction shall be performed to verify that the work is performed as recommended.	LTS/M
Impact GEO-SP-3: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update could result in a significant impact related to development on unstable geologic units and soils or result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	Mitigation Measure GEO-SP-3: Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-SP-1.	LTS/M
Impact GEO-SP-4: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update could create substantial risks to property as a result of its location on expansive soil, as defined by Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code.	Mitigation Measure GEO-SP-4: Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-SP-1.	LTS/M
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
Impact HAZ-SP-4: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update would occur on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	Mitigation Measure HAZ-SP-4a: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for an individual property within the Specific Plan Area with residual environmental contamination, the agency with primary regulatory oversight of environmental conditions at such property ("Oversight Agency") shall have determined that the proposed land use for that property, including proposed development features and design, does not present an unacceptable risk to human health, if applicable, through the use of an Environmental Site Management Plan (ESMP)	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	that could include institutional controls, site-specific mitigation measures, a risk management plan, and deed restrictions based upon applicable risk-based cleanup standards. Remedial action plans, risk management plans and health and safety plans shall be required as determined by the Oversight Agency for a given property under applicable environmental laws, if not already completed, to prevent an unacceptable risk to human health, including workers during and after construction, from exposure to residual contamination in soil and groundwater in connection with remediation and site development activities and the proposed land use. Mitigation Measure HAZ-SP-4b: For those sites with potential residual volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in soil, soil gas, or groundwater that are planned for redevelopment with an overlying occupied building, a vapor intrusion assessment shall be performed by a licensed environmental professional. If the results of the vapor intrusion assessment indicate the potential for significant vapor intrusion into the proposed building, the project design shall include vapor controls or source removal, as appropriate, in accordance with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or the San Mateo County Environmental Health Divisions (SMCEHD) requirements. Soil vapor mitigations or controls could include passive venting and/or active venting. The vapor intrusion assessment as associated vapor controls or source removal can be incorporated into the ESMP (Mitigation Measure HAZ4-SP-4a). Mitigation Measure HAZ-SP-4c: Prior to the import of a soil to a particular property within the Specific Plan Area as part of that property's site development, such soils shall be sampled for toxic or hazardous materials exceeding applicable Environmental Screening Levels for the proposed land use at such a property in accordance with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or the San Mateo County Environmental Health Divisions (SMCEHD) requirements prior to importing to such a property.	

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION		
Impact TRANS-SP-1.1: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update would result in the addition of traffic to intersection #4 El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue causing this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS F in the AM peak hour and would add more than five (5) seconds of delay in the PM peak hour (currently operating at LOS E), resulting in LOS F under Existing Plus Project conditions.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1:** The City shall modify the El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue intersection footprint. The modified intersection footprint would add one (1) northbound right turn pocket lane (for a total of two [2] turn lanes) and one (1) westbound right turn pocket lane (for a total of two [2] turn lanes), each approximately 200 feet long. The City can accommodate these modifications to the intersection #4 within the current footprint through restriping. This can be accomplished by converting one westbound through lane to a right turn only lane and by re-striping the northbound approach to make the left turn lane 10 feet wide, the through lanes 12 feet wide, and the two (2) right turn lanes 11 feet wide.	SU
Impact TRANS-SP-1.2: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update would result in the addition of traffic volumes to freeway segments currently operating over capacity and Specific Plan Update-generated traffic would add more than one (1) percent of the segment's capacity at the following locations: ▪ Northbound US 101 from Millbrae Avenue to Broadway – AM peak hour Northbound US 101 from Broadway to Peninsula Avenue – AM peak hour	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.2:** Construct an additional mixed flow and/or HOV lane on northbound US 101.	SU
Impact TRANS-SP-1.3: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update would contribute a considerable level of traffic and increase the average vehicle delay by more than five (5) seconds at the intersection #4 El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue during the AM and PM peak hour.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.3:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1.	SU
Impact TRANS-SP-1.4: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update would contribute a considerable level of traffic to intersection #5 El Camino Real/Murchison Drive and cause this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS E in the PM peak hour under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (Specific Plan Update) conditions.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.4:** The City of Millbrae shall work with the City of Burlingame to modify the El Camino Real/Murchison Drive intersection footprint. The modified intersection footprint would add one (1) northbound left turn pocket lane (for a total of two [2] turn lanes), one (1) westbound right turn pocket lane (for a total of two [2] turn lanes), and one (1) eastbound left turn pocket lane (for a total of two [2] turn lanes). The modified intersection footprint can be accommodated within the existing right of way. This is accomplished through the following measures: ▪ Remove parking lanes along Murchison Drive. ▪ Restripe westbound approach with through lanes 11 feet wide and	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	westbound right turn lanes are 10 feet wide. ▪ Restripe northbound approach such that left and right turn lanes are 10 feet wide and through lanes are 12 feet wide. An additional one foot of space would need to be acquired from either the center median or side median separating El Camino Real from the adjacent access road. ▪ Restripe eastbound approach such that each lane (turns and through lanes) are 12 feet wide.	
Impact TRANS-SP-1.5: Implementation of the Specific Plan would contribute a considerable level of traffic to intersection #7 California Drive/Murchison Drive and cause this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (Specific Plan Update) conditions. In addition, the intersection meets the Caltrans peak hour signal warrant for urbanized areas (Warrant 3).	Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.5: The City of Millbrae shall work with the City of Burlingame to conduct a full signal warrant analysis under the direction of a professional engineer and install a signal at the California Drive/Murchison Drive intersection.	SU
Impact TRANS-SP-1.6: Implementation of the Specific Plan Update would contribute a considerable level of traffic to intersection #8 Rollins Road/Millbrae Avenue and cause this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (Specific Plan Update) conditions.	Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.6: The City shall expand the Rollins Road/Millbrae Avenue intersection footprint. The expanded intersection footprint would add one (1) eastbound and one (1) westbound through lane (for a total of four [4] in each direction), one (1) eastbound left turn pocket lane (for a total of two [2]), one (1) eastbound right turn pocket lane (for a total of two [2]), one (1) westbound right turn pocket lane (for a total of two [2]), and one (1) southbound right turn pocket lane (for a total of two [2]).	SU
Impact TRANS-SP-1.7: Under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (Specific Plan Update) conditions, the Specific Plan Update would add traffic volumes representing more than one (1) percent of the segment's capacity to the following freeway segments exceeding the capacity without the Specific Plan Update: Northbound and Southbound US 101 Grand Avenue to Produce Avenue – AM and PM peak hours Northbound US 101 Produce Avenue to I-380 – AM peak hour Northbound US 101 I-380 to Millbrae Avenue – AM peak hour Northbound and Southbound US 101 Millbrae Avenue to Broadway – AM and PM peak hours Northbound and Southbound US 101 Broadway to Peninsula Avenue – AM and PM peak hours	Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.7: Construct an additional mixed flow and/or HOV lane on southbound US 101.	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Impact TRANS-SP-2: As discussed under TRANS-1, implementation of the Specific Plan Update would result in a *significant* impact at the CMP facilities during at least one (1) of the peak hours under Existing (2014) and Cumulative (2040) conditions as follows: Existing (2014) Plus Project (Specific Plan Update) ▪ El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue – AM and PM peak hour ▪ Northbound US 101 from Millbrae Avenue to Broadway – AM peak hour ▪ Northbound US 101 from Broadway to Peninsula Avenue – AM peak hour Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (Specific Plan Update) ▪ El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue – AM and PM peak hour ▪ Northbound and Southbound US 101 Grand Avenue to Produce Avenue – AM and PM peak hours ▪ Northbound US 101 Produce Avenue to I-380 – AM peak hour ▪ Northbound US 101 I-380 to Millbrae Avenue – AM peak hour ▪ Northbound and Southbound US 101 Millbrae Avenue to Broadway – AM and PM peak hours Northbound and Southbound US 101 Broadway to Peninsula Avenue – AM and PM peak hours	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-2a:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.2. **Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-2b:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.7.	SU
Impact TRANS-SP-4: Queues that were already exceeding available storage space under Existing (2014) conditions were exacerbated under Existing (2014) Plus Project (Specific Plan Update) conditions at and between the intersections of El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue and Rollins Road/Millbrae Avenue resulting in hazardous driving conditions from backed up traffic.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-4a:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1. **Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-4b:** In addition to implementing Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.6, the City shall also extend the El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue intersection eastbound left turn pocket to 310 feet, extend the westbound left turn pocket to 490 feet, and extend the southbound turn pocket to 775 feet under the Existing (2014) Plus Project conditions. Under the Cumulative (2040) Plus Project conditions, the following turn pocket extensions would apply: ▪ El Camino Real/Murchison Drive, extend eastbound left to 395 feet, northbound left to 180 feet, and southbound left to 385 feet.	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	▪ Rollins Road/Millbrae Avenue, extend westbound left to 720 feet, southbound left to 415 feet. ▪ El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue, extend eastbound left to 415 feet, westbound left to 530 feet, and northbound right to 555 feet.	
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS		
Water Supply		
Impact UTIL-SP-1: With implementation of the proposed Specific Plan Update Plan there would not be sufficient water supplies available to serve the proposed Project from existing entitlements and resources during multiple dry years.	Mitigation Measure UTIL-SP-1: Prior to approving future applications for development in the Specific Plan Area, the City shall require future project applicants to prepare and submit a written statement to the satisfaction of the City of Millbrae Community Development Department that clearly demonstrates how the project complies with the water conservation and water efficiency ordinances adopted by the City, including the Indoor Water Ordinance (Municipal Code 9.60), the Green Building Code Ordinance (Municipal Code 9.35), and the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Municipal Code 8.45) and any other water conservation strategies that would be implemented by the project applicant.	SU
TOD #1 Project		
AIR QUALITY		
Impact AQ-TOD#1-1: The proposed TOD #1 project, when considered with the proposed TOD #2 project, would exceed the projected growth increase for the city and exceed Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD's)regional significance thresholds. Therefore, it would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the *2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan*.	No additional measures are available to reduce emissions beyond those described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality.	SU
Impact AQ-TOD#1-2: Operation of the proposed TOD #1 project would generate emissions that exceed BAAQMD's regional operational-phase significance thresholds for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NO_X).	No additional measures are available to reduce emissions beyond those described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality.	SU
Impact AQ-TOD#1-3.1: Construction of the proposed TOD #1 project would result in exceedance of BAAQMD's risk thresholds.	Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#1-3.1: Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-TOD#1-4.1a and AQ-TOD#1-4.1b.	SU
Impact AQ-TOD#1-3.2: Implementation of the proposed TOD #1 project would	No additional measures are available to reduce emissions beyond those	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
exceed BAAQMD's regional significance thresholds.	described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality.	
Impact AQ-TOD#1-3.3: Risks levels for the on-site sensitive receptors could exceed BAAMD's applicable cumulative cancer risk threshold of 100 in a million due to the siting of the project site to sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs).	Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#1-3.3: Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#1-4.2.	LTS/M
Impact AQ-TOD#1-4.1: Risk impacts to nearby sensitive receptors from construction of the proposed TOD #1 project would exceed the cancer risk threshold of 10 in a million.	Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#1-4.1a: The Applicant shall require the construction contractor to use equipment that meets the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA)-Certified Tier 3 emissions standards for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower. Additionally, any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by CARB regulations. Prior to construction, the project engineer shall ensure that all demolition and grading plans clearly show the requirement for US EPA Tier 3 or higher emissions standards and Level 3 diesel emissions control for construction equipment over 50 horsepower. During construction, the construction contractor shall maintain a list of all operating equipment in use on the Project site for verification by the City of Millbrae Community Development Department or their designee. The construction equipment list shall state the makes, models, and number of construction equipment onsite. Equipment shall properly service and maintain construction equipment in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. Construction contractors shall also ensure that all nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with CARB Rule 2449. Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#1-4.1b: Prior to issuance of any building permits, the Applicant shall prepare and submit to the City of Millbrae Community Development Department an additional health risk assessment (HRA) to provide a refined evaluation of health risks impacts to the surrounding sensitive receptors from project-related construction activities. If available, the HRA shall include within the report a detailed list of the construction equipment mix anticipated to be utilized in addition construction phasing and other details of the	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	overall construction processes. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with the policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations exceed 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e. below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Mitigation measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the all construction plans (e.g. demolition and grading plans) and verified by the City of Millbrae Community Development Department.	
Impact AQ-TOD#1-4.2: Due to the proximity of the proposed TOD #1 project site to high-volume roadways and potentially other stationary sources, on-site residents could potentially be exposed to substantial TAC concentration.	Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#1-4.2: Prior to issuance of any building permits, the proposed TOD #1 project applicant shall prepare and submit to the City of Millbrae Community Development Department a health risk assessment (HRA) to evaluate the health risk impacts of all major sources of TACs within 1,000 feet of the project site. The HRA shall be prepared in in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations exceed 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e. below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to: ▪ Air intakes located away from high volume roadways and/or truck loading zones. ▪ Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	with appropriately sized Maximum Efficiency Rating Value (MERV) filters. Mitigation measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed TOD #1 project. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City of Millbrae Community Development Department.	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Impact BIO-TOD#1-1.1: The proposed TOD #1 project could result in inadvertent loss of bird nests in active use, which would conflict with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code if adequate controls and preconstruction surveys are not implemented.	**Mitigation Measure BIO-TOD#1-1.1:** Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-SP-1.1.	LTS/M
Impact BIO-TOD#1-1.2: The proposed TOD #1 project could result adversely affect the pallid bat if adequate controls are not implemented.	**Mitigation Measure BIO-TOD#1-1.2:** Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-SP-1.2.	LTS/M
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Impact CULT-TOD#1-1: The TOD #1 Project could adversely affect historical resources.	**Mitigation Measure CULT-TOD#1-1:** Prior to the entitlement phase, an evaluation of the two properties at 190 El Camino Real (Millbrae Cabinet Shop) and 150 Serra Avenue (Convalescent Home) shall be carried out by a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural History, and the results of the evaluation should be submitted as report of findings to the City of Millbrae. Once the report is reviewed and approved by the City, a copy of the report should be submitted to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC). CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(3) states that a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than significant. Therefore, if, under the project-by-project review described above, a structure is	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	determined to be a historical resource as defined by CEQA, the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines referenced above shall be followed. The documentation should be submitted to the City of Millbrae and the NWIC.	
Impact CULT-TOD#1-2: The proposed TOD #1 project would have the potential to cause a significant impact to an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	**Mitigation Measure CULT-TOD#1-2a:** Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-2a. **Mitigation Measure CULT-TOD#1-2b:** Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-2b.	LTS/M
Impact CULT-TOD#1-3: The proposed TOD #1 project would have the potential to directly or indirectly affect a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature.	**Mitigation Measure CULT-TOD#1-3:** Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-3.	LTS/M
GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY		
Impact GEO-TOD#1-1: The proposed TOD #1 project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving surface rupture along a known active fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.	**Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#1-1:** The recent geotechnical investigation of the TOD #1 project site concluded that "variable liquefaction settlement" was one of the two most significant geotechnical constraints on the project site. The report presented formal recommendations for project design and construction, including site grading/soil preparation and foundation design, some goals of which were to mitigate the potential for liquefaction-related settlement, expansive soils, and highly compressible soils prone to settlement/subsidence. The final geotechnical report shall be provided to the City of Millbrae for review and approval. The geotechnical engineer of record should also review the final grading, drainage, and foundation plans to confirm incorporation of the report recommendations. Lastly, field monitoring during project construction is warranted to verify that the work is performed as recommended and in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.	LTS/M
Impact GEO-TOD#1-3: The proposed TOD #1 project could result in a significant impact related to development on unstable geologic units and soils or result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	**Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#1-3:** Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#1-1.	LTS/M
Impact GEO-TOD#1-4: The proposed TOD #1 project could create substantial risks to property as a result of its location on expansive soil, as defined by Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code.	**Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#1-4:** Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#1-1.	LTS/M
LAND USE AND PLANNING		
Impact LU-TOD#1-2: The maximum height proposed by the TOD #1 project	There is no mitigation available to reduce this impact. Chapter 5.2, Alternatives	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
height exceeds the maximum height identified in the Specific Plan Update for the project site.	to the TOD #1 Project, includes a discussion of two reduced intensity alternatives, which result in reduced heights on the TOD #1 project site. Implementation of a reduced height project would reduce this impact.	
NOISE		
Impact NOISE-TOD#1-1: The proposed TOD #1 project would expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan, and/or the applicable standards of other agencies.	Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-1: Development of residential uses in the TOD #1 project site shall conform to the outdoor noise level goal of 70 dBA L_{dn} (or CNEL) for areas where a railroad is the noise source as established in General Plan Policy NS2.1. Additionally, indoor noise levels for residential uses in the TOD #1 project site shall demonstrate an indoor noise level of 45 dBA CNEL, per Millbrae Municipal Code standards. To achieve this goal, acoustical studies shall be prepared during the project design phase and shall accompany the building plans submitted to the City for approval. These studies must demonstrate that the structure has been designed to limit interior noise in habitable rooms to acceptable noise levels. With such detailed acoustical studies and the associated appropriate sound insulation design features, indoor and outdoor noise effects for residents living in the TOD #1 project site would be less than significant.	LTS/M
Impact NOISE-TOD#1-2.1: The proposed TOD #1 project could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive short-term construction-related groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-2.1: Impact pile driving shall not be used. Suitable alternative techniques could include (but are not necessarily limited to) Auger Cast Piles (large diameter hollow stem auger with steel rebar and concrete installed prior to/during auger removal); Torque-down Piles (steel pipe pile drilled in place then filled with concrete); Micro-piles (Steel piles sized for corrosion protection with a concrete pile cap); and/or Helical piles (screw piles with concrete cap).	LTS/M
Impact NOISE-TOD#1-2.2: The proposed TOD #1 project could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels from Vibration Related to Railway Transportation Activity.	Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-2.2: The project applicant shall submit a vibration evaluation study to the satisfaction of the City of Millbrae Community Development Department. Site-specific reports should contain a brief description of the project(s) and the sensitivity of the land use type to vibration effects/impacts, an accurate map describing the setting with surrounding uses and vibration sources identified, and a quantitative description of the vibration environment. For multi-story structures, the report should discuss vibration effects for the upper floors. Field vibration level measurements should be taken	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	over several days and at several locations to adequately establish the in situ conditions from rail operations. If the project is located within the vicinity of previously collected measurements, a measurement should also be duplicated at that point for purposes of updating the database to the then-current conditions. Vibration reports shall be prepared by an acoustical or vibrations engineer holding a degree in engineering, architecture, physics, or allied discipline able to demonstrate a minimum of two years of experience in the following areas: field measurement of vibration levels, transportation vibration forecasting, building acoustics and vibration isolation, and vibration mitigation. The evaluation report shall include design recommendations for external project features or internal project features or both to adequately mitigate rail vibration at the receiver property. External project features could include investigations of buffer zones near rail lines or the use of vibration-reducing trenches between the rail line(s) and the receiving property. Internal design features could include investigations of building designs for whole-building isolation features and/or floor stiffening elements.	
Impact NOISE-TOD#1-4: Construction activities associated with the proposed TOD #1 project would result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the TOD #1 project site above existing levels.	Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-4: The project Applicant shall implement the following measures, which shall be identified in construction contracts and acknowledged by the contractor: ▪ Construction equipment shall be well maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical. Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g. improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds), wherever feasible; ▪ Utilize "quiet" models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where such technology exists. Select hydraulically or electrically powered equipment and avoid pneumatically powered equipment where feasible. Impact tools (e.g. jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project demolition or construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever such procedures	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	are available and consistent with construction procedures; ▪ Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors that adjoin construction sites. Construct temporary noise barriers or partial enclosures to acoustically shield such equipment where feasible; ▪ Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines; ▪ Prior to initiation of on-site construction-related demolition or earthwork activities, a minimum 8-foot-high temporary sound barrier shall be erected along the project property line abutting adjacent operational businesses, residences or other noise-sensitive land uses. These temporary sound barriers shall be constructed with a minimum surface weight of 4 pounds per square foot and shall be constructed so that vertical or horizontal gaps are eliminated. These temporary barriers shall remain in place through the construction phase in which heavy construction equipment, such as excavators, dozers, scrapers, loaders, rollers, pavers, and dump trucks, are operating within 50 feet of the edge of the construction site by adjacent sensitive land uses. This measure could lower construction noise levels at adjacent, ground-floor residential units by up to 8 dBA, depending on topography and site conditions; ▪ To the maximum extent feasible, route construction-related traffic along major roadways and away from sensitive receptors; ▪ Notify all businesses, residences or other noise-sensitive land uses within 500 feet of the perimeter of the construction site of the construction schedule in writing prior to the beginning of construction and prior to each construction phase change that could potentially result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity; ▪ Signs shall be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and a day and evening contact number for the on-site complaint and enforcement manager, and the City's Building Division, in the event of problems; ▪ An on-site complaint and enforcement manager shall be available to respond to and track complaints. The manager will be responsible for responding to any complaints regarding construction noise and for coordinating with the adjacent land uses. The manager will determine the	

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	cause of any complaints (e.g. starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and coordinate with the construction team to implement effective measures (considered technically and economically feasible) to correct the problem. The telephone number of the coordinator shall be posted at the construction site and provided to neighbors in a notification letter. The manager shall notify the City's Building Division of all complaints within 24 hours. The manager will be trained to use a sound level meter and should be available during all construction hours to respond to complaints; and ▪ A pre-construction meeting shall be held with Building Division Staff and the general contractor/on-site project manager to confirm that noise measures and practices (including construction hours, neighborhood notification, posted signs, etc.) are fully operational.	
Impact NOISE-TOD#1-5: The TOD #1 project would cause exposure of people residing or working in the vicinity of the TOD #1 project site to excessive aircraft noise levels.	Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-5: Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-1.	LTS/M
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION		
Impact TRANS-TOD #1-8.1: The proposed TOD #1 project would add traffic to intersection #4 El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue, which currently operates at LOS E during the PM peak hour. Traffic added by the proposed TOD #1 project would increase vehicle delay at this intersection by more than five (5) seconds in the PM peak hour under Existing (2014) Plus Project (TOD #1) conditions and result in the intersection operating at LOS F.	Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-8.1: Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#1-8.2: The proposed TOD #1 project would result in the addition of traffic to intersection #4 El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue and causing this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS E in the AM peak hour and would add more than five (5) seconds of delay in the PM peak hour (operating at LOS F under baseline), resulting in LOS F under Near Term (2020) Plus Project (TOD #1) conditions. The worsening of traffic conditions at this location is due primarily to the increase in traffic from the proposed TOD #1 project using El Camino Real as a regional and local access point.	Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-8.2: Implement of Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#1-8.3: The proposed TOD #1 project would add traffic to intersection #4 El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue, which is expected to operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour and at LOS F during the PM peak hour under Cumulative (2040) No Project (TOD #1) conditions. Traffic added by the	Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-8.3: Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1.	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
proposed TOD #1 project would increase vehicle delay at this intersection by more than five (5) seconds in the AM and PM peak hours under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (TOD #1) conditions and result in the intersection operating at LOS F.		
Impact TRANS-TOD#1-8.4: The proposed TOD #1 project would result in the addition of traffic to intersection #5 El Camino Real/Murchison Drive and would cause this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS E in the PM peak hour under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (TOD #1) conditions.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-8.4:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.4a.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#1-8.5: The proposed TOD #1 project would contribute a considerable level of traffic to intersection #7 California Drive/Murchison Drive and cause this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS E in the AM and PM peak hour under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (TOD #1) conditions. In addition, the intersection meets the Caltrans peak hour signal warrant for urbanized areas (Warrant 3).	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-8.5:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.5.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#1-9: As discussed under TRANS-8, implementation of the proposed TOD #1 project would result in a *significant* impact at the CMP facilities during at least one (1) of the peak hours under Existing (2014), Near Term (2020) and Cumulative (2040) conditions as follows: Existing (2014) Plus Project (TOD #1) ▪ El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue – AM and PM peak hour Near Term (2020) Plus Project (TOD #1) ▪ El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue – AM and PM peak hour Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (TOD #1) ▪ El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue – AM and PM peak hours	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-9a:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1. **Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-9b:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-8.1.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#1-11: Queues that were already exceeding available storage space under Existing (2014) conditions were exacerbated under Existing (2014) Plus Project (TOD #1) conditions at and between the intersections of El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue and Rollins Road/Millbrae Avenue resulting in hazardous driving conditions from backed up traffic.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-11a:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1. **Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-11b:** Implement Mitigation Measures TRANS-SP-1.6 and TRANS-SP-4b.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#1-13: The proposed TOD #1 project would reduce access to transit service or create unsafe access for transit passengers.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-13:** The project applicant shall provide shuttle access on the westside of the station to be as close to the Millbrae	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	Station entrance as possible taking into consideration the design constraints of the proposed TOD #1 project. The existing sawtooth configuration should be expanded to three (3) shuttle bays to accommodate up to 35-feet cutaway vehicles and projected shuttle activity in 2040. If this is not feasible, the replacement facility on California Drive (or other location) would be designed to safely and effectively accommodate future shuttle activity, provide adequate facilities for riders, and minimize rider walk distance from the Millbrae Station. The northbound ECR stop shall be located in front of pedestrian paseo directly across from the westside station entrance (currently Linden Avenue). The ultimate decision to reroute southbound ECR service will be made by SamTrans. While providing better access to the Millbrae Station and Specific Plan Area the deviation would incur a time penalty compared to a through trip on El Camino Real. The tradeoff between access and travel time (which increases operating costs) will be considered by SamTrans during the service planning process.	
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS		
Water Supply		
Impact UTIL-TOD#1-1: Implementation of the proposed TOD #1 project would not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources during multiple dry years.	Mitigation Measure UTIL-TOD#1-1: Prior to project approval, the project applicant shall prepare and submit a written statement to the satisfaction of the City of Millbrae Community Development Department that clearly demonstrates how the project complies with the water conservation and water efficiency ordinances adopted by the City, including the Indoor Water Ordinance (Municipal Code 9.60), the Green Building Code Ordinance (Municipal Code 9.35), and the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Municipal Code 8.45) and any other water conservation strategies that would be implemented by the project applicant.	SU
Wastewater		
Impact UTIL-TOD#1-6: The proposed TOD #1 project would adversely affect the already limited capacity of sewer pipes adjacent to the TOD #1 project area.	Mitigation Measure UTIL-TOD#1-6. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the proposed TOD #1 project applicant, in coordination with the City, shall engineer, design and construct or pay their fair share of the capital improvements required to increase capacity and/or reduce RDII for the sewer	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	collection and treatment system, based on hydraulic studies and agreements forthcoming by the applicant, prior to City approval of the project building permits.	
TOD #2 Project		
AIR QUALITY		
Impact AQ-TOD#2-1: The proposed TOD #2 project, when considered with the proposed TOD #2 project, would exceed the projected growth increase for the city and exceed Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD's) regional significance thresholds. Therefore, it would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the *2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan*.	No additional measures are available to reduce emissions beyond those described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality.	SU
Impact AQ-TOD#2-2: Operation of the proposed TOD #2 project would generate emissions that exceed BAAQMD's regional operational-phase significance thresholds for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NO_X).	No additional measures are available to reduce emissions beyond those described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality.	SU
Impact AQ-TOD#2-3.1: Construction of the proposed TOD #2 project would result in exceedance of BAAQMD's risk thresholds.	Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#2-3.1: Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-TOD#1-4.1a and AQ-TOD#1-4.1b.	SU
Impact AQ-TOD#2-3.2: Implementation of the proposed TOD #2 project would exceed BAAQMD's regional significance thresholds.	No additional measures are available to reduce emissions beyond those described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality.	SU
Impact AQ-TOD#2-3.3: Risks levels for the on-site sensitive receptors could exceed BAAMD's applicable cumulative cancer risk threshold of 100 in a million due to the siting of the project site to sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs).	Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#2-3.3: Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#1-4.2.	LTS/M
Impact AQ-TOD#2-4.1: Risk impacts to nearby sensitive receptors from construction of the proposed TOD #2 project would exceed the cancer risk threshold of 10 in a million. Additionally, risk impacts from construction of both the proposed TOD #1 and TOD #2 projects concurrently would exceed the cancer risk and $PM_{2.5}$ thresholds.	Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#2-4.1: Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-TOD #1-4.1a and AQ-TOD #1-4.1b.	SU
Impact AQ-TOD#2-4.2: Due to the proximity of the proposed TOD #2 project site to high-volume roadways and potentially other stationary sources, on-site residents could potentially be exposed to substantial TAC concentration.	Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#2-4.2: Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-TOD#1-4.2.	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Impact CULT-TOD#2-2: The proposed TOD #2 project would have the potential to cause a significant impact to an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	**Mitigation Measure CULT-TOD#2-2a:** Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-2a. **Mitigation Measure CULT-TOD#2-2b:** Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-2b.	LTS/M
Impact CULT-TOD#2-3: The proposed TOD #2 project would have the potential to directly or indirectly affect a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature.	**Mitigation Measure CULT-TOD#2-3:** Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-SP-3.	LTS/M
GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY		
Impact GEO-TOD#2-1: The proposed TOD #2 project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving surface rupture along a known active fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.	**Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#2-1:** The recent geotechnical investigation of the proposed TOD #2 project site identified settlement, including liquefaction-related settlement, as a significant geotechnical concern. The report presented formal recommendations for project design and construction, including site grading/soil preparation and foundation design, some goals of which were to mitigate the potential for liquefaction-related settlement, expansive soils, and highly compressible soils prone to settlement/subsidence. The final geotechnical report shall be provided to the City of Millbrae for review and approval. The geotechnical engineer of record should also review the final grading, drainage, and foundation plans to confirm incorporation of the report recommendations. Lastly, field monitoring during project construction is warranted to verify that the work is performed as recommended and in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.	LTS/M
Impact GEO-TOD#2-3: The proposed TOD #2 project could result in a significant impact related to development on unstable geologic units and soils or result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	**Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#2-3:** Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#2-1.	LTS/M
Impact GEO-TOD#2-4: The proposed TOD #2 project could create substantial risks to property as a result of its location on expansive soil, as defined by Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code.	**Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#2-4:** Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-TOD#2-1.	LTS/M
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
Impact HAZ-TOD#2-4: Future redevelopment of the TOD #2 project site would include a mixed commercial and residential development where contaminate soil and groundwater could pose a significant hazard to the public or the	**Mitigation Measure HAZ-TOD#2-4a:** Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the agency with primary regulatory oversight of environmental conditions at the project site ("Oversight Agency") shall have determined that the proposed land	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
environment during redevelopment activities.	use for that property, including proposed development features and design, does not present an unacceptable risk to human health, if applicable, through the use of an Environmental Site Management Plan (ESMP) that could include institutional controls, site-specific mitigation measures, a risk management plan, and deed restrictions based upon applicable risk-based cleanup standards. Remedial action plans, risk management plans and health and safety plans shall be required as determined by the Oversight Agency for a given property under applicable environmental laws, if not already completed, to prevent an unacceptable risk to human health, including workers during and after construction, from exposure to residual contamination in soil and groundwater in connection with remediation and site development activities and the proposed land use. Mitigation Measure HAZ-TOD#2-4b: Prior to the construction of the proposed TOD #2 project, the Project Applicant shall prepare a vapor intrusion assessment by a licensed environmental professional. If the results of the vapor intrusion assessment indicate the potential for significant vapor intrusion into the proposed building, the project design shall include vapor controls or source removal, as appropriate, in accordance with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or the San Mateo County Environmental Health Divisions (SMCEHD) requirements. Appropriate soil vapor mitigations or controls could include vapor barriers, passive venting, and/or active venting. The vapor intrusion assessment as associated vapor controls or source removal can be incorporated into the ESMP (Mitigation Measure HAZ-TOD#2-1a). Mitigation Measure HAZ-TOD#2-4c: Prior to the import of a soil, the Project Applicant shall prepare a soil inspection where such soils shall be sampled for toxic or hazardous materials exceeding applicable Environmental Screening Levels by a licensed environmental professional during the construction phase. If contaminated soils are encountered, such soils shall be handled and disposed of in accordance with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or the San Mateo County Environmental Health Divisions (SMCEHD) requirements.	

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
NOISE		
Impact NOISE-TOD#2-1: The proposed TOD #2 project would expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan, and/or the applicable standards of other agencies.	**Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#2-1:** Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-1.	LTS/M
Impact NOISE-TOD#2-2: The proposed TOD #1 project could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels from vibration related to railway transportation activity.	**Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#2-2:** Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-2.	LTS/M
Impact NOISE-TOD#2-4: Construction activities associated with the proposed TOD #2 project would result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the TOD #2 project site above existing levels.	**Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#2-4:** Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-4.	LTS/M
Impact NOISE-TOD#2-5: The TOD #2 project would cause exposure of people residing or working in the vicinity of the TOD #2 project site to excessive aircraft noise levels.	**Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#2-5:** Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-TOD#1-1.	LTS/M
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION		
Impact TRANS-TOD#2-15.1: The proposed TOD #2 project would add traffic to intersection #4 El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue and would cause this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS E in the AM peak hour and would add more than five (5) seconds of delay in the PM peak hour (currently operating at LOS E), resulting in LOS F under Existing (2014) Plus Project (TOD #2) conditions. The worsening of traffic conditions at this location is due primarily to the increase in traffic from the project using El Camino Real as a regional and local access point.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#2-15.1:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#2-15.2: The proposed TOD #2 project would result in the addition of traffic to intersection #4 El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue causing this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS E in the AM peak hour and would add more than five (5) seconds of delay in the PM peak hour (operating at LOS F under baseline), resulting in LOS F under Near Term (2020) Plus Project (TOD #2) conditions. The worsening of traffic conditions at this location is due primarily to the increase in traffic from the project using El Camino Real as a regional and local access point.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#2-15.2:** Implement of Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1.	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Impact TRANS-TOD#2-15.3: The proposed TOD #2 project would add traffic to intersection #4 El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue, which is expected to operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour and at LOS F during the PM peak hour under Cumulative (2040) No Project (TOD #2) conditions. Traffic added by the proposed TOD #2 project would increase vehicle delay at this intersection by more than five (5) seconds in the AM and PM peak hours under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (TOD #2) conditions and result in the intersection operating at LOS F.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#2-15.3:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#2-15.4: The proposed TOD #2 project would result in the addition of traffic to intersection #8 Rollins Road/Millbrae Avenue and would cause this intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS E in the AM and PM peak hours under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (TOD #2) conditions.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS- TOD#2-15.4:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.6.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#2-16: As discussed under TRANS-15, implementation of the proposed TOD #2 project would result in a significant impact at the CMP facilities during at least one (1) of the peak hours under Existing (2014), Near Term (2020) and Cumulative (2040) conditions as follows: Existing (2014) Plus Project (TOD #2) ▪ El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue – AM and PM peak hour Near Term (2020) Plus Project (TOD #2) ▪ El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue – AM and PM peak hour Cumulative (2040) Plus Project (TOD #2) El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue – AM and PM peak hours	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-16a:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1. **Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-16b:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#1-8.1.	SU
Impact TRANS-TOD#2-18: Queues that were already exceeding available storage space under Existing (2014) conditions were exacerbated under Existing (2014) Plus Project (TOD #2) conditions at and between the intersections of El Camino Real/Millbrae Avenue and Rollins Road/Millbrae Avenue resulting in hazardous driving conditions from backed up traffic.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#2-18a:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.1. **Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#2-18c:** Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-SP-1.6 and TRANS-SP-4b.	SU

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Impact TRANS-TOD#2-20: The proposed TOD #2 project would reduce access to transit service or create unsafe access for transit passengers.	**Mitigation Measure TRANS-TOD#2-20:** The project shall provide shuttle access on the eastside of the station as close to the Millbrae Station entrance as possible taking into consideration the design constraints of the proposed TOD #2 project. Cutaway shuttles (35 feet and smaller) should be allowed to use the East Station Access Road with accommodations for four (4) bays while the three (3) bays and two (2) layover spots included in the TOD #2 project site would provide access to larger (up to 45 feet) OTR coaches and transit buses. Garden Lane east of Rollins Road shall be widened to 12-foot travel lanes to safely accommodate bi-directional bus activity. The intersection crossing at Garden Lane and Rollins Road shall be designed with improvements to enhance the safety and convenience of pedestrian access to shuttle access on Garden Lane.	LTS/M
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS		
Water Supply		
Impact UTIL-TOD#2-1: Implementation of the proposed TOD #2 project would not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources during multiple dry years.	**Mitigation Measure UTIL-TOD#2-2:** Implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-TOD#1-1.	SU
Wastewater		
Impact UTIL-TOD#2-6: The proposed TOD #2 project would adversely affect the already limited capacity of sewer pipes adjacent to the TOD #2 project area.	**Mitigation Measure UTIL-TOD#2-6.** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the proposed TOD #2 project applicant, in coordination with the City, shall engineer, design and pay their fair share of the capital improvements required to increase capacity and/or reduce RDII for the sewer collection and treatment system, based on hydraulic studies and agreements forthcoming by the applicant, prior to City approval of the project building permits.	LTS/M

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation

This page intentionally blank.

SU = Significant and Unavoidable LTS/M = Less than Significant with Mitigation