

Final

# THE U.S. NAVY SITE AND ITS ENVIRONS SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT (THE CROSSING HOTEL SITE)

Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for  
City of San Bruno

August 2015



Final

# THE U.S. NAVY SITE AND ITS ENVIRONS SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT (THE CROSSING HOTEL SITE)

Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for  
City of San Bruno

August 2015



550 Kearny Street  
Suite 800  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
415.896.5900  
[www.esassoc.com](http://www.esassoc.com)

Los Angeles

Oakland

Orlando

Petaluma

Portland

Sacramento

San Diego

Seattle

Tampa

Woodland Hills

130117

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

## **The U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan Amendment (The Crossing Hotel Site) Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1-1</b>
A. CEQA Process	1-1
B. Method of Organization	1-2
<b>2. Agencies and Persons Commenting on the Draft EIR</b>	<b>2-1</b>
A. Agencies and Persons Commenting in Writing	2-1
<b>3. Written Comments on the Draft EIR and Responses to Comments</b>	<b>3-1</b>
Letter 1: San Francisco International Airport	3-2
Letter 2: Department of Transportation	3-6
<b>4. Revisions to the Draft EIR</b>	<b>4-1</b>
A. Staff-Initiated Changes to the Draft EIR	4-1
B. Changes to the Draft EIR in Response to Comments	4-6
<b>5. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program</b>	<b>5-1</b>
A. Introduction	5-1
B. Format	5-1
C. Enforcement	5-2
<b>List of Tables</b>	
5-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	5-3

This page intentionally left blank

# CHAPTER 1

---

## Introduction

### A. CEQA Process

On May 18, 2015 the City of San Bruno (Lead Agency) released for public review a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) for the proposed U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan Amendment (The Crossing Hotel Site) (SCH# 1999092026). The minimum 45-day public review and comment period on the Draft EIR began on May 18, 2015, and closed on July 2, 2015.

The Draft SEIR for the proposed U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan Amendment (The Crossing Hotel Site) (proposed project) together with this Response to Comments Document constitutes the Final SEIR for the proposed project. The Final SEIR is an informational document prepared by the Lead Agency that must be considered by decision-makers before approving the proposed project and that must reflect the Lead Agency's independent judgment and analysis of the anticipated physical impacts of proposed project on the environment (CEQA *Guidelines*, Section 15090). California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Section 15132) specify the following:

The Final SEIR shall consist of:

- (a) The Draft SEIR or a revision of that draft.
- (b) Comments and recommendations received on the Draft SEIR either verbatim or in a summary.
- (c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft SEIR.
- (d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.
- (e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

This document has been prepared pursuant to CEQA and in conformance with the CEQA Guidelines. This Response to Comments Document incorporates comments from public agencies and the general public, and contains appropriate responses by the Lead Agency to those comments. The Final SEIR reflects the City of San Bruno's independent judgment and analysis.

## **B. Method of Organization**

This SEIR Response to Comments Document for the proposed project contains information in response to comments raised during the public comment period (May 18, 2015 through July 2, 2015).

This chapter, *Introduction*, describes the CEQA process and the organization of this Response to Comments Document.

Chapter 2, *Agencies and Persons Commenting on the Draft SEIR*, lists all agencies, organizations, and persons that submitted written comments on the Draft SEIR during the public review and comment period. The list also indicates the receipt date of each written correspondence.

Chapter 3, *Written Comments on the Draft SEIR and Responses to Comments*, contains comment letters received during the review and comment period. The responses to the comments are provided following each letter. Numbering is used for each comment letter and the corresponding response.

Chapter 4, *Revisions to the Draft SEIR*, contains text changes to the Draft SEIR.

Chapter 5, *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*, describes the identified mitigation measures and the responsible parties, tasks, and schedule for monitoring mitigation compliance.

## CHAPTER 2

---

# Agencies and Persons Commenting on the Draft SEIR

### A. Agencies and Persons Commenting in Writing

The following agencies, organizations and individuals submitted written comments on the Draft SEIR during the public review period, or shortly thereafter. The minimum 45-day public review and comment period on the Draft SEIR began on May 18, 2015, and closed at 5:00 p.m. on July 2, 2015.

---

<b>Letter</b>	<b>Person/Agency and Signatory</b>	<b>Date</b>
1	San Francisco International Airport John Bergener, Airport Planning Director	June 29, 2015
2	California Department of Transportation Patricia Maurice, District Branch Chief	July 1, 2015

---

This page intentionally left blank

## **CHAPTER 3**

---

# **Written Comments on the Draft EIR and Responses to Comments**

This chapter contains copies of the comment letters received during the public review period on the Draft SEIR and the individual responses to those comments. Each written comment letter is designated with a number (1 and 2) in the upper right-hand corner of the letter.

Within each written comment letter, individual comments are labeled with a number in the margin. Immediately following each comment letter is an individual response to each numbered comment. Where responses have resulted in changes to the Draft SEIR, these changes also appear in Chapter 4 of this Response to Comments Document.



San Francisco International Airport

June 29, 2015

Mr. Mark Sullivan
Long-Range Planning Manager
City of San Bruno
Community Development Department
567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA 94066

Subject: Notice of a Draft Supplemental EIR for the U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs
Specific Plan Amendment (The Crossing Hotel Site)

Dear Mr. Sullivan:

Thank you for notifying the San Francisco International Airport (SFO or the Airport) that the City of San Bruno (San Bruno) has made the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) for the U.S. Navy site and its Environs Specific Plan Amendment (Specific Plan Amendment) for the Crossing Hotel site available for review.

SFO staff reviewed the Draft SEIR for the proposed Crossing Hotel project, noting the amendments to the Specific Plan to alter the size and use of the hotel. Of particular interest to SFO is the amendment to reduce the scale of the hotel approved in the Specific Plan to a 152-room hotel on a 1.5 acre site, with a maximum height reduction from 90 feet to approximately 73 feet.

The proposed project site area lies beneath critical aeronautical surfaces associated with aircraft flight operations at SFO as described in the October 2012 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport (ALUCP). While the Specific Plan allowed for a building with a maximum height of 90 feet that was approved through Measure E, the Specific Plan Amendment states the maximum building height shall not penetrate critical aeronautical surfaces. The Airport welcomes this amendment and notes that airspace protection policies should not only require compliance with the FAA 7460-1 airspace evaluation process as noted within the Draft SEIR, but also with ALUCP airspace policies AP-1 through AP-4, which include the SFO critical aeronautical surfaces map (ALUCP 4.5.4).

One additional clarification that should be made in the Specific Plan Amendment involves specification of building height with regard to elevation Above Mean Sea Level (AMSL) vs. Above Ground Level (AGL). In May 2012, the Airport provided San Bruno with information regarding allowable building heights on the site in the context of the ALUCP critical airspace surfaces as described in ALUCP 4.5.4. Included were allowable height limits AMSL along with estimated allowable heights AGL based on U.S. Geological Survey National Elevation 1/3 arc-second database estimates of ground heights at that time. Ground heights can change over time if earthwork is performed on a site and estimated ground elevations can differ based on different measurement methodologies (e.g., US Geological Survey National Elevation 1/3 arc-second database vs. more accurate on-site survey). For this reason, it is recommended that allowable building heights be described in terms of allowable height AMSL instead of AGL.

1-1

1-2

AIRPORT COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

EDWIN M. LEE MAYOR LARRY MAZZOLA PRESIDENT LINDA S. CRAYTON VICE PRESIDENT ELEANOR JOHNS RICHARD J. GUGGENHIME PETER A. STERN JOHN L. MARTIN AIRPORT DIRECTOR

Post Office Box 8097 San Francisco, California 94128 Tel 650.821.5000 Fax 650.821.5005 www.flysfo.com

Mr. Mark Sullivan  
June 29, 2015  
Page 2 of 2

The Airport appreciates your consideration of these comments. If I can be of assistance as the City considers airport land use compatibility as it relates to this project or future projects, please do not hesitate to contact me at (650) 821-7867 or at [john.bergener@flysfso.com](mailto:john.bergener@flysfso.com).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Bergener', with a stylized flourish at the end.

John Bergener  
Airport Planning Director  
Bureau of Planning and Environmental Affairs

cc: Nixon Lam, SFO, Environmental Affairs Manager  
Bert Ganoung, SFO, Aircraft Noise Abatement Office Manager  
Sandy Wong, Executive Director, C/CAG

## Letter 1: San Francisco International Airport John Bergener, Airport Planning Director

- 1-1 The commenter notes that airspace protection policies should not only require compliance with the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) 7460-1 airspace evaluation process as noted within the Draft SEIR, but also with airspace policies AP-1 through AP-4 included in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for San Francisco International Airport (SFO), which include the SFO critical aeronautical surfaces map (ALUCP 4.5.4).

ALUCP policy AP-1 (filing Form 7460-1 with the FAA) was included in the Initial Study under Mitigation Measure C.1a. The project must comply with the remaining ALUCP policies AP-2 through AP-4. The Initial Study Section 4.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials* section acknowledges that the project site is "within the defined Airport Influence Area (AIA) [and] is subject to land use policies contained in the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport (ALUCP)" (pp. 47-48). The Initial Study includes mitigation measures (p. 49) from the prior Specific Plan EIR that: 1) require compliance with the height limitations contained in 14 CFR Part 77, through the filing of FAA Form 7460-1, and 2) prohibit other airport hazards, including directing lights or reflecting sunlight towards aircraft on takeoff or landing; generation of smoke or rising columns of air; attracting large concentrations of birds; and generation of electrical interference that may interfere with aircraft communications or instrumentation. ALUCP Policies AP-2 (compliance with findings of FAA studies) and AP-3 (maximum building height) are a corollary to compliance with the 14 CFR Part 77 height restrictions and the filing of Form 7460-1, and thus through implementation of Mitigation Measure C.1a, would be complied with. The project would comply with Policy AP-4 (avoidance of other flight hazards) through implementation of Mitigation Measure C.1b.

- 1-2 The commenter clarifies that allowable building heights should be described in terms of allowable height above mean sea level (AMSL) instead of above ground level (AGL).

As stated on pages 3-7 and 3-8 of the Draft SEIR, "under the proposed project, the Specific Plan would be amended such that the maximum building height must not penetrate critical aeronautical surfaces, which would be determined by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in an aeronautical study prepared for a specific project. The maximum height at The Crossing Hotel site is estimated to be approximately 73 feet, which would allow five stories. This is the height limit proposed under the Specific Plan amendments."

The 73-foot height limit was based on allowable heights of between approximately 133 feet and 136 feet above mean sea level across most of the site, as determined by the

FAA, based on the aeronautical surfaces noted above.<sup>1</sup> As stated by the commenter, the height of approximately 73 feet above grade was set forth by the FAA based on estimated ground elevations taken from U.S. Geological Survey data.

As stated in the preceding paragraph, and explained further in the response to Comment 1-1, above, the proposed project would be subject to compliance with height limits promulgated by the FAA under 14 CFR Part 77. Among other things, 14 CFR Part 77 specifies the permitted clear space in which buildings cannot be constructed, depending on their distance from an airport and horizontal orientation relative to flight paths. Because these aeronautical surfaces are specified relative to the elevation of the airport in question, they are given in feet above mean sea level to provide for a uniform base of measurement. Accordingly, when filing Form 7460-1, Notice Of Proposed Construction or Alteration, with the FAA, the project sponsor will be required to provide elevation data for the project site and for the proposed project in feet above mean sea level. The Specific Plan would include a height limit that is the lesser of 73 feet or the maximum height permitted by the FAA subject to 14 CFR Part 77, which increases from southeast to northwest across the site from approximately 133 feet to 136 feet above mean sea level.

---

<sup>1</sup> The southwest corner of the site is subject to lesser restrictions on height because it sits outside the boundary of a more restrictive FAA aeronautical surface.

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

DISTRICT 4  
111 GRAND AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 23660, MS-10D  
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660  
PHONE (510) 286-5528  
FAX (510) 286-5559  
TTY 711  
www.dot.ca.gov



*Flex your power!  
Be energy efficient!*

July 1, 2015

SMVar026  
SM-82-19.12  
SCH#1999092026

Mr. Mark Sullivan  
City of San Bruno  
Planning and Building Department  
567 El Camino Real  
San Bruno, CA 94066

Dear Mr. Sullivan:

**U.S. Navy Site and its Environs Specific Plan (The Crossing Hotel Site) – Supplemental Environmental Impact Report**

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. Our comments seek to promote the State's smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy and build active communities rather than sprawl. They are based on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report.

***Traffic Impact Report***

Please provide the following information:

- 1. Freeway segment analysis under Cumulative Conditions, and
- 2. Queuing analysis for left-turn lanes on El Camino Real to Commodore Drive.

I 2-1  
I 2-2

Please feel free to call or email Sandra Finegan at (510) 622-1644 or [sandra.finegan@dot.ca.gov](mailto:sandra.finegan@dot.ca.gov) with any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA MAURICE  
District Branch Chief  
Local Development – Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse

## Letter 2: California Department of Transportation Patricia Maurice, District Branch Chief

- 2-1 The commenter requests that the SEIR provide freeway segment analysis under cumulative conditions.

As described on page 4.C-14 of the Draft SEIR, based on the number of trips generated by the proposed project and the dispersion of project traffic along I-280, I-380, and U.S. 101, the proposed project would not add more than one percent of capacity to any study freeway segment (the threshold of significance established in the City and Council Association of Government's Congestion Management Program); see Chapter 4 (Revisions to the Draft EIR) for the freeway analysis worksheets inadvertently omitted from Appendix E of the Draft EIR. Therefore, potential adverse effects to existing freeway segment capacities from the proposed project would be less-than-significant. Because the freeway segment capacities are not expected to change under cumulative conditions, the proposed project would continue to not add more than one percent of capacity under cumulative conditions, and the project would therefore result in less-than-significant impacts.

In addition, as described on page 4.C-16 of the Draft SEIR, the anticipated increase in peak-hour traffic associated with the proposed project would not result in adverse effects to freeway segment LOS conditions, as project-related trips would not result in an increase in volume-to-capacity ratios along affected freeway segments; see Chapter 4 (Revisions to the Draft EIR) for the freeway analysis worksheets inadvertently omitted from Appendix E of the Draft EIR. While traffic volumes on area freeways will increase under cumulative conditions with the addition of traffic from other future projects, with corresponding effects on LOS conditions, project-related trips would continue to not result in an increase in volume-to-capacity ratios along affected freeway segments under cumulative conditions, and the project would result in less-than-significant impacts.

- 2-2 The commenter requests that the SEIR provide a queuing analysis for left-turn lanes on El Camino Real to Commodore Drive.

Using the Synchro level of service software program, queue lengths (50th and 95th percentile) were computed for the northbound left-turn lanes on El Camino Real at Commodore Drive under the Draft SEIR's analysis scenarios (i.e., Existing, Existing + Proposed Project, 2030 Cumulative Baseline, and 2030 Cumulative + Proposed Project). The results of those computations indicate that the dual left-turn lanes (total storage capacity of about 350 feet) accommodate left-turning vehicles during typical signal cycles, and the project's estimated 25 additional northbound left turns during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours (i.e., about one every two minutes) would not cause queue spillback beyond the left-turn lanes. Therefore, the project impact would be less than significant.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

# CHAPTER 4

---

## Revisions to the Draft SEIR

The following revisions are made to the Draft SEIR and incorporated as part of the Final SEIR. Revised or new language is underlined. Deleted language is indicated by ~~strikethrough~~ text.

The revisions in this chapter do not identify any new significant impacts other than those already identified in the Draft SEIR, nor do they reveal any substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact in comparison to the analyses contained in the Draft SEIR. The revisions also do not describe any project impact or mitigation measure that is considerably different from those identified in the Draft SEIR. Accordingly, the revisions in this chapter do not constitute “significant new information” and it is therefore not necessary for the Lead Agency to recirculate the EIR for public comment prior to certification of the Final EIR (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15088.5).

Section A, below, identifies staff-initiated changes made to the Draft SEIR. Section B identifies changes made to the SEIR in response to comments received.

### A. Staff-Initiated Changes to the Draft SEIR

The text changes presented in this section were initiated by Lead Agency staff. None of the revisions results in fundamental alterations of the conclusions of the Draft SEIR. The following text changes have been made:

Freeway segment analysis worksheets, inadvertently omitted from the Draft SEIR, have been added to Appendix E of the SEIR. These worksheets are included in this Final EIR, beginning on the following page.

## The Crossings Hotel SEIR Freeway Segment Capacity Analysis

Freeway Segment	Direction	No. of Lanes	Capacity	Peak Hour	1% of capacity	Project Trips	Impact?
US 101 - North of I-380	NB	5	11000	AM	110	9	no
				PM	110	10	no
	SB	5	11000	AM	110	9	no
				PM	110	10	no
US 101 - South of I-380 (c)	NB	5	11000	AM	110	15	no
				PM	110	17	no
	SB	5	11000	AM	110	15	no
				PM	110	17	no
I-280 - North of San Bruno Ave	NB	4	8800	AM	88	3	no
				PM	88	3	no
	SB	4	8800	AM	88	3	no
				PM	88	3	no
I-280 - South of San Bruno Ave	NB	4	8800	AM	88	3	no
				PM	88	3	no
	SB	4	8800	AM	88	3	no
				PM	88	3	no
I-380 - West of El Camino Real	EB	3	6600	AM	66	3	no
				PM	66	3	no
	WB	6 (a)	11000	AM	110	3	no
				PM	110	3	no
I-380 -East of El Camino Real	EB	4 (b)	8100	AM	81	21	no
				PM	81	24	no
	WB	4	8800	AM	88	21	no
				PM	88	24	no

### Notes:

- 1) Capacities of 2,200 vehicles per hour per lane (vphpl) for freeway segments.
- 2) One percent (1%) threshold based on *C/CAG CMP Guidelines* - if project trips would result in more than 1% increase, impact would be identified
- 3) Net added project trips includes total AM/PM Peak-Hour Inbound and Outbound trips
  - (a) Freeway segment includes 4 general purpose (mixed-use) lanes and 2 auxiliary lanes
  - (b) Freeway segment includes 3 general purpose (mixed-flow) lanes and 1 auxiliary lane
  - (c) Capacity analysis for freeway segment includes peak-hour project trips traveling along US 101 and utilizing both San Bruno Avenue interchange and I-380 interchange

Sources: ESA, 2014; Caltrans, 2011; and *C/CAG Policy on Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) to Determine Traffic Impacts on the CMP Network Resulting from Roadway Changes, General Plan Updates, and Land Use Development Projects (August 2006)*

Lane Capacity Metrics		Capacity
Mixed Flow lane		2200
1-lane aux		1500
2-lane aux		2200

Trip Distribution (along Freeways)		Project Trips	
		AM	PM
101 n/o 380	15%	9	10
101 s/o 380	25%	15	17
101 to San Bruno Ave	5%	3	3
101 to 380	20%	12	14
280 n/o 380 (use Sneath)	5%	3	3
280 s/o 380 (use 380)	5%	3	3
380 e/o El Camino Real	35%	21	24
380 w/o El Camino Real	5%	3	3

### Project Trip Generation (Peak Hour Totals)

	AM	PM
IN	36	35
OUT	25	33
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>68</b>

**The Crossings Hotel SEIR**  
**Freeway Segment LOS Analysis**

Freeway Segment	Direction	No. of Lanes	Existing Conditions					Existing plus Project Conditions						
			Capacity	Peak Hour	Volumes	V/C Ratio	LOS	Project Trips	Volumes	V/C Ratio	Change in V/C	LOS	LOS Standard	Impact? (e)
US 101 - North of I-380 (d)	NB	5	11000	AM	6418	0.58	C	9	6427	0.58	0.00	C	E	no
		5	11000	PM	6094	0.55	C	10	6104	0.55	0.00	C	E	no
	SB	5	11000	AM	5987	0.54	C	9	5996	0.55	0.00	C	E	no
		5	11000	PM	6119	0.56	C	10	6129	0.56	0.00	C	E	no
US 101 - South of I-380 (d)	NB	5	11000	AM	5954	0.54	C	15	5969	0.54	0.00	C	E	no
		5	11000	PM	5001	0.45	B	17	5018	0.46	0.00	B	E	no
	SB	5	11000	AM	5376	0.49	B	15	5391	0.49	0.00	B	E	no
		5	11000	PM	5510	0.50	B	17	5527	0.50	0.00	B	E	no
I-280 - North of San Bruno Ave (c)	NB	4	8800	AM	7657	0.87	D	3	7660	0.87	0.00	D	D	no
		4	8800	<b>PM</b>	<b>8867</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8870</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	D	no
	SB	4	8800	AM	7656	0.87	D	3	7659	0.87	0.00	D	D	no
		4	8800	PM	7801	0.89	D	3	7804	0.89	0.00	D	D	no
I-280 - South of San Bruno Ave (c)	NB	4	8800	AM	7744	0.88	D	3	7747	0.88	0.00	D	D	no
		4	8800	<b>PM</b>	<b>8091</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8094</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>E</b>	D	no
	SB	4	8800	<b>AM</b>	<b>7939</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7942</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>E</b>	D	no
		4	8800	PM	7450	0.85	D	3	7453	0.85	0.00	D	D	no
I-380 - West of El Camino Real (d)	EB	3	6600	AM	6675	1.01	F	3	6678	1.01	0.00	F	F	no
		3	6600	PM	4282	0.65	C	3	4285	0.65	0.00	C	F	no
	WB	6 (a)	11000	AM	3271	0.30	A	3	3274	0.30	0.00	A	F	no
		6	11000	PM	6208	0.56	C	3	6211	0.56	0.00	C	F	no
I-380 -East of El Camino Real (d)	EB	4 (b)	8100	AM	7700	0.95	E	21	7721	0.95	0.00	E	F	no
		4	8100	PM	5087	0.63	C	24	5111	0.63	0.00	C	F	no
	WB	4	8800	AM	3957	0.45	B	21	3978	0.45	0.00	B	F	no
		4	8800	PM	7093	0.81	D	24	7117	0.81	0.00	D	F	no

**NOTES:**

**BOLD** indicates freeway segment is operating at unacceptable LOS.

(a) Freeway segment includes 4 general purpose (mixed-use) lanes and 2 auxiliary lanes

(b) Freeway segment includes 3 general purpose (mixed-flow) lanes and 1 auxiliary lane

(c) Freeway segment volumes were provided in 2011 Caltrans Peak Hour Count Data

(d) Freeway segment volumes were provided in Table 14.5 of *Transit Corridors Draft EIR*

(e) Per C/CAG TIA Guidelines (2006), a project would result in a significant impact if the project will add traffic demand equal to one (1) percent or more of the segment capacity or causes the freeway segment volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio to increase by one (1) percent, if the freeway segment is currently not in

Sources: ESA, 2014; 2012 Transit Corridors Draft EIR, Table 14.5 (City of San Bruno); 2011 Caltrans; 2011 C/CAG CMP Guidelines - LOS Standards; and 2006 C/CAG TIA Guidelines (pages 9-10).

**The Crossings Hotel SEIR**  
**Freeway Segment LOS Analysis**

Freeway Segment	Direction	No. of Lanes	Cumulative (General Plan) Conditions					Cumulative (General Plan) plus Project Conditions						
			Capacity	Peak Hour	Volumes	V/C Ratio	LOS	Project Trips	Volumes	V/C Ratio	Change in V/C	LOS	LOS Standard	Impact? (e)
US 101 - North of I-380 (d)	NB	5	11000	AM	7494	0.68	C	9	7503	0.68	0.00	C	E	no
		5	11000	PM	7221	0.66	C	10	7231	0.66	0.00	C	E	no
	SB	5	11000	AM	7155	0.65	C	9	7164	0.65	0.00	C	E	no
		5	11000	PM	7209	0.66	C	10	7219	0.66	0.00	C	E	no
US 101 - South of I-380 (d)	NB	5	11000	AM	6972	0.63	C	15	6987	0.64	0.00	C	E	no
		5	11000	PM	5826	0.53	C	17	5843	0.53	0.00	C	E	no
	SB	5	11000	AM	6247	0.57	C	15	6262	0.57	0.00	C	E	no
		5	11000	PM	6462	0.59	C	17	6479	0.59	0.00	C	E	no
I-280 - North of San Bruno Ave (c)	NB	4	8800	<b>AM</b>	<b>8954</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>F</b>	3	<b>8957</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	D	no
		4	8800	<b>PM</b>	<b>10362</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10365</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	D	no
	SB	4	8800	<b>AM</b>	<b>8974</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>F</b>	3	<b>8977</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	D	no
		4	8800	<b>PM</b>	<b>9143</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>F</b>	3	<b>9146</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	D	no
I-280 - South of San Bruno Ave (c)	NB	4	8800	<b>AM</b>	<b>9056</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>F</b>	3	<b>9059</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	D	no
		4	8800	<b>PM</b>	<b>9455</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9459</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	D	no
	SB	4	8800	<b>AM</b>	<b>9305</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9308</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	D	no
		4	8800	<b>PM</b>	<b>8732</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>E</b>	3	<b>8735</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>E</b>	D	no
I-380 - West of El Camino Real (d)	EB	3	6600	<b>AM</b>	<b>7806</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7809</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	F	no
		3	6600	PM	5004	0.76	D	3	5007	0.76	0.00	D	F	no
	WB	6 (a)	11000	AM	3834	0.35	B	3	3837	0.35	0.00	B	F	no
		6	11000	PM	7276	0.66	C	3	7279	0.66	0.00	C	F	no
I-380 -East of El Camino Real (d)	EB	4 (b)	8100	<b>AM</b>	<b>8951</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8972</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>F</b>	F	no
		4	8100	PM	6037	0.75	D	24	6061	0.75	0.00	D	F	no
	WB	4	8800	AM	4737	0.54	C	21	4758	0.54	0.00	C	F	no
		4	8800	PM	8275	0.94	E	24	8299	0.94	0.00	E	F	no

**NOTES:**

**BOLD** indicates freeway segment is operating at unacceptable LOS.

(a) Freeway segment includes 4 general purpose (mixed-use) lanes and 2 auxiliary lanes

(b) Freeway segment includes 3 general purpose (mixed-flow) lanes and 1 auxiliary lane

(c) Freeway segment volumes were derived by extrapolating 2011 Caltrans Peak Hour Count Data with growth factored similar to growth for I-380 and US 101

(d) Freeway segment volumes were provided in Table 14.11 of *Transit Corridors Draft EIR*

(e) Per C/CAG TIA Guidelines (2006), a project would result in a significant impact if the project will add traffic demand equal to one (1) percent or more of the segment capacity or causes the freeway segment volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio to increase by one (1) percent, if the freeway segment is currently not in

Sources: ESA, 2014; 2012 Transit Corridors Draft EIR, Table 14.5 (City of San Bruno); 2011 Caltrans; 2011 C/CAG CMP Guidelines - LOS Standards; and 2006 C/CAG TIA Guidelines (pages 9-10).

# CHAPTER 5

## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

---

### A. Introduction

When approving projects with Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) that identify significant impacts, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires public agencies to adopt monitoring and reporting programs or conditions of project approval to mitigate or avoid the identified significant effects (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(1)). A public agency is required to ensure that the measures are fully enforceable, through permit conditions, agreements, or other means (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(b)). The mitigation measures required by a public agency to reduce or avoid significant project impacts not incorporated into the design or program for the project may be made conditions of project approval as set forth in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The program must be designed to ensure project compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation.

The MMRP includes the mitigation measures identified in the EIR required to address the significant impacts associated with the proposed project. The required mitigation measures are summarized in this program; the full text of the impact analysis and mitigation measures is presented in the Draft EIR in Chapter 2, Summary, except as revised in this Final EIR. No mitigation measures were revised as part of the Final EIR.

### B. Format

The MMRP is organized in a table format (see **Table 5-1**), keyed to each significant impact and each EIR mitigation measure. Only mitigation measures adopted to address significant impacts are included in this program. Each mitigation measure is set out in full, followed by a tabular summary of monitoring requirements. The column headings in the tables are defined as follows:

- **Mitigation Measures:** This column presents the mitigation measure identified in the EIR.
- **Implementation Responsibility:** This column identifies the person/group responsible for implementation of the migration measure.
- **Monitoring Responsibility:** This column contains an assignment of responsibility for the monitoring and reporting tasks.
- **Monitoring and Reporting Action:** This column refers the outcome from implementing the mitigation measure.

- **Mitigation Schedule:** The general schedule for conducting each mitigation task, identifying where appropriate both the timing and the frequency of the action.
- **Verification of Compliance:** This column may be used by the lead agency to document the person who verified the implementation of the mitigation measure and the date on which this verification occurred.

## C. Enforcement

If the proposed project is approved, the MMRP would be incorporated as a condition of such approval. Therefore, all mitigation measures for significant impacts must be carried out in order to fulfill the requirements of approval. A number of the mitigation measures would be implemented during the course of the development review process. These measures would be checked on plans, in reports, and in the field prior to construction. Most of the remaining mitigation measures would be implemented during the construction or project implementation phase and verified within a quarterly monitoring report.

**TABLE 5-1  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
<b>Mitigation Measures from the EIR</b>					
<b>A. Air Quality</b>					
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.A-2 (H.1.a):</b> The City shall condition approval of individual development proposals under the Specific Plan on implementation of an appropriate dust abatement program, patterned after the BAAQMD approach described herein. The following will be required for all construction activities within the project area. These measures will reduce fugitive dust emissions primarily during soil movement and grading activities, but also during vehicle and equipment movement on unpaved project sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.</li> <li>All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</li> <li>All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.</li> <li>All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</li> <li>All streets, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</li> <li>Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of CCR). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</li> <li>All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.</li> <li>A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>Project sponsor includes dust abatement program in contractor specifications.</li> <li>Contractor implements measures during construction.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>City reviews construction specifications to verify inclusion.</li> <li>Project sponsor requires construction contractor to submit documentation of compliance following completion of project.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City of San Bruno</li> <li>City of San Bruno</li> <li>Project sponsor and construction contractor</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prior to project approval.</li> <li>During construction</li> <li>Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy</li> </ol>	

**TABLE 5-1 (Continued)  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.A-3:</b> The project sponsor shall ensure that construction contract specifications include a requirement that all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment used for project improvements be equipped with engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and are fitted with Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control (VDEC), which would reduce diesel particulate emissions by at least 85 percent. (Engines meeting Tier 4 [Interim or Final] emission standards automatically meet the Level 3 VDEC requirement and no additional emissions control is required.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>2. Project sponsor includes dust abatement program in contractor specifications.</li> <li>3. Contractor implements measures during construction.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>2. City reviews construction specifications to verify inclusion.</li> <li>3. Project sponsor</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. City of San Bruno</li> <li>3. Project sponsor and construction contractor</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to project approval.</li> <li>2. Prior to issuance of grading permit.</li> <li>3. Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy</li> </ol>	
<b>Mitigation Measures from the Initial Study</b>					
<b>4. Biological Resources</b>					
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.a (G.1.b):</b> In the event that tree removal is required, a tree removal permit would be obtained from the City of San Bruno. The City would assure that the conditions contained within the appropriate tree removal permit would be followed.</p> <p>The following measures are also applicable for removed trees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree removal will not occur between February 1 and August 31 without a bird survey conducted by a qualified biologist to determine that the tree is unused during the breeding season by avian species that are protected under California Fish and Game Codes 3503, 3503.5, and 3511. If bird species are detected or active nests are observed, the District will obtain the necessary permits from California Fish and Game, and will comply with permit conditions for protecting these species, which will likely involve seasonal avoidance or construction “exclusion zones” around nest sites. Buffer zones will be avoided during construction activities until young have fledged or the nest is otherwise abandoned.</li> <li>• A qualified biologist shall conduct bat surveys to determine whether any mature trees that would be removed during project construction provides hibernacula or nursery colony roosting habitat. Exclusion should be conducted at specific times of the year. Winter roosts are generally occupied between October 15 and February 28, and maternity colonies are generally occupied between April 15 and August 31. Therefore, exclusion, if required, should be conducted generally between</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>2. Project sponsor presents final site plan to City that delineates extent of tree removal.</li> <li>3. If tree removal is proposed, project sponsor contracts with a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction bird and bat surveys</li> <li>4. If tree removal is proposed, project sponsor submits plan for replacement plantings.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>2. City reviews site plan.</li> <li>3. Conduct bird and bat surveys.</li> <li>4. City reviews landscaping plan.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. City of San Bruno</li> <li>3. Project sponsor or contractor</li> <li>4. City of San Bruno</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to project approval.</li> <li>2. Prior to issuance of grading or demolition permit.</li> <li>3. Prior to construction activities.</li> <li>4. Prior to issuance of grading or demolition permit.</li> </ol>	

**TABLE 5-1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
<p>August 15 and October 15 and between March 1 and April 15. If bats are using trees that need to be removed, the roosting season of the colony should be determined and the removal of the tree conducted when the colony is using an alternate roost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City of San Bruno will require replacement of all removed street trees with native trees and will require that the replaced trees be incorporated into a landscape plan for site development that is submitted to the City for review and approval.</li> </ul>					
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.e (G.1.a):</b> The City of San Bruno, to the extent feasible, will avoid removal of, or damage to all street trees, as designated by the City of San Bruno Tree and Planting Ordinance. The following presents limitations for construction within and around trees to be preserved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A certified arborist shall be contracted to perform a tree survey of the site to confirm the presence or absence of heritage trees within the project site prior to construction. The survey will also confirm the presence of trees that are to remain onsite according to the Tree Disposition Plan (2001).</li> <li>Should heritage trees be present within the project site, a certified arborist shall determine appropriate protective measures to be implemented during construction and which may include but is not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A certified arborist shall be consulted prior to construction to accurately locate root protection zones and identify other specific measures that would limit potential indirect impacts on trees that may be encroached upon. For all development that would encroach into the feeder root zone (drip-line) or a 12-foot radius from the trunk, whichever is greater, of a preserved tree, special construction techniques to allow roots to breath and obtain water will be required, as determined by the City of San Bruno (e.g., use hand equipment for trenching, protect natural resources with highly visible protective fencing, allow only one pass through an area with preserved trees).</li> <li>The existing ground surface within the drip-line of any tree will not be cut, filled, or compacted unless otherwise approved by the City of San Bruno. Excavation adjacent to any trees, when permitted, will be in such a manner that will cause only minimal root damage. Permission and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City of San Bruno incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>Applicant contracts with a certified arborist to perform a tree survey on the project site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verify and approve the incorporation of the measure into the construction plan.</li> <li>Conduct tree survey and present results to City.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City of San Bruno</li> <li>Applicant and its contractor(s); City of San Bruno</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prior to project approval.</li> <li>Prior to construction activities.</li> </ol>	

**TABLE 5-1 (Continued)  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
<p>inspection will be required prior to back-filling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction staging areas shall be designated on plans and prohibit parking, loading, digging (especially trenching), and grading during all construction activities within root protection zones of all trees. There will be no parking or storing of vehicles, equipment, machinery, construction materials, or construction trailers, and no mechanical excavation, construction of buildings or dumping of oils or chemicals within the drip-lines of any trees.</li> </ul> <p>Prior to the start of any clearing, stockpiling, trenching, grading, compaction, paving, or change in ground elevation on a site with saved protected trees, fencing will be installed at the drip-line. Prior to grading or issuance of any permits, the fences may be inspected and the location thereof approved by appropriate county staff. The county requires the installation of a 6-foot-high chain-link fence around the drip-line of preserved trees during construction and demolition phases. A 4-inch-layer of chipped bark mulch should be placed over the soil surface within the fenced dripline prior to installing temporary fencing. Suitable mulch must contain bark "fines." Maintain this layer of mulch throughout construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pruning shall be overseen by a certified arborist for all protected trees, and should be done to clean and raise canopy per International Society of Arboriculture pruning standards.</li> <li>- A drainage plan shall be designed that will avoid heritage trees.</li> <li>- Construction drawings shall accurately locate areas to be avoided such as tree trunks and root protection zones.</li> <li>- A pre-construction meeting conference shall be held with contractors to review BMPs and require bonding and fines to ensure the replacement of any inadvertently damaged trees.</li> <li>- Whenever possible, existing grade shall be maintained within the fenced portion of the dripline.</li> </ul>					

**TABLE 5-1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
<b>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>					
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 8.a (L.1.d):</b> The City of San Bruno will require all proposed project sponsors to submit a Phase II report, based on the September 17, 2013 Phase I findings, and subsequent reports as may be required by the City of San Bruno, completed no more than 18 months prior to approval of a proposed project by City Council to assure no additional contamination is present from overlooked USTs or other unknown sources. The City of San Bruno will require that any project sponsor incorporate the recommendations of the Phase II report into the design of the proposed project.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>2. Project sponsor and its contractor(s) shall retain a qualified environmental professional to prepare a Phase II report.</li> <li>3. Project sponsor and its contractor(s) shall incorporate the recommendations of the Phase II report into the design of the proposed project.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>2. Review construction plans for inclusion of Phase II results.</li> <li>3. City reviews results of Phase II and any applicable project revisions.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. Project sponsor and its contractor</li> <li>3. City of San Bruno</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to Project Approval.</li> <li>2. Prior to ground-disturbing activities.</li> <li>3. Prior to ground disturbing activities.</li> </ol>	
<b>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)</b>					
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 8.e</b></p> <p><b>C.1a:</b> The City of San Bruno will require that all building heights and associated roof structures proposed under the Specific Plan be consistent with the height limitations defined by FAR Part 77. Prior to issuance of any demolition or construction permits, the City of San Bruno shall require the project sponsors for any project within the Specific Plan area to provide appropriate notification to the FAA via FAA Form 7460-1.</p> <p><b>C.1b:</b> The City of San Bruno shall prohibit the following uses within the Specific Plan area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any use that would direct a steady or flashing light of white, red, green, or amber color toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing, other than FAA-approved navigational lights.</li> <li>• Any use that would cause sunlight to be reflected toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or engaged in straight final approach toward a landing.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>2. Project sponsor to provide notification to the FAA via FAA Form 7460-1.</li> <li>3. Project sponsor to submit disclosure notice to City for approval.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>2. City to review FAA response to Form 7460-1.</li> <li>3. City review disclosure notice.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. City of San Bruno</li> <li>3. City of San Bruno.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to project approval</li> <li>2. Prior to issuance of building permit.</li> <li>3. Prior to issuance of building permit.</li> </ol>	

**TABLE 5-1 (Continued)  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any use that would generate smoke or rising columns of air.</li> <li>• Any use that would attract large concentrations of birds within approach-climbout areas.</li> <li>• Any use that would generate electrical interference that may interfere with aircraft communications or aircraft instrumentation.</li> </ul> <p><b>C.1c:</b> The City shall require all sponsors of new dwelling units and/or buildings for human occupation to record a notice of fair disclosure, regarding the proximity of the proposed development to San Francisco International Airport and of the potential impacts of aircraft operation, per the recommendations contained in the Final Report of the 1998 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury, as implemented by the City of San Bruno.</p>					
<b>Mitigation Measures Required by the Initial Study (cont.)</b>					
5. Cultural References					
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 5.b (N.1b):</b> If cultural resources or human remains, prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered during construction of a project, all construction activities within 100 feet will halt and the resources and their context shall not be further disturbed until a qualified cultural resource consultant has evaluated the situation. The City of San Bruno shall assure that identified cultural resources are recorded on proper historical properties forms.</p> <p>A Secretary of the Interior-qualified archaeologist will inspect the findings within 24 hours of discovery. If it is determined that the project could damage a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines), mitigation will be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2 and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, with a preference for preservation in place. Consistent with Section 15126.4(b)(3), this may be accomplished through planning construction to avoid the resource; incorporating the resource within open space; capping and covering the resource; or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. If avoidance is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist will prepare and implement a detailed treatment plan in consultation with the City of San Bruno. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of PRC Section 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of (but would not be not limited to) sample excavation, artifact collection, site</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>2. If cultural/archeological resources are encountered, a Secretary of the Interior-qualified archaeologist shall inspect the findings within 24 hours of discovery and report to City.</li> <li>3. If cultural/archeological resources are encountered, Archaeologist shall conduct independent review and prepare treatment plan, if necessary.</li> <li>4. If cultural/archeological resources are encountered, Project sponsor or its contractor(s) shall implement treatment plan.</li> <li>5. If cultural/archeological resources are encountered, City of San Bruno shall assure that identified cultural resources are recorded on proper</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>2. If resources are encountered, verify work is suspended.</li> <li>3. If resources are encountered, review and approve treatment plan.</li> <li>4. If resources are discovered, implement treatment plan.</li> <li>5. Review historic properties forms.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. Project Sponsor and Archaeologist; City of San Bruno</li> <li>3. Archaeologist; City of San Bruno.</li> <li>4. Project sponsor and archaeologist.</li> <li>5. City of San Bruno</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to project approval</li> <li>2. Upon cultural resources discovery.</li> <li>3. Upon cultural resources discovery.</li> <li>4. Upon cultural resources discovery.</li> <li>5. Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.</li> </ol>	

**TABLE 5-1 (Continued)  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
documentation, and historical research, with the aim to target the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the project. The treatment plan will include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner, curation of artifacts and data at an approved facility, and dissemination of reports to local and state repositories, libraries, and interested professionals.	historical properties forms.				
<b>Mitigation Measures Required by the Initial Study (cont.)</b>					
<b>1. Hydrology and Water Quality</b>					
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 9a(G.3a):</b> The City shall require all contractors to develop and implement a SWPPP, as required by the State Water Resources Control Board NPDES General Construction Permit, for areas to be disturbed by construction activities . At a minimum, the SWPPP shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A construction schedule that restricts excavation and grading activities to the dry season (generally April 15 to October 15) to reduce erosion associated intense rainfall and surface runoff. The construction schedule shall indicate a timeline for earthmoving activities, hydroseeding, and stabilization of soils;</li> <li>• Soil stabilization techniques such as hydroseeding and short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets;</li> <li>• Silt fences, hay bales, or some kind of inlet protection at downstream storm drain inlets; and</li> <li>• The post-construction inspection of all drainage facilities and clearing of drainage structures of debris and sediment.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>2. Project sponsor and its contractor(s) shall prepare a SWPPP that adheres to all specifications of this measure.</li> <li>3. Inspect construction site for adherence to SWPPP.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>2. Review and approve SWPPP.</li> <li>3. Include any findings in monitoring report</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. City of San Bruno</li> <li>3. City of San Bruno</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to project approval.</li> <li>2. Prior to issuance of construction and grading permit(s).</li> <li>3. One inspection to occur during each phase of construction.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 9c</b></p> <p><b>G.2a:</b> The City of San Bruno shall require, for incorporation into all redevelopment designs, permanent stormwater controls such as vegetated swales, retention ponds, landscape areas, etc., in accordance with MS4 NPDES and San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP) requirements, for the stormwater collected from new parking lots and other impervious surfaces.</p> <p><b>G.2b:</b> To help minimize the amount of runoff containing urban pollutants, streets, and parking areas in the redevelopment subareas</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>2. Project sponsor and its contractor(s) shall submit incorporate all specifications of this measure in the construction plans.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>2. Review project construction plans; verify inclusion of SMCWPPP</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. City of San Bruno</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to project approval.</li> <li>2. Prior to project approval.</li> </ol>	

**TABLE 5-1 (Continued)  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
shall be frequently cleaned by the City of San Bruno using street-sweeping equipment, and the collected material properly disposed.		requirements.			
<b>12. Noise</b>					
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 12.a</b></p> <p><b>I.3.b:</b> All development under the proposed Specific Plan shall be constructed to comply with the relevant noise insulation standards contained in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (Part 2, Appendix Chapter 12A).</p> <p><b>I.1:</b> The project applicant will obtain a permit to construct from the Director of Public Works prior to the start of construction activities, since construction would exceed the specified noise levels in the City Municipal Code. Noise-generating construction activities would be limited to reasonable daytime hours, such as between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays. No construction activities will be allowed on weekends or national holidays. Information concerning construction-related activities and construction hours should be distributed throughout the affected areas and incorporated as part of the Specific Plan, heavy construction activities would be prohibited on Saturdays and Sundays.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project sponsor shall submit building plans documenting compliance with Title 24 noise standards.</li> <li>2. Project sponsor shall obtain construction permit.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review plans for compliance.</li> <li>2. Review plans for compliance.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. City of San Bruno</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to Issuance of building permit.</li> <li>2. Prior to issuance of building or grading permit(s)</li> </ol>	
<b>14. Public Services</b>					
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 14.a.i (F.1):</b> The City of San Bruno shall install signals that can be pre-empted by fire protection or emergency medical response vehicles. Developers shall contribute a “fair share” portion of the costs of these pre-emptive signals as determined by the City of San Bruno.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>2. Project sponsor to pay fair share fee for traffic signal installation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>2. Verification of fee payment</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. City of San Bruno</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to project approval.</li> <li>2. Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Mitigation Measure 14.a.iii (F.4):</b> The City of San Bruno shall coordinate payment to the appropriate school districts of the school impact fee required by California Senate Bill 50.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno to provide assistance as needed to project sponsor to coordinate payment of required school impact fee.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Verification of fee payment</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.</li> </ol>	
<b>17. Utilities and Service Systems</b>					
<b>Mitigation Measure 17.c</b>					

**TABLE 5-1 (Continued)  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Procedure	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
<p><b>E.6:</b> Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of San Bruno shall require that all designs for residential and commercial development within the Specific Plan area include adequate storage space for projected recyclable and compostable materials. The City shall require adequate storage space on each floor of each building and in its enclosed garbage areas, as well as adequate loading space, to accommodate the City of San Bruno's recycling program.</p> <p><b>E.7:</b> As a condition of project approval and before demolition and construction, the City of San Bruno shall require the demolition and construction contractors to maximize diversion of materials remaining from the demolition of structures and the byproducts of construction. The City shall require that project sponsors work with the City of San Bruno's Public Works Department and submit a recovery plan for maximizing diversion of construction and demolition materials associated with construction of any project in the Specific Plan area, so that at least 50 percent of the demolition debris is, if feasible, recycled or can be used as alternative landfill cover.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno incorporates measure as a condition of approval.</li> <li>2. Project sponsor shall submit building plans documenting compliance.</li> <li>3. Project sponsor and construction contractor(s) to submit construction/ demolition waste diversion plan to City for approval.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City adopts condition of approval with project.</li> <li>2. Review plans for compliance.</li> <li>3. Review diversion plan.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City of San Bruno</li> <li>2. City of San Bruno</li> <li>3. City of San Bruno.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to project approval.</li> <li>2. Prior to issuance of building or grading permit.</li> <li>3. Prior to issuance of building or grading permit.</li> </ol>	