

# U.S. NAVY SITE AND ITS ENVIRONS SPECIFIC PLAN

## *Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report*

SCH# 99092026

November, 2001

Prepared by:  
Community Development Department  
City of San Bruno

225 Bush Street  
Suite 1700  
San Francisco,  
California  
94104  
(415) 896-5900

1000 Broadway  
Suite 410  
Oakland,  
California  
94607  
(510) 839-5066

700 University Avenue  
Suite 130  
Sacramento,  
California  
95825  
(916) 564-4500

4221 Wilshire Boulevard  
Suite 480  
Los Angeles,  
California  
90010  
(323) 933-6111

2685 Ulmerton Road  
Suite 102  
Clearwater,  
Florida  
33762  
(727) 572-5226

**ESA** Environmental  
Science  
Associates

E

## SUMMARY

Martin/Regis San Bruno Associates, L.P (“Martin/Regis”)<sup>1</sup>, the owner of the former U.S. Navy Site, has requested revisions to the U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan (“the adopted Specific Plan” or “the Plan”), and the consideration of two potential development alternatives to allow flexibility in responding to varying market conditions. The environmental effects of the proposed revisions and each of the alternatives were analyzed as part of three separate Initial Studies based substantially on the certified U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) and the certified San Bruno Redevelopment Project Area Plan EIR.

Neither the proposed revisions to the adopted Specific Plan nor the proposed alternatives would result in new impacts to the environment not already discussed and adequately addressed by the certified Specific Plan EIR. Neither the proposed revisions nor the proposed alternatives would substantially increase a previously identified impact. While most impacts are the same, one of the alternatives would reduce some traffic impacts and reduce the amount of solid waste sent to landfills. The other alternative would not reduce any of the impacts resulting from development proposed as part of the adopted Specific Plan, but would not substantially increase impacts analyzed as part of the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, in accordance with Sections 15062, the conclusions reached in the Specific Plan EIR remain valid and applicable to the proposed revisions and alternatives; and therefore no supplemental EIR is required. In accordance with 15064 of the CEQA Guidelines, this Addendum to the previously certified Specific Plan EIR has been prepared to document the project revisions. This Addendum should be considered in conjunction with the Specific Plan EIR.

## BACKGROUND

On January 9, 2001, the San Bruno City Council adopted the U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan (“the adopted Specific Plan” or “the Plan”) and certified the *U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report* (“Specific Plan EIR”). Concurrently, the City Council approved amendments to both the 1984 San Bruno General Plan and the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance for the Specific Plan area in order to implement the Specific Plan, and approved a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”). The MMRP assigns responsibility and establishes a schedule for implementing the mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

Although the Specific Plan encompasses nearly 52 acres, the Plan limits new development in the Specific Plan area to the following Plan locations:

- The 20-acre former U.S. Navy site (occupied primarily by the U.S. Navy’s Engineering Field Activity, West);
- The 1.5-acre commercial strip along El Camino Real, adjacent to the former U.S. Navy site; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Martin/Regis is a partnership of TMG Partners and SARES-REGIS Group of Northern California.

- Improvements along El Camino Real, between Sneath Lane and I-380.

The Specific Plan EIR analyzed the development outlined below in Table 1. In addition, the Specific Plan EIR includes three alternatives:

- The No Project Alternative;
- Alternative 2: Reduced Intensity – No Vote Required; and
- Alternative 3: No Signalized, Four-way Intersection Allowed.

In October, 2000, Martin/Regis successfully bid on the former U.S. Navy site through an auction sponsored by the U.S. General Services Administration. In conformance with the Specific Plan, Martin/Regis proposes to develop residential, office and commercial development at the former U.S. Navy site, now referred to as *The Crossing|San Bruno*, as well as associated infrastructure and landscaping improvements.

## **PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE PROJECT AND NEW ALTERNATIVES**

Recently, because of changes in market conditions that may no longer favor large-scale office development, Martin/Regis requested a modification to the Specific Plan (“proposed revisions to the Specific Plan” or the “revised Plan”) that would increase the maximum residential density from 50 dwelling units per acre to 60 units per acre at the former U.S. Navy site. In addition, Martin/Regis requests an increase in the maximum senior residential density from 100 dwelling units per acre to 120 units per acre. The revisions, however, would eliminate any potential additional 25% density bonus for either affordable residential or senior residential units. Martin/Regis has also requested a Development Agreement consistent with the revised Plan.

This Addendum also contemplates two new potential alternatives for the Specific Plan area, which have each been reviewed at the same level of analysis as the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, should these alternatives be proposed in the future to address market conditions. Alternative 4 – *Residential and Commercial Development Only* (“Alternative 4”) would eliminate proposed office development and consider increasing the number of multi-family units up to 900 units, while retaining the hotel with its own parking structure, but eliminating the proposed shared office parking structure. Alternative 5 – *Increased Multi-Family Units and Reduced Retail/Commercial Space* (“Alternative 5”) would increase the number of multi-family units permitted at the former U.S. Navy site, reduce the amount of ancillary retail/commercial space, eliminate the proposed shared office parking structure, and retain the proposed hotel with a separate parking structure and proposed office space with underground parking. Both alternatives assume the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan analyzed as the Plan Revisions (“proposed revisions to the Specific Plan”), including the increase in multi-family residential density from 40 dwelling units per acre to 60 units per acre, and the increase in senior residential density from 100 units per acre to 120 units per acre.

Table 1, below, compares the development proposed as part of the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, and as part of Alternatives 4 and 5.

**TABLE 1  
U.S. NAVY SITE AND ITS ENVIRONS SPECIFIC PLAN: COMPARISON OF PROPOSED LAND USES**

Proposed Development	Specific Plan EIR	Proposed Revisions to the Specific Plan	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Hotel	Up to 500 rooms	Up to 500 rooms	Up to 500 rooms	Up to 500 rooms
	6 stories above ground floor lobby and service areas	7 stories (including ground floor lobby and service areas)	7 stories (including ground floor lobby and service areas)	7 stories (including ground floor lobby and service areas)
	Maximum of 90 feet in height	Up to 15,000 sq. ft. of meeting/retail space Maximum of 90 feet in height	Up to 15,000 sq. ft. of meeting/retail space Maximum of 90 feet in height	Up to 15,000 sq. ft. of meeting/retail space Maximum of 90 feet in height
Residential	40 dwelling units per acre (50 dwelling units per acre with 25% density bonus)	60 dwelling units per acre Maximum of 315 units	60 dwelling units per acre Maximum of 900 units	60 dwelling units per acre Maximum of 460 units
	Maximum of 210 units	Maximum of 5 stories/70 feet in height	Maximum of 5 stories/70 feet in height	Maximum of 5 stories/70 feet in height
	Maximum of 4 stories/65 feet in height			
Senior Housing	100 dwelling units per acre	120 dwelling units per acre	120 dwelling units per acre	120 dwelling units per acre
	Maximum of 190 units	Maximum of 228 units	Maximum of 228 units	Maximum of 228 units
	Maximum of 6 stories/75 feet in height	Maximum of 6 stories/75 feet in height	Maximum of 6 stories/75 feet in height	Maximum of 6 stories/75 feet in height
Office	FAR = 1	FAR = 1	Ancillary – mixed with commercial in residential, retail buildings	FAR = 1
	2 to 4 buildings	2 to 4 buildings		2 to 4 buildings
	Maximum of 285,000 sq. ft.	Maximum of 285,000 sq. ft.	Maximum of 20,000 sq. ft.	Maximum of 285,000 sq. ft.
	Maximum of 6 stories/90 feet in height	Maximum of 6 stories/70 feet in height		Maximum of 6 stories/70 feet in height
Retail/Commercial	Ancillary – within office and residential buildings	Ancillary – within office and residential buildings	Ancillary – mixed with office in residential, retail buildings	Ancillary – within office and residential buildings
	Maximum of 20,000 sq. ft.	Maximum of 20,000 sq. ft.	Maximum of 20,000 sq. ft.	Maximum of 10,000 sq. ft.
Retail	80% lot coverage	80% lot coverage	80% lot coverage	80% lot coverage
	Maximum of 15,000 sq. ft.	Maximum of 15,000 sq. ft.	Maximum of 15,000 sq. ft.	Maximum of 15,000 sq. ft.
	Maximum of 3 stories/65 feet in height	Maximum of 3 stories/65 feet in height	Maximum of 3 stories/65 feet in height	Maximum of 3 stories/65 feet in height
<b>MAXIMUM TOTALS</b>				
Residential:	400 units (190 senior and 210 multi-family)	543 units (228 senior and 315 multi-family)	1,128 units (228 senior and 900 multi-family)	688 units (228 senior and 460 multi-family)
Commercial:	35,000 sq. ft.	35,000 sq. ft.	35,000 sq. ft.	25,000 sq. ft.
Office:	285,000 sq. ft.	285,000 sq. ft.	Ancillary	285,000 sq. ft.
Hotel:	Up to 500 rooms	Up to 500 rooms	Up to 500 rooms	Up to 500 rooms
Shared Office/Hotel	Yes	Yes	Hotel only	Hotel only,
Parking Structure:				underground office parking

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

### CEQA Guidelines

An Addendum is prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary. The lead agency (the City of San Bruno) has the discretion to prepare an addendum if none of the conditions described in Section 15162 “calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred” (CEQA *Guidelines*, Section 15164 (a)).

According to CEQA *Guidelines*, Section 15162:

- (a) When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:
  - (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
  - (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
  - (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known or could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
    - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
    - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
    - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project; but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
    - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

- (b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subsection (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, and addendum, or nor further documentation.

Based on the Initial Studies prepared for the Revisions and the new Alternatives, because no substantial changes have occurred within the Specific Plan area and no changes to the boundaries of the Specific Plan are proposed, this Addendum has been prepared to the *U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan Draft EIR* and the *U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan Final EIR* to document the project revisions.

### **Addendum to the U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan EIR**

In order to adequately assess the environmental effects of the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5, each were the subject of an Initial Study. These Initial Studies are on file with the City of San Bruno and available for public review. Differences in the environmental effects of the proposed revisions, Alternatives 4 and Alternative 5 occur primarily in three areas: *Population and Housing, Transportation/Traffic, Utilities and Services Systems*, as well as in the estimated number of children that would be generated by proposed development.

No changes are proposed to the boundaries of the adopted Specific Plan and all development proposed as part of the proposed revisions, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 would take place mostly within the building footprints established by the adopted Specific Plan. Therefore, development within the boundaries of the designated Specific Plan areas would not result in new impacts to agricultural, biological, historical, or mineral resources. The proposed revisions to the Specific Plan and the new alternatives would not change either existing hazards or the geological setting. No substantial changes are proposed to land use other than intensification of uses established by the adopted Specific Plan. Voter approval of buildings that exceed the heights required by Ordinance No. 1284 would result in slightly taller residential buildings and slightly lower office buildings than assessed by the Specific Plan EIR. The height increase for residential structures is 5 feet, which would not be a significant effect on aesthetics as described in the Specific Plan EIR.

### **Population and Housing**

Table 2, below, presents population estimates for the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5. Although the largest population increase would occur under Alternative 4, under this alternative, only ancillary office space would be constructed, thereby substantially reducing the number of employees that would be at the site. Both Alternative 5 and the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan would include 285,000 sq. ft. of office space, which by itself would result in approximately 1,030 employees at the site during weekdays. (The proposed revisions to the Specific Plan and Alternative 5 would actually result in a maximum of 305,000 sq. ft. of office space when the ancillary retail/commercial space is added.)

**TABLE 2  
U.S. NAVY SITE AND ITS ENVIRONS SPECIFIC PLAN:  
COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL POPULATION ESTIMATES\***

Proposed Development	Specific Plan EIR	Proposed Revisions to the Specific Plan	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Residential	365	548	1,565	800
Senior	190	228	228	228
Total	555	776	1,793	1,028
Estimated population density in Census tract 6041.2 (2000)	2,431 persons/sq. mi.	2,674 persons/sq. mi.	3,807 persons/sq. mi.	2,957 persons/sq. mi.
Estimated population density in City of San Bruno (2000)	6,276 persons/sq. mi.	6,276 persons/sq. mi.	6,276 persons/sq. mi.	6,276 persons/sq. mi.
Percentage increase in the population of Census tract of 6041.2 (2000)	34%	48%	110%	63%
Percentage increase in the population of the City of San Bruno	1%	2%	4%	3%

\* These estimates make use of Census 2000 and therefore differ from the Specific Plan EIR population estimates. The average household size uses the average household size for the Census tract (Census tract 6041.2) in which the U.S. Navy site is located. Census 2000 estimates that the average household consists of an estimated 1.74 persons in Census tract 6041.2. These estimates also use 6.4 square miles as the land area for San Bruno, instead of the 5.7 square miles used in the Specific Plan EIR.

SOURCE: Census 2000, ESA.

The largest number of persons at the former U.S. Navy site— residents and employees – would occur under Alternative 5, where an estimated range of 2,930 to 3,255 persons would live and work at the project site. However, the total number of residents that would be generated by the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 or Alternative 5 would be small incremental increases to San Bruno’s existing population and would result in far less density than in other portions of the city.

As stated in the Specific Plan EIR, the Specific Plan is located in an area appropriate for higher density residential uses. Future development is constrained by the Specific Plan’s density and land use restrictions, as well as surrounding existing development. The former U.S. Navy site has a history of use as an employment center and is now under-utilized for employment purposes. The increased number of employees would be located in an established and discrete employment center. Neither the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 or Alternative 5 would

result in substantial population increases when compared to population densities throughout the rest of the City of San Bruno.

### **Transportation/Traffic**

Table 3, below, provides vehicle trip generation rates for the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5. The threshold used in the Specific Plan EIR is the No Project Condition. The proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 add fewer peak-hour trips than the No Project Condition. In addition, neither the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 nor Alternative 5 would cause a freeway segment in conformance with the Congestion Management Program (“CMP”) policy in the No Project Conditions to violate the CMP policy. The project would have a less than significant impact on freeway segments anticipated to operate at a worse than CMP level of service standards in 2020.

Table 4, below, lists intersections for which levels of service would be reduced by either the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 or Alternative 5, when compared to the Specific Plan EIR. The threshold used in the Specific Plan EIR states that significant impacts would occur if “signalized intersection operations change from an acceptable level under No Project Conditions to an unacceptable level, and if an unsignalized intersection meets Caltrans signal warrant guidelines when it did not meet the guidelines under the No Project Conditions. Therefore, the worsening levels of service associated with the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan . . . would be considered to have less than significant effects” (Specific Plan EIR, p. III.D-21).

Table 5, below, describes parking provisions for the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5. With the exception of hotel and, in one case, retail parking, the number of proposed parking spaces exceeds demand, although it does not meet City requirements. The shortage in hotel parking (a total of 15 spaces) would be adequately mitigated by the Specific Plan EIR, which requires the City to establish an arrangement by which office parking spaces would be available for hotel workers and guests on weekends. The shortage of retail parking spaces under Alternative 4 consists of a shortage of 18 parking spaces for specialty retail, but a surplus of 18 spaces for retail. The combined types of retail use provide adequate parking for both. The number of parking spaces for the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 would increase the number of parking spaces currently provided by the adopted Specific Plan. Therefore, neither the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4, nor Alternative 5 would result in a new significant impact or substantially worsen a significant impact identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

**TABLE 3**  
**VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION**  
**NO PROJECT CONDITION, SPECIFIC PLAN EIR, PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SPECIFIC PLAN,**  
**ALTERNATIVE 4 AND ALTERNATIVE 5**

Time Period	Trips Generated														
	Specific Plan EIR			Proposed Revisions to the Specific Plan			Alternative 4			Alternative 5			No Project Condition		
	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Weekday AM Peak Hour	859	556	303	919	568	351	768	220	548	979	571	409	1,597	1,223	374
Weekday Midday Peak Hour	742	343	399	773	360	413	485	240	245	770	363	407	1,629	764	865
Weekday PM Peak Hour	918	356	562	992	406	586	917	574	343	1,043	450	593	1,760	552	1,208
Weekend Peak Hour	770	392	378	836	425	411	1,002	502	500	849	430	419	1,374	706	668

SOURCE: Fehr and Peers Associates, Inc. (2001), DKS Associates (2000), ESA (2001)

**TABLE 4**  
**REDUCED LEVELS OF SERVICE (LOS) AT NEARBY INTERSECTIONS**  
**PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SPECIFIC PLAN, ALTERNATIVE 4 AND ALTERNATIVE 5**  
**COMPARED WITH THE SPECIFIC PLAN EIR AND THE NO PROJECT CONDITION**

Intersection	Time Period	Specific Plan EIR		Proposed Revisions to the Specific Plan		Alternative 4		Alternative 5		No Project Condition	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS
Sneath Lane/Cherry Avenue	Weekday PM Peak Hour	0.60	A	N.A.	N.A.	0.61	B	0.61	B	0.64	B
El Camino Real/L-380 WB off-ramp	Weekday PM Peak Hour	0.69	B	0.71	C	0.71	C	0.72	C	0.79	C
El Camino Real/Tanforan Shopping Center Driveaway	Weekday Midday Peak Hour	0.70	B	0.71	C	N.A.	N.A.	0.71	C	0.85	D
El Camino Real/Tanforan Shopping Center Driveaway	Weekday PM Peak Hour	0.84	D	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0.87	D	1.10	F
El Camino Real/Tanforan Shopping Center Driveaway	Weekend Peak Hour	1.00	E	1.01	F	1.04	F	1.02	F	1.10	F
Cherry Avenue/Commodore (unsignalized)	Weekday PM Peak Hour	-	D	-	E	-	N.A.	-	F	-	F

SOURCE: Fehr and Peers Associates, Inc. (2001), DKS Associates (2000), ESA (2001)

**TABLE 5  
PARKING SPACES PROVIDED, PARKING DEMAND\* AND CITY PARKING REQUIREMENTS  
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SPECIFIC PLAN, ALTERNATIVE 4 AND ALTERNATIVE 5  
COMPARED WITH THE SPECIFIC PLAN EIR**

Land Use	Proposed Revisions to the Specific Plan											
	Specific Plan EIR		Specific Plan		Alternative 4		Alternative 5					
	Provided	Demand	Required	Provided	Demand	Required	Provided	Demand	Required	Provided	Demand	Required
Multi-Family	235	218	420	488	381	630	1,395	1,089	1,800	713	557	920
Senior	95	61	63	114	73	76	114	63	76	114	73	76
Office	810	795	1,140	848	795	1,140	30	28	40	848	795	1,140
Specialty Retail	None	65	80	100	65	80	50	32	80	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Retail	**75	63	60	45	63	60	45	63	60	50	32	40
Hotel	500	515	501	500	515	501	500	515	501	500	15	501
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,715</b>	<b>1,717</b>	<b>2,264</b>	<b>2,095</b>	<b>1,892</b>	<b>2,487</b>	<b>2,095</b>	<b>1,737</b>	<b>2,497</b>	<b>2,225</b>	<b>1,972</b>	<b>2,677</b>

\* Demand is determined by parking generation rates for the higher weekend and weekend peak parking generation rates are published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Parking Generation, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 1987.*

\*\* The Specific Plan EIR refers to "commercial" rather than "retail" parking.

SOURCE: Fehr and Peers Associates, Inc. (2001), DKS Associates (2000), ESA (2001)

Therefore, neither the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 nor Alternative 5 would result in a new significant impact or substantially increase a significant impact identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

**Public Services - Schools**

Table 6, below, compares the number of school-aged children estimated as a result of the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5. (The analysis in Table 6 differs slightly from the Specific Plan EIR because it makes use of the 2000 U.S. Census, and uses the average household size from the Census tract in which the Specific Plan is located.)

**TABLE 6  
NUMBER OF SCHOOL-AGED CHILDREN\*  
SPECIFIC PLAN EIR, PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SPECIFIC PLAN,  
ALTERNATIVE 4 AND ALTERNATIVE 5**

School Level	Specific Plan EIR	Proposed Revisions to the Specific Plan	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Elementary	17	23	54	31
Middle School	6	8	18	10
High School	17	23	54	31
Total	40	54	130	77

\* This analysis uses the age distributions from the 1990 U.S. Census. Detailed age distributions from the 2000 U.S. Census are not yet available. The 1990 U.S. Census indicates that 3 percent of the population would be in the age group that attends elementary school, 1 percent in the age group that would attend middle school and 3 percent in the age group for high school. Average household size for the Census tract in which the Specific Plan is located is 1.74 persons.

SOURCE: Census 2000, 1990 U.S. Census, ESA (2001)

Students living at the former U.S. Navy site would attend Allen Elementary School, Parkside Intermediate School and Capuchino High School. Both Parkside Intermediate and Capuchino High Schools have sufficient capacity for students generated by development from the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5. Allen Elementary does not have sufficient excess capacity for the number of elementary school students that would be generated by the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 or Alternative 5.

However, California Senate Bill 50 prohibits the City of San Bruno from denying a land use approval on the basis that school facilities are inadequate and mandates an impact fee that serves as the legally-mandated CEQA mitigation measure. The City of San Bruno would be required by the Specific Plan EIR to coordinate the appropriate payments to the appropriate school districts of

the school impact fee required under Senate Bill 50. Therefore, neither the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 nor Alternative 5 would have a significant impact on public schools.

### Public Utilities

The proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 would result in differing anticipated water usage and amounts of wastewater generated. Table 7, below, provides a comparison of water usage and wastewater generation under the adopted Specific Plan, the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5.

**TABLE 7  
ESTIMATED WATER USAGE AND WASTEWATER GENERATION  
SPECIFIC PLAN EIR, PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SPECIFIC PLAN,  
ALTERNATIVE 4 AND ALTERNATIVE 5**

	Specific Plan EIR	Proposed Revisions to the Specific Plan	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Water	55,500 gallons/day	77,600 gallons/day	179,300 gallons/day	102,800 gallons/day
Wastewater	54,225 gallons/day	70,650 gallons/day	131,700 gallons/day	77,675 gallons/day

SOURCE: Census 2000, U.S. Navy Site and Its Environs Specific Plan (2001), ESA

While the increases in water use and wastewater generation would increase, the City of San Bruno's primary water source, the San Francisco Water District, has included anticipated population increases in its future plans. The District is constructing a new pipeline and pumping plant at the Crystal Springs Reservoir to be completed by 2005. The increases in water use would not exceed 5 percent of current use.

In addition, the City owns its wastewater treatment plant and is currently under a Cease and Desist Order issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board to expand its water treatment plant to accommodate 13 million gallons of wastewater per day during dry weather and 62 million gallons per day during wet weather. All new development would be required to pay \$0.87 per gallon of wastewater per day toward the cost of upgrades to the treatment plant. The increase in wastewater would be an incremental increase in existing wastewater.

### **Solid Waste**

The proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 would increase the amount of solid waste that would require diversion under AB 939. However, the mitigation measures included in the Specific Plan EIR would adequately reduce the impact of this solid waste to a less than significant level.

Therefore, the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 would result in a less than significant impact on water supplies, water treatment capacity and landfills.

### **CONCLUSION**

The proposed revisions to the Specific Plan, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 would result in potentially significant impacts to the environment that would be adequately reduced to less than significant levels by the mitigation measures established by the Specific Plan EIR and the adopted MMRP.