

1. Executive Summary

This chapter presents an overview of the proposed Strive San Mateo General Plan 2040 (General Plan 2040 or proposed General Plan) and proposed Climate Action Plan (CAP) update, hereinafter referred to together as “proposed project.” This executive summary also provides a summary of the alternatives to the proposed project, identifies issues to be resolved, areas of controversy, and conclusions of the analysis in Chapters 4.1 through 4.18 of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). For a complete description of the proposed project, see Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of this Draft EIR. For a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project, see Chapter 5, *Alternatives*, of this Draft EIR.

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

This Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA¹ and the State CEQA Guidelines² to determine if approval of the identified discretionary actions and related subsequent development could have any significant impacts on the environment. The City of San Mateo (City), as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable City technical personnel and review of all technical reports. Information for this Draft EIR was obtained from on-site field observations; discussions with public service agencies; analysis of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies, reports, data, and similar literature in the public domain; and specialized environmental assessments (e.g., air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation).

1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This Draft EIR has been prepared to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project. The main objectives of this document as established by CEQA are:

- To disclose to decision-makers and the public the significant environmental impacts of proposed activities.
- To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.

¹ The CEQA Statute is found at California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Sections 21000–21177.

² The CEQA Guidelines are found at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000–15387.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
- To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in the CEQA statute and in the CEQA Guidelines. It provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations³ if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

1.1.1 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Executive Summary.** Summarizes environmental consequences that would result from implementation of the proposed project, describes recommended mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of environmental impacts with and without mitigation.
- **Chapter 2: Introduction.** Provides an overview describing the Draft EIR document.
- **Chapter 3: Project Description.** Describes the proposed project in detail, including the characteristics, objectives, and the structural and technical elements of the proposed action.
- **Chapter 4: Environmental Analysis.** Organized into 18 subchapters corresponding to the environmental resource categories identified in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, *Environmental Checklist*, this chapter provides a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published and by referencing historic conditions that are supported with substantial evidence, from both a local and regional perspective. Additionally, this chapter provides an analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and recommended mitigation measures, if required, to reduce the impacts to less than significant where possible, and to reduce their magnitude or significance when impacts cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The environmental setting included in each subchapter provides baseline physical conditions to provide a context, which the lead agency uses to determine the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Each subchapter also includes a description of the thresholds used to determine if

³ CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project; and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project.

- **Chapter 5: Alternatives to the Proposed Project.** Considers alternatives to the proposed project, including the CEQA-required “No Project Alternative” and “environmentally superior alternative.”
- **Chapter 6: CEQA-Required Conclusions and Findings.** Discusses growth inducement, cumulative impacts, unavoidable significant effects, and significant irreversible changes as a result of the proposed project.
- **Chapter 7: Organizations and Persons Consulted.** Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR for the proposed project.
- **Appendices:** The appendices for this document contain the following supporting documents:
 - Appendix A: Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Comments on the NOP
 - Appendix B: Projects Included in Buildout Projections
 - Appendix C: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data
 - Appendix D: Noise Data
 - Appendix E: Transportation Data
 - Appendix F: Hazardous Materials Sites

1.1.2 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THIS DRAFT EIR

As described in the CEQA Guidelines, different types of EIRs are used for varying situations and intended uses. Because of the long-term planning horizon of the proposed project and the permitting, planning, and development actions that are related both geographically and as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions for implementation, this Draft EIR has been prepared as a program EIR for the proposed project, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. Once the program EIR has been certified, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether additional CEQA review is needed. However, where the program EIR addresses the program’s effects as specifically and comprehensively as is reasonably possible, later activities that are within scope of the effects examined in the program EIR, may qualify for a streamlined environmental review process or may be exempt from environmental review. When a program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into the subsequent activities.⁴ If a subsequent activity would have effects that are not within the scope of the program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR unless the activity qualifies for an exemption. For these subsequent environmental review documents, this program EIR will serve as the first-tier environmental analysis to streamline future environmental review.

⁴ CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c] and CEQA streamlining provisions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.2 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would replace the City's existing General Plan, which has a buildout horizon to 2030, with an updated General Plan. The proposed project also involves a technical update to the City's current 2020 CAP to provide consistency between the City's CAP and the proposed General Plan.

The existing San Mateo General Plan 2030 was adopted in 2010. The City determined that the General Plan 2030 provided a good foundation for General Plan 2040. The General Plan 2030 included a comprehensive review process, resulting in a broad range of community goals and policies. Many of the community issues vetted in General Plan 2030 are still relevant, well addressed, and do not require major change. Therefore, while the approach to the proposed General Plan 2040 is a comprehensive update, it builds off of the current General Plan 2030 and carries forward topics and themes of community importance and priority. The proposed General Plan 2040 will also integrate topics that are now required by State mandate and revise relevant policies and actions to meet those requirements. It also incorporates regional forecasts for 2040, thus moving the planning horizon forward by 10 years. Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of this Draft EIR includes a detailed description of the proposed project.

1.3 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

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

- **No Project Alternative (Current General Plan).** Consistent with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, Alternative A presents the No Project scenario. Accordingly, under this alternative the proposed project would not be adopted or implemented, and further development in the city would continue to be subject to existing policies, regulations, development standards, and land use designations under the existing General Plan 2030.
- **Reduced Traffic Noise Alternative.** The Reduced Traffic Noise Alternative would involve enhanced transportation demand management (TDM) requirements to reduce vehicle travel to a greater extent than under the proposed project. This alternative would accommodate the same amount of proposed development as the proposed project and would involve the same General Plan land use map and designations.

Chapter 5, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*, of this Draft EIR, includes a complete discussion of these alternatives. As discussed in Chapter 5, Alternative B: Reduced Traffic Noise, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.

1.4 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

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

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

1.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The City issued an NOP on January 12, 2022. The CEQA-mandated 30-day scoping period for this EIR was between January 12, 2022, and February 11, 2022, during which interested agencies and the public could submit comments about the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. During this time, the City received 43 comment letters from a variety of State agencies as well as a local organization and members of the public.

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

- Biological resources (special-status species, aquatic habitat, sensitive natural communities, riparian habitat, tree loss)
- Cultural and tribal cultural resources (historic resources and districts, tribal cultural resources)
- Hydrology and water quality (flooding, sea level rise)
- Land use and planning (zoning)
- Population and housing (projected growth)
- Public services (fire and police services staffing)
- Transportation (vehicle miles traveled (VMT), public transit)
- Utilities and service systems (infrastructure capacity and water availability)
- Wildfire (wildfire evacuation, emergency response)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.6 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1-1, *Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis in this Draft EIR and presents a summary of significant impacts and mitigation measures identified. For a complete description of potential impacts, including those where no mitigation measures are required, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapters 4.1 through 4.18.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
AIR QUALITY			
<p>AQ-2: Construction of development projects that could occur from implementation of the proposed project would generate emissions that would exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s regional significance thresholds and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.</p>	S	<p>AQ-2: Prior to discretionary approval by the City for development projects subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., nonexempt projects), future project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the City for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts identified in BAAQMD’s <i>CEQA Air Quality Guidelines</i>. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require feasible mitigation measures to reduce air quality emissions. Measures shall require implementation of the BAAQMD Best Management Practices for construction-related fugitive dust emissions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) at least twice daily or as often as needed to control dust emissions. ▪ All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. ▪ All visible mud or dirt trackout onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. ▪ All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. ▪ All roadways, driveways, sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seedling or soil binders are used. ▪ All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph. ▪ All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site. ▪ Unpaved roads providing access to sites located 100 feet or further from a paved road shall be treated with a 6- to 12-inch layer of compact layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel. 	SU

S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
<p>AQ-3: Operation of development projects under the proposed project would generate operational emissions that would exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s regional significance thresholds for volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x).</p>	<p>S</p>	<p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to the commencement of construction activities, individual project proponents shall post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. <p>Measures shall be incorporated into appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) and shall be verified by the City.</p> <p>AQ-3: Prior to discretionary approval by the City for development projects subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CE) review (i.e., nonexempt projects), future project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operational air quality impacts to the City for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts identified in BAAQMD’s current <i>CEQA Air Quality Guidelines</i> at the time that the project is considered.</p> <p>If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require the project applicant(s) to incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the conditions of approval or a mitigation monitoring and reporting plan adopted for the project as part of the project CEQA review. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions could include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementing commute trip reduction programs. ▪ Unbundling residential parking costs from property costs. ▪ Expanding bikeway networks. ▪ Expanding transit network coverage or hours. ▪ Using cleaner-fueled vehicles. ▪ Exceeding the current Title 24 Building Envelope Energy Efficiency Standards. ▪ Establishing on-site renewable energy generation systems. ▪ Requiring all-electric buildings. ▪ Replacing gas-powered landscaping equipment with zero-emission alternatives. </p>	<p>SU</p>

S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
<p>AQ-4: Construction emissions associated with development under the proposed project could expose air quality-sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air contaminant concentrations and exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s project-level and cumulative significance thresholds.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementing organics diversion programs. ▪ Expanding urban tree planting. <p>AQ-4: Prior to discretionary approval by the City, project applicants for new industrial or warehousing development projects that 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes) or Overburdened Community, as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City for review and approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). If the HRA shows that the cumulative and project-level incremental cancer risk, noncancer hazard index, and/or PM_{2.5} exceeds the respective threshold, as established by BAAQMD (all areas of the City and Sphere of Influence) and project-level risk of 6.0 in Equity Priority Communities at the time a project is considered, the project applicant will be required to identify best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs) and appropriate enforcement mechanisms, and demonstrate that they are capable of reducing potential cancer, noncancer risks, and PM_{2.5} to an acceptable level. T-BACTs may include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions ▪ Electrifying warehousing docks ▪ Requiring use of newer equipment ▪ Requiring near-zero or zero-emission trucks for a portion of the vehicle fleet based on opening year. ▪ Truck Electric Vehicle (EV) Capable trailer spaces. ▪ Restricting off-site truck travel through the creation of truck routes. <p>T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be included as part of the conditions of approval or a mitigation monitoring and reporting plan adopted for the project as part of the project CEQA review.</p>	SU
<p>AQ-6: Implementation of the proposed project would generate a substantial increase in emissions that exceeds the Bay Area Air Quality Management</p>	S	<p>AQ-6: Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-4.</p>	SU

S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
District’s significance thresholds and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations and health risk in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.			
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
ENERGY			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
NOISE			
NOISE-1: Buildout under the proposed project is anticipated to result in unacceptable traffic noise with an increase of more than 5.0 dBA L _{dn} over existing conditions along one roadway segment (1 st Avenue west of B Street) within the EIR Study Area.	S	None available.	SU
NOISE-6: Buildout under the proposed project is anticipated to result in unacceptable cumulative traffic noise within the EIR Study Area.	S	None available.	SU

S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
PARKS AND RECREATION			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
PUBLIC SERVICES			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
TRANSPORTATION			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
<i>No significant impacts</i>			
WILDFIRE			
WILD-2: Development under the proposed project would increase population, buildings, and infrastructure in wildfire-prone areas, thereby exacerbating wildfire risks.	S	None available.	SU
WILD-5: Potential development under the proposed project could, in combination with other surrounding and future projects in the State Responsibility Areas, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, or Wildland Urban Interface, result in cumulative impacts associated with the exposure of project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of a wildfire due to slope, prevailing winds, or other factors.	S	None available.	SU

S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This page intentionally left blank.