

5. Response to Comments

This chapter includes a reproduction of, and responses to, each comment letter received during the public review period on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Comments are presented in their original format in Appendix G, *Comments Received on the Draft EIR*, along with annotations that identify each individual comment number.

Responses to comments are provided in this chapter alongside the text of each corresponding comment. Letters are categorized by:

- Governmental Agencies
- Organizations
- Members of the Public
- Public Hearing Oral Comments

Letters are arranged by category, date received, and name. Where the same comment has been made more than once, a response may direct the reader to another numbered comment and response, and/or to a master response (described in Section 5.1, Master Responses). Where a response requires revisions to the Draft EIR, these revisions are shown in Chapter 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*, of this Final EIR. Table 5-1, *Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EIR*, presents comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to each of those comments. Exhibits referenced in responses to comments are included in the commenter's original comment letter and are included in Appendix G, *Comments Received on the Draft EIR*, of this Final EIR.

All comments included in this document are formally acknowledged for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-making bodies as part of this Final EIR for their consideration in reviewing the project.

5.1 MASTER RESPONSES

Certain topics raised by commenters require a lengthy response, and certain topics addressed in this Final EIR require a detailed explanation. In addition, certain topics were raised repeatedly, albeit in slightly different forms, in comments on the Draft EIR. To minimize duplication in responses and to provide a more comprehensive discussion, "master responses" have been prepared for some of these issues. Responses to individual comments reference these master responses as appropriate. A particular master response may provide more information than requested by any individual comment. Conversely, the master response may not provide a complete response to a given comment, and additional information may be contained in the individual response to that comment. Master responses in this Final EIR address the following issues:

1. Standards for Responses to Comments
2. Roadway Classifications
3. Lower Growth Alternative

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

MASTER RESPONSE 1: STANDARDS FOR RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

PROJECT MERITS

Often during review of an EIR, the public raises issues that relate to qualities of the project itself or the project's community consequences or benefits, personal wellbeing and quality of life, and economic or financial issues (referred to here as "project merits"), rather than the environmental analyses or impacts and mitigations raised in the EIR. However, consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15131, *Economic and Social Effects*, the Draft EIR is not meant to address these project merits; rather, the purpose of CEQA and the Draft EIR is to fully analyze and mitigate the project's potentially significant physical impacts on the environment to the extent feasible.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, *Evaluation of and Response to Comments*, and Section 15132, *Contents of Final Environmental Impact Report*, a Final EIR must include a response to comments on the Draft EIR pertaining to environmental issues analyzed under CEQA. Several of the comments provided in response to the Draft EIR express an opinion for or against the proposed project, but do not address the adequacy of the analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR. Rather, these opinions relate to the merits of the project.

Lead agency review of environmental issues and project merits are both important in the decision of what action to take on a project, and both are considered in the decision-making process for a project. However, as part of the environmental review process, a lead agency is only required by CEQA to respond to environmental issues that are raised. The City will hold public hearings to consider action on the merits of the proposed project for adoption. The City will consider both the EIR and project merit issues that have been raised prior to any action to adopt the proposed project.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a), *Focus of Review*, provides direction for parties reviewing and providing comment on a Draft EIR, as follows:

In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

Therefore, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a), the City is not required to respond to comments that express an opinion about the project merits, but do not relate to environmental issues covered in the Draft EIR. Although such opinions and comments on the project merits received as part of the EIR process do not require responses in the EIR, as previously noted, they do provide important

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

input to the process of reviewing the project overall. Therefore, merits and opinion-based comment letters are included in the EIR to be available for consideration by the City's decision makers at the merits stage of the project. City decision makers may consider these letters and issues as part of their deliberations on the merits of the project and whether to adopt, modify, or disapprove the project.

SPECULATION WITHOUT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

Some commenters assert or request that impacts should be considered significant but fail to provide substantial evidence in support of their assertion. Predicting the project's physical impacts on the environment without substantial evidence based on facts to support the analysis would require a level of speculation that is inappropriate for an EIR.

CEQA Section 21082.2(a), *Significant Effect on Environment; Determination; Environmental Impact Report Preparation*, requires that the lead agency "shall determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record." CEQA Guidelines Section 15384(a), *Substantial Evidence*, clarifies that "'substantial evidence'... means enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from this information that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached. Whether a fair argument can be made that the project may have a significant effect on the environment is to be determined by examining the whole record before the lead agency. Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative evidence which is clearly erroneous or inaccurate, or evidence of social or economic impacts which do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environment, does not constitute substantial evidence." CEQA Guidelines Section 15384(b) goes on to state that "substantial evidence shall include facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts." Where there are no facts available to substantiate a commenter's assertion that the physical environment could ultimately be significantly impacted as a result of the project, the City, acting as the lead agency, is not required to analyze that effect, nor to mitigate for that effect. Section 15204(c) of the CEQA Guidelines advises reviewers that comments should be accompanied by factual support:

Reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.

Under CEQA, the decision as to whether an environmental effect should be considered significant is reserved for the discretion of the lead agency based on substantial evidence in the record as a whole. The analysis of the Draft EIR is based on scientific and factual data, which has been reviewed by the lead agency and reflects its independent judgment and conclusions. CEQA permits disagreements of opinion with respect to environmental issues addressed in an EIR. As Section 15151, *Standards for Adequacy of an EIR*, of the CEQA Guidelines states, even "[d]isagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among experts."

CEQA Guidelines Section 15145, *Speculation*, provides that:

If, after thorough investigation, a lead agency finds that a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, the agency should note its conclusion and terminate discussion of the impact.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

During the review period for the Draft EIR, members of the public submitted comments that requested additional analysis, mitigation measures, or revisions that are not provided in this Final EIR for reasons more specifically addressed in the individual comments. As described previously, Section 15204(a) of the CEQA Guidelines provides that CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters.

Section 15003 of the CEQA Guidelines, *Policies*, also explains the emphasis of CEQA on good-faith efforts at full disclosure rather than technical perfection:

(i) CEQA does not require technical perfection in an EIR, but rather adequacy, completeness, and a good-faith effort at full disclosure. A court does not pass upon the correctness of an EIR's environmental conclusions, but only determines if the EIR is sufficient as an informational document. (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692).

(j) CEQA requires that decisions be informed and balanced. It must not be subverted into an instrument for the oppression and delay of social, economic, or recreational development or advancement. (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assoc. v. Regents of U.C.* (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112 and *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553).

Sections 15204(a) and 15003 reflect judicial interpretation of CEQA. Under CEQA, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues, and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, so long as a good-faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

MASTER RESPONSE 2: ROADWAY CLASSIFICATIONS

Multiple comments expressed concerns regarding roadway classifications, specifically regarding Figure 4.15-1, *Proposed Street Classification*, in Chapter 4.15, *Transportation*, of the Draft EIR, which shows 5th Avenue and 9th Avenue classified as arterials.

The City is not proposing any changes to roadway classifications as part of the General Plan Update, and the street classifications mapped in the figure are determined by Caltrans, not the City. Therefore, Figure 4.15-1 has been retitled as *Existing Street Classification*, as shown in Chapter 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*, of this Final EIR. Whereas the version of Figure 4.15-1 that appeared in the Draft EIR included four classifications (freeway, arterial, collector, and local), the revised map included in this Final EIR includes five classifications that currently exist within the city (freeway or expressway, principal arterial, minor arterial, major collector, and local). Chapter 3 of this Final EIR also provides revisions to Chapter 4.15 of the Draft EIR regarding the definitions and traffic volumes for these classifications. As shown on the revised version of Figure 4.15-1 in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR, 5th Avenue and 9th Avenue are mapped as minor arterials, which carry annual average daily traffic volumes between 3,000 and 14,000 trips.

Comments also expressed concerns regarding traffic calming and questioned whether roadway classifications conflict with desired traffic-calming improvements for certain roadways. Following the publication of the Draft EIR and Draft General Plan 2040, a new action has been added to the proposed General Plan to explore whether traffic calming should be provided on neighborhood streets designated as minor arterials and collectors:

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Action C 6.9 Neighborhood Traffic Management Program. Evaluate whether updates are needed to the City’s Neighborhood Traffic Management Program to determine if the program should be expanded to include collectors and minor arterials.

Further, an additional action has been added to the proposed General Plan based on the City’s intention for its Complete Streets Plan to be used for roadway classifications within the city:

Action C 6.13 Street Classification Update. Request that Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration update their functional roadway classifications based on the roadway network framework that will be defined by the Complete Streets Plan.

MASTER RESPONSE 3: LOWER GROWTH ALTERNATIVE

Several comments expressed concerns regarding the buildout projections for the proposed project and requested that the EIR include an analysis of a lower growth or “moderate growth” alternative. Some comments also state that, without such an alternative, the EIR fails to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. Further, some comments state that lower growth alternatives would lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project. As described in detail below, lower growth alternatives (apart from the No Project Alternative) were considered by the City but were rejected from detailed consideration in the Draft EIR because they would not meet the project objectives and would not reduce the project’s significant impacts.

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states, “An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible.” Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states, “The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.” As shown in Chapter 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*, of this Final EIR, lower growth alternatives were considered by the City but rejected from detailed analysis.

The lower growth alternatives considered by the City were developed by the City as part of the planning process for the proposed project. Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR describes the planning process that led to the development of General Plan 2040, and explains that from 2019 to 2022, community members and the City Council developed and evaluated three scenarios for the General Plan. As stated on pages 3-7 to 3-8 of the Draft EIR, the Alternatives Evaluation Report published in January 2022 began the community engagement process to choose a preferred scenario for land use and circulation based on the relative benefits, trade-offs, potential impacts, and desired mix of growth and development of each alternative. This process led to the selection of the preferred scenario, which was created by mixing and matching different combinations of housing and commercial development in

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

each Study Area for General Plan 2040. The resulting preferred scenario, selected by the City Council, based on community input, is the proposed project evaluated in this EIR and its buildout projections and project objectives are described in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR. Two lower growth scenarios (referred to as Alternatives A and B in the Alternatives Evaluation Report) were considered and evaluated as part of this planning process. Alternative A allowed for the smallest increase in residential densities and the lowest amount of new residential development; the Alternatives Evaluation Report concluded that it was unlikely to meet future State housing requirements. Alternative B would most likely be able to fulfill future State-mandated housing targets, but would have a smaller housing buffer compared to Alternative C. Based on the conclusions of the Alternatives Evaluation Report, both Alternatives A and B would be less likely than the proposed project to meet the project objective of identifying sufficient residential land to meet both current and future housing needs for people at all income levels. In addition, the lower residential densities would result in less concentrated growth and fewer residents within close proximity to transit, which would increase the City's per-capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) (for both residents and workers) when compared to the proposed project.

The lower growth scenarios would reduce overall VMT, which could decrease the significant and unavoidable traffic noise impact identified for the proposed project; however, because these scenarios would increase VMT per capita, they would increase the project's transportation impact. In addition, the lower growth scenarios could prevent the City's ability to meet future State housing requirements, which would render these alternatives infeasible. Lastly, these scenarios were considered for their ability to reduce the proposed project's significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. The proposed project's air quality impacts are a result of the programmatic nature of the analysis in the EIR; the application of significance thresholds used by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD); and the magnitude of development due to the proposed project being a long-term, citywide plan. These impacts could not be avoided by a lower growth alternative that still allows enough development for the city to meet current and future housing needs. Therefore, the lower growth alternatives were considered but rejected.

However, the Draft EIR does analyze the No Project Alternative, under which the current General Plan 2030 would remain in place, which represents an alternative with a lower amount of growth than the proposed project. Some comments incorrectly indicate that the No Project Alternative represents a "no growth" alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, the City's existing General Plan would remain in place and future growth would be able to occur under existing land use designations and policies. Rather than representing a zero-growth scenario, as shown in Table 5-1, *Development Projections for the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives*, the No Project Alternative is expected to result in 53,704 total housing units by 2030, an increase of 9,934 units when compared to baseline conditions of 43,770 existing housing units, and 65,300 jobs by 2030, an increase of 2,900 jobs compared to baseline conditions of 62,400 jobs. As stated on page 5-4 of the Draft EIR, "2040 buildout under the No Project Alternative [has] not been calculated, as the City's existing General Plan has a horizon year of 2030 that would have to be updated to extend the buildout horizon past 2030. Overall, development under the current General Plan, as considered in the No Project Alternative, would be expected to be lower than the buildout analyzed for the proposed General Plan 2040." While buildout for 2040 under the existing General Plan has not been calculated, it can reasonably be expected to be between the 2030 levels described above and the 2040 buildout analyzed for the proposed project.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

During the public review period for Draft General Plan 2040 and the Draft EIR, the City Council directed changes to the proposed land use designations in the proposed General Plan, including removal of the proposed Residential High II and Mixed-Use High II land use designations, reducing the proposed height limits and intensities for the Office land use designations, and reducing the proposed heights and densities along some study area edges to support transitions between high and low density areas. These changes to the proposed land use map have the effect of reducing the total residential and commercial buildout potential allowed under the proposed General Plan when compared to the proposed project analyzed in this EIR. Buildout with these changes to the land use map is expected to result in approximately:

- 19,760 net new housing units by 2040, compared to 21,410 under the proposed project;
- 15,000 net new jobs by 2040, compared to 16,920 under the proposed project; and
- 3,186,000 square feet of net new non-residential floor area, compared to 4,325,000 square feet under the proposed project.

The reduction in residential and non-residential development capacity does not affect the impact conclusions in this EIR as it does not increase the severity of any impacts identified in the EIR, generate any new impacts, or create the need for any new mitigation measures or project alternatives. Therefore, the reduced buildout does not require recirculation of the Draft EIR because it does not constitute “significant new information” under Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The analysis in this EIR remains based on the buildout projections presented in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR. As such, this EIR sets a conservative maximum envelope analyzed for proposed General Plan 2040.

5.2 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Table 5-1 presents comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to each of those comments. Letters are arranged by date received. Where the same comment has been made more than once, a response may direct the reader to another numbered comment and response. Where a response requires revisions to the Draft EIR, these revisions are shown in Chapter 1, *Executive Summary*, and Chapter 3, *Revisions to the Draft EIR*, of this Final EIR.

Comments are presented in their original format in Appendix G, *Comments Received on the Draft EIR*, along with annotations that identify each individual comment number. Table 5-1 includes figures and tables included in the comment letters at a reduced image resolution. To view the images at full resolution, please refer to the original comment letters in Appendix G.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

TABLE 5-1 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT EIR

Comment #	Comment	Response
Governmental Agencies		
GOV1	9/1/2023	Brian Olson, California Geological Survey
GOV1-1	Thank you for providing the City’s Draft EIR for the 2040 General Plan for our review. This email conveys the following recommendations from CGS concerning geologic issues within the General Plan documents:	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses GOV1-2 through GOV1-8.
GOV1-2	1. Liquefaction and Landside Hazards The Draft EIR discusses liquefaction and landsliding as potential hazards and provides a map of "Liquefaction Potential" and "Slope Failure Potential" based on the ABAG Hazard Viewer Map (Figure 4.6-4). CGS notes the slope failure potential depicted in Figure 4.6-4 represents "rainfall induced" landsliding, not "earthquake-induced" landsliding, which is a related, but unique seismic hazard. The City should consider providing an additional discussion of this hazard.	The comment asserts that the liquefaction and slope failure potential map in the Draft EIR is based on the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Hazard Viewer Map and represents rainfall-induced landslides and not earthquake-induced landslides. The information represented in Figure 4.6-4, <i>Seismic Hazard Zones</i> , in Chapter 4.6, <i>Geology and Soils</i> , of the Draft EIR was provided by the City of San Mateo, not ABAG, and represents both rainfall- and earthquake-induced landslides.
GOV1-3	The City should supplement these sections with a discussion of official CGS Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation (EZRI) for both liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides, and consider providing a map of these official zones, which are more extensive than those provided by ABAG	The comment requests supplemental information based on the official California Geological Survey (CGS) Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation for liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides rather than ABAG. As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i> , of this Final EIR, Chapter 4.6, <i>Geology and Soils</i> , of the Draft EIR has been revised to include a discussion on the Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation, as well as the new Figure 4.6-5, <i>Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation</i> .
GOV1-4	CGS maps and data are available here: https://maps-cnra-cadoc.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/cadoc::cgs-seismic-hazards-programliquefaction-zones-1/about https://maps-cnra-cadoc.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/cadoc::cgs-seismic-hazards-programlandslide-zones-doc-hosted/about	The comment provides sources for CGS maps and data. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no response is warranted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
GOV1-5	<p>https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/.</p> <p>Cities and counties affected by EZRI must regulate certain development projects within them. The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (1990) also requires sellers of real property (and their agents) within a mapped hazard zone to disclose at the time of sale that the property lies within such a zone.</p>	<p>The comment provides information on the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act. The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act is described in Chapter 4.6, <i>Geology and Soils</i>, page 4.6-2, of the Draft EIR. Future development under the proposed project within seismic hazard zones would be required to comply with federal and state regulations, including the requirement for a geotechnical report defining and delineating any seismic hazard prior to project approval and disclosure at the time of sale that the property lies within such a zone. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
GOV1-6	<p>2. Radon Hazards The Draft EIR does not address indoor radon gas hazards; however, part of the City is within an area mapped by CGS with "High Radon Potential".</p>	<p>CEQA requires the analysis of the impacts of the proposed project on the environment; therefore, the impact of existing radon potential to future development is not within the purview of the CEQA. Nevertheless, pursuant to the California Civil Code, sellers of real property containing up to four residential units are required to complete a disclosure form indicating the presence of all environmental hazards, including radon gas, formaldehyde, and mold, that are known to the seller. Potential future development under the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Indoor Radon Abatement Act and the California Health and Safety Code to meet the standard of less than 4 picocuries/liter (pCi/L) of radon in air.</p>
GOV1-7	<p>The City should provide a discussion of both the health hazards and geologic sources of radon gas, and consider including a map of CGS radon potential zones within the proposed project from CGS Special Report 226, entitled "Radon Potential in San Mateo County, California".</p>	<p>Please see Response GOV1-6 regarding radon hazards.</p>
GOV1-8	<p>CGS maps and data are available here: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/radon/app/</p>	<p>The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/cadoc::cgs-mineral-hazards-indoor-radon-potential-zones/about https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/mineral-hazards/radon</p>	
GOV2	9/25/2023	Yunsheng Luo, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
GOV2-1	<p>Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Strive San Mateo General Plan 2040 and Climate Plan Update. We are committed to ensuring that impacts to the State’s multimodal transportation system and to our natural environment are identified and mitigated to support a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system. The Local Development Review (LDR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities. The following comments are based on our review of the August 2023 DEIR.</p>	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses GOV2-2 through GOV2-11.</p>
GOV2-2	<p>Project Understanding The proposed project would build off the existing General Plan 2030 to provide a framework for land use, transportation, conservation decisions through the horizon year of 2040. It would also update the buildout projects used in the City’s Climate Action Plan to be consistent with the updated General Plan 2040.</p>	<p>The comment correctly summarizes the proposed project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
GOV2-3	<p>Travel Demand Analysis With the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 743, Caltrans is focused on maximizing efficient development patterns, innovative travel demand reduction strategies, and multimodal improvements. For more information on how Caltrans assesses Transportation Impact Studies, please review Caltrans’ Transportation Impact Study Guide (link).</p>	<p>The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
GOV2-4	<p>The project’s Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis and significance determination are undertaken in a manner consistent with the Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) Technical Advisory and the City’s Transportation Impact</p>	<p>-The comment endorses the methodology utilized in the Draft EIR for VMT analysis and supports the conclusions and adequacy of the analysis; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
GOV2-5	<p>Analysis guidelines. Per the VMT analysis in the DEIR, this project is found to have a less than significant VMT impact, therefore working towards meeting the State’s VMT reduction goals.</p> <p>Page 4.15-16, “the proposed project is generally consistent with and would not obstruct the transit-related goals and policies in Plan Bay Area as it supports transit facilities and transit-oriented development”. Please consider strengthening the language as the General Plan Update could be reinforced with stronger language to advance the stated transportation goals of Plan Bay Area and the State.</p>	<p>The comment requests strengthening the General Plan language to advance the stated transportation goals of Plan Bay Area and the State. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
GOV2-6	<p>Caltrans encourages policies and programs related to land use and circulation that increase density, improve regional accessibility, and reduce VMT. The City may also consider the following strategies to reduce VMT, in addition to the priority strategies identified in Table 4.7-3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Real-time transit information system - Transit subsidies - Unbundled parking requirement from housing developments <p>For additional TDM options, please refer to the Federal Highway Administration’s Integrating Demand Management into the Transportation Planning Process: A Desk Reference, Chapter 8 (link).</p>	<p>The recommended strategies are noted and are implemented by some projects as TDM measures. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
GOV2-7	<p>Multimodal Transportation Planning</p> <p>Please review and include the reference to the Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian Plan (2021) and the Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan (2018) in the DEIR. These two plans studied existing conditions for walking and biking along and across the State Transportation Network (STN) in the nine-county Bay Area and developed a list of location-based and prioritized needs.</p>	<p>As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i>, of the Draft EIR has been revised to include discussion on the Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian and Bike Plans.</p>
GOV2-8	<p>Please note that any Complete Streets reference should be updated to reflect Caltrans Director’s Policy 37 (link) that highlights the importance of addressing the needs of non-</p>	<p>As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i>, of the Draft EIR has been revised to reflect the updated Caltrans Director’s Policy 37.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
GOV2-9	<p>motorists and prioritizing space-efficient forms of mobility, while also facilitating goods movement in a manner with the least environmental and social impacts. This supersedes Deputy Directive 64-R1, and further builds upon its goals of focusing on the movement of people and goods.</p> <p>Integrated Transportation and Land Use Planning Please review and include the reference to the current California Transportation Plan (CTP) in the DEIR.</p> <p>CTP 2050 envisions that the majority of new housing located near existing housing, jobs, and transit, and in close proximity to one another will reduce vehicle travel and greenhouse gas emissions, and be accessible and affordable for all Californians, including disadvantaged and low-income communities. The location, density, and affordability of future housing will dictate much of our future travel patterns, and our ability to achieve the vision outlined in CTP 2050. Caltrans encourages the City to consider and explore the potential of excess state-owned property for affordable housing development, per Executive Order N-06-19.</p>	<p>As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i>, of the Draft EIR has been revised to include discussion on the California Transportation Plan.</p>
GOV2-10	<p>Equitable Access If any Caltrans facilities are impacted by the project, those facilities must meet American Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards after project completion. As well, the project must maintain bicycle and pedestrian access during construction. These access considerations support Caltrans' equity mission to provide a safe, sustainable, and equitable transportation network for all users.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
GOV2-11	<p>Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Marley Mathews, Transportation Planner, via LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov.</p> <p>For future early coordination opportunities or project referrals, please contact LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov.</p>	<p>The comment serves as a conclusion to the preceding comments. Please see Responses GOV2-2 through GOV2-10.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
Organizations		
ORG1	9/5/2023	San Mateo Heritage Alliance
ORG1-1	<p>Congratulations on completing the Draft EIR for the San Mateo Draft 2040 General Plan. It is a well written, visually appealing document.</p> <p>The San Mateo Heritage Alliance appreciates that you have incorporated many of our comments on the General Plan policies to identify historic resources more broadly in San Mateo and use more appropriate terminology for the definition of historic resources.</p> <p>The Draft EIR Cultural Resources section, however, is incomplete. The section is therefore inadequate and must be revised and recirculated for public comment for these substantial reasons:</p>	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses ORG1-2 through ORG1-20.</p>
ORG1-2	<p>1. 4.4.1.2, Existing Conditions section is missing a description of at least two National Register of Historic Places eligible historic districts—Baywood and Yoshiko Yamanouchi House.</p>	<p>As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, Chapter 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, of the Draft EIR has been revised to discuss the status of the requests to list the Baywood District and Yoshiko Yamanouchi House in the National Register with the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). As shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR, in late 2023 the Yoshika Yamanouchi House was added to the National and California Registers.</p>
ORG1-3	<p>2. The impact discussion is missing an analysis of the project effects on historic districts.</p>	<p>The proposed project's impact on historic resources is discussed in impact discussion CULT-1, in Chapter 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, of the Draft EIR, which concludes that the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. As detailed in Chapter 4.4, page 4.4-10, of the Draft EIR, the types of cultural resources that meet the definition of historical resources under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 generally consist of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant for their traditional, cultural, and/or historical associations.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG1-4	3. The impact conclusion is not supported by the impact analysis.	The comment is noted. The commenter does not explain why, in the opinion of the commenter, the impact conclusion of the Draft EIR is not supported by the impact analysis. Therefore, a more detailed response cannot be provided.
ORG1-5	4. General Plan policies are not reliable mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the significant adverse impacts that may be caused by the project. The City of San Mateo has failed to comply with its General Plan policies regarding historic resources for the past 25+ years.	The comment is noted. The commenter does not explain why, in the opinion of the commenter, the City has a history of noncompliance with General Plan policies. Regarding the commenter's statement that General Plan policies are not reliable mitigation measures, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(b), General Plan policies can be considered mitigation measures and the annual report on general plan status, required pursuant to the Government Code, is considered a reporting program for adoption of a general plan.
ORG1-6	5. CEQA is not a reliable mitigation measure for the significant adverse impacts that may be caused by the project. The City of San Mateo's compliance with CEQA has been selective, and most often used to justify demolition and not protection of historic resources.	The opinion of the commenter is noted. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21080(d) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the City determined that the proposed project could result in potentially significant environmental impacts and that a program EIR would be required. Once the program EIR has been certified, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether additional CEQA review is needed. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c) and CEQA streamlining provisions, when a program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into the subsequent activities. CEQA Section 21081.6 requires that the lead agency adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for any project for which it has made findings pursuant to CEQA Section 21081. Such a program is intended to ensure the implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the preparation of an EIR. The MMRP for the proposed project is included as Appendix H, <i>Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program</i> , of this Final EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG1-7	<p>We offer the following comments on the Draft EIR.</p> <p>4.4 Cultural Resources 4.4.1.2 Existing Conditions p. 4.4-9, para. 2: The existing conditions section is not complete because it does not include two documented historic districts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Baywood Historic District is bounded by Alameda de las Pulgas, Crystal Springs Road, Eaton Road, Virginia Avenue, Edinburgh Street, and Notre Dame. 2. The Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District is at 1007 East 5th Avenue. <p>The City received the Baywood Historic Asset Analysis (Brandi 2022) in April 2022. This report identifies the historic context of the Baywood neighborhood, the boundary of the Baywood Historic District, and the criteria under which the Historic District is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. This report should be referenced in the EIR.</p>	<p>Furthermore, the proposed project includes General Plan policies and actions that would serve to protect historic resources. Proposed General Plan Policy CD 5.2, <i>Historic Preservation</i>, encourages the identification and preservation of historic resources. Proposed Policy CD 5.7, <i>Demolition Alternatives</i>, would require an applicant to submit alternatives to preserve a historic resource as part of any planning application that proposed full demolition. Proposed Action CD 5.8, <i>Historic Preservation Ordinance</i>, requires an update to the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance and proposed Action CD 5.12, <i>Historic Resources Design Standards</i>, would create objective design standards for alterations to historic resources and contributors to a designated historic district, and new development adjacent to historic resources within historic districts.</p> <p>Please see Response ORG1-2 regarding the added discussion of the status of the requests to list the Baywood District and Yoshiko Yamanouchi House in the National Register with the California OHP to the Draft EIR.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG1-8	<p>In addition, San Mateo Heritage Alliance is submitting an additional report on the Baywood Historic District that identifies the district boundaries, provides information on each property in the district, and identifies the contributors to the district and the properties that are not contributors.</p> <p>The Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District has 9 resources on the property including 3 buildings, 3 sites, and 3 structures. This information should be included in the Draft EIR and the effects on the districts from increased adjacent traffic should be analyzed. The effects on the Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District is potentially significant due to the increased levels of traffic and pollution.</p> <p>4.4.4.1 Regulatory Framework The discussions of cultural resource regulations does not include the regulatory framework for historic districts. The treatment of historic districts may be different than the treatment of individual historic properties. It is important to understand the regulatory framework for districts because the City has four historic districts; two identified as part of the 1989 Historic Building Survey, the Baywood Historic District, and the Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District.</p>	<p>Chapter 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, page 4.4-6, of the Draft EIR, discusses the preservation and maintenance of the city's historic structures and the Downtown Historic District, as required by San Mateo Municipal Code (SMMC) Chapter 27.66, <i>Historic Preservation</i>. Local standards and ordinances are not yet established for other districts and individual development projects within those districts are reviewed for environmental impacts during the planning process.</p>
ORG1-9	<p>CULT 1: Thank you for acknowledging the potential impact of incompatible new buildings adjacent to historic buildings or districts. The City's practice has been to only address the direct effects of the project on historic resources. The impact of new development on the Downtown Historic District has not been analyzed or mitigated (e.g., Prometheus building at the former Trag's site).</p>	<p>Please see Response ORG1-3 regarding what is considered a historic resource under CEQA. Furthermore, as stated in Chapter 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, page 4.4-13, of the Draft EIR, CEQA would require that future potential projects permitted under the proposed project with the potential to significantly impact historical resources be subject to project-level CEQA review wherein the future project's potential to affect the significance of a surrounding historical resource would be evaluated and mitigated to the extent feasible.</p>
ORG1-10	<p>p. 4.4-11, para. 2 states:</p>	<p>Please see Response ORG1-2 regarding the added discussion of the status of the requests to list the Baywood District and</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>“properties in the EIR Study Area that are listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the National and California Registers would be categorized as historic resources even if they are not formally landmarked by the City.”</p> <p>This statement cannot be relied upon because the City has not followed these procedures. The City did not include the Baywood or Yamanouchi districts in this EIR. The City disregarded the Baywood historic district report (Brandi 2022) that outlined the boundaries of the district and identified Baywood as an eligible historic district, as well as a memo that indicated the property was a contributor to the district. The City did not treat the property as a historic resource and permitted demolition of the property without conducting the appropriate CEQA review.</p>	<p>Yoshiko Yamanouchi House in the National Register with OHP to the Draft EIR, and Response ORG1-9 regarding what is considered a historic resource under CEQA and requires further CEQA review.</p>
<p>ORG1-11</p>	<p>p. 4.4-11: Policy CD 5.3: Historic Resources Definition. Define historic resources as buildings, structures, sites, and districts that are listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources, designated resources in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, and resources found to be eligible through documentation in a historic resources report.</p> <p>The City currently treats contributors to the Downtown Historic District as historic resources. This definition of historic resources only include districts. The City Historic Resources Code, which only applies to the Downtown Historic District currently states:</p> <p>27.66.040 CONFORMANCE WITH STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES. (a) City-wide. All exterior modifications of individually eligible and contributor buildings (e.g., exterior building</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>additions and alterations) shall conform with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Structures, 1990 Edition.</p> <p>This code implies contributors are treated as historic resources. Will contributors in new districts be required to follow the Secretary of Interior's guidelines for exterior modifications?</p> <p>Please add "contributors to eligible historic districts" to the definition of historic resources in Policy CD 5.3, to be consistent with how Downtown historic resources are treated. Contributors to historic districts must be protected in order to protect the integrity of the district.</p> <p>Please provide a reference or more information about the requirements of a historic resources report.</p>	
<p>ORG1-12</p>	<p>Impacts to Historic Districts</p> <p>The impact analysis should address the potential for direct and indirect significant effects on eligible historic districts and their contexts, especially for areas that have not yet been fully surveyed. The Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District could be adversely affected by the proposed project, including increased traffic and the reconstruction of the 3rd/4th Avenue Interchange. Please revise the analysis to include an analysis of the impacts on the historic district.</p> <p>The Aragon and San Mateo Park neighborhoods border El Camino Real development areas. Hayward Park borders the railroad development corridor and El Camino Real development corridor. The analysis is incomplete because it does not consider the potential for direct and indirect impacts on unsurveyed potential historic districts identified in the 1989 Historic Building Survey. The impact analysis should be revised to address this new impact.</p>	<p>Please see Response ORG1-2 regarding the added discussion of the status of the requests to list the Baywood District and Yoshiko Yamanouchi House in the National Register with OHP to the Draft EIR, and Response ORG1-9 regarding what is considered a historic resource under CEQA and requires further CEQA review. Furthermore, proposed General Plan Policy CD 5.2, <i>Historic Preservation</i>, requires the City to actively identify and preserve concentrations of historic resources.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG1-13	<p>General Plan policies are not a reliable means of mitigating potential significant adverse impacts to historic resources because the City fails to comply with its own policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The City of San Mateo has for 13 years disregarded its adopted General Plan policies regarding historic resources. ◆ The City has failed to comply with current General Plan policy C/OS 8.2 Historic Districts. <p>The policy requires the City to “Consider the protections of concentrations of buildings which convey the flavor of local historical periods or provide an atmosphere of exceptional architectural interest or integrity, after additional study.” and “In consideration of future historic districts, specific regulations to maintain historic character shall be developed.” The City continues to disregard this policy by refusing to acknowledge identified eligible historic districts and permitting demolition of historic resources to occur unabated and unaffected by its General Plan policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The City has failed to comply with current General Plan policy C/OS 8.4 Inventory Maintenance. This policy directs the City to “Establish and maintain and inventory architecturally, culturally and historically significant structures and sites.” It also warns that “without maintenance, the inventory becomes unreliable and unusable.” For 34 years the City has failed to maintain or update the 1989 Historic Building Survey resulting in the continual and unabated loss of historic resources. 	<p>Please see Response PUB7-4 regarding the City's intent to implement proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions. The City evaluates discretionary projects for General Plan consistency, including with existing General Plan Policy C/OS 8.2. The statements made by the commenter are their opinion, but are not supported by substantial evidence.</p> <p>The City implements existing General Plan Policy C/OS 8.4 by maintaining an inventory of historic resources through historic resource evaluations prepared in consultation with a qualified architectural historian. These actions are required during the entitlement process for projects of structures 50 years or older that were not previously surveyed.</p> <p>Please also see Response ORG1-5 regarding General Plan policies as mitigation measures.</p>
ORG1-14	<p>Policy CD 5.7: Demolition Alternatives Please add the requirement to identify demolition alternatives for contributors to a historic district.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
ORG1-15	<p>Action CD 5.8: Historic Resources Context Statements, Action CD 5.9: Historic Resources Survey, and Action CD 5.10: Historic Preservation Ordinance These actions imply they will be conducted sequentially (Prepare neighborhood-specific historic context statements</p>	<p>The comment references proposed General Plan Action CD 5.8, <i>Historic Preservation Ordinance</i>, Action CD 5.9, <i>Historic Resources Context Statements</i>, and Action CD 5.10, <i>Historic Resources Survey</i>, and requests updates to the Historic Preservation Ordinance prior to historic context statements.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG1-16	<p>prior to updating the historic resources survey.) Please update the Historic Preservation Ordinance first to address the two new eligible historic districts (the Yoshiko Yamanouchi House Historic District and Baywood Historic District).</p> <p>p. 4.4-13 Significance without mitigation: Less than significant Conclusion.</p> <p>The conclusion that the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse impact on historical resources is contrary to the discussion of the many ways the proposed project could have significant adverse impacts on historical resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ “Implementation of the proposed project could have the potential to directly impact cultural resources by altering land use regulations that govern these properties or surrounding sites.” ◆ “Potential impacts from future development on, or adjacent to, historical resources could lead to demolition...inappropriate modification...inappropriate new construction... incompatible new buildings.” ◆ “Development activities under the proposed project therefore have the potential to be incompatible with historical resources, which could be a significant impact.” ◆ “If new development were to directly impact existing resources, impacts on historical resources could be significant.” <p>Based on the above statements from the impact discussion, the conclusion should be amended to read “the proposed project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change to historical resources.”</p>	<p>The comment is noted, and the order of the actions has been updated to be considered for implementation earlier in the planning period. However, the comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p> <p>Chapter 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, page 4.4-13, of the Draft EIR, provides a discussion of how these potential impacts would be mitigated. This includes required compliance with existing federal, State, and local laws, as well as conformance with the identified proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions, including Policy CD 5.7, <i>Demolition Alternatives</i>, Action CD 5.8, <i>Historic Preservation Ordinance</i>, and Action CD 5.12, <i>Historic Resources Design Standards</i>. While conformance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties would normally mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level under CEQA, the proposed project is a program-level document, and specifics related to future individual projects are not known, so the proposed project assumes conformance with these Standards. CEQA requires further project-level environmental review to evaluate and mitigate the impact of future projects on historical resources. Therefore, the conclusion that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on historical resources is accurate.</p>
ORG1-17	<p>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is not a reliable means of mitigating potential significant adverse impacts to historic resources.</p> <p>CEQA does not prevent demolition of historic resources. The</p>	<p>Please see Response ORG1-6 and Response ORG1-16 regarding further CEQA review and implementation of mitigation measures.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>City can make overriding considerations that housing is more important than historic resources. The impact analysis does not support the conclusion of no significant impact with no mitigation. The Draft EIR (p. 4.4-13) states:</p> <p>“Under CEQA, conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties would normally mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed General Plan is a program level document, it is not possible to determine whether individual projects under the proposed project would be able to conform with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. ... The requirement for subsequent CEQA review, pursuant to state law, would minimize the potential for new development to indirectly affect the significance of existing historical resources to the maximum extent practicable.”</p> <p>This statement suggests that some significant impacts may not be mitigated through compliance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards or through CEQA review. If no additional mitigation is imposed the project could result in significant unavoidable adverse effects. Additional mitigation measures should be presented.</p>	
ORG1-18	<p>Recirculation is Necessary The Draft EIR should be recirculated in accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15088.5. Recirculation of an EIR Prior to Certification because the impact analysis is incomplete and new mitigation measures are necessary. The lack of the impact analysis and mitigation measures deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>The comment asserts that the Draft EIR needs to be recirculated because the impact analysis is incomplete and new mitigation measures are required. Please see Responses ORG1-2 through ORG 1-17 above regarding the Draft EIR's impact analysis of historical resources and required mitigations and further CEQA review. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, "significant new information" requiring recirculation can include: a new significant environmental impact that would result from the project or from new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented; substantial increase of the severity of an environmental impact that would result unless mitigation measures are</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG1-19	<p>CULT-4</p> <p>The proposed project would not, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, result in cumulative cultural resources impacts in the area.</p> <p>The discussion under this impact does not describe the specific or even a general discussion of the number of historic resources lost through development to date. It is not possible to credibly assess cumulative impacts with no discussion of impacts to date.</p> <p>The Downtown Historic District has been eroded on all sides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The entrance at Third Avenue and El Camino Real ◆ Prometheus building on Baldwin ◆ Redevelopment of Donut Delite and Talbots ◆ The 6-7 story buildings on 3rd and 4th east of the railroad. <p>Please provide the number of downtown historic buildings and contributors modified or demolished to date. What is the cumulative impact threshold for losses of historic buildings in the historic districts, especially the Downtown Historic District? Mitigation is necessary for the potentially significant cumulative effects.</p>	<p>adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance; a feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it; or the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. Because the revisions shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR do not constitute as "significant new information," recirculation is not required.</p> <p>The comment asserts that the cumulative cultural resources impact analysis is lacking discussion of historic resources lost through development to date. The comment refers to events that have occurred in the past and are part of the baseline condition, rather than effects of the proposed project or cumulative projects. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, an EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the proposed project. therefore, discussion of historic buildings and contributors modified or demolished to date is not required.</p>
ORG1-20	<p>I look forward to reviewing the revised Draft EIR with the missing analyses and mitigation measures.</p>	<p>The comment serves as a conclusion to the preceding comments. Please see Responses ORG1-2 through ORG1-19.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
<p>ORG2</p>	<p>9/25/2023</p>	<p>David Bohannon, Hillsdale Shopping Center</p>
<p>ORG2-1</p>	<p>On behalf of HSC Property Owner LLC, the owners of the Hillsdale Shopping Center and surrounding properties (Owners), we appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the Strive San Mateo General Plan Update (GPU) and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).</p> <p>As you may know, the Owners have embarked on a process to collect community input to reimagine the Hillsdale Shopping Center for its next evolution - from a shopping center into a great neighborhood with retail, homes, supporting commercial development and more. As part of this process, our team has reviewed the GPU and DEIR and supports the City's goals and efforts in the GPU. In the spirit of collaboration, the Owners wish to submit the following comments for consideration on both the GPU and DEIR. Further, we request that these comments are considered in the implementation of the GPU, i.e., through zoning amendments or otherwise.</p>	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses ORG2-2 through ORG2-5.</p>
<p>ORG2-2</p>	<p>GPU</p> <p><u>1. Land Use Policy 6.2 [Hillsdale Shopping Center]</u> - This policy allows redevelopment of the Hillsdale Shopping Center for a "mix of uses, including commercial, retail, office, hotel, and residential uses." Given the market demand for research and development (R&D) uses, and the fact that R&D uses can provide important job generating uses that have the added benefit of "in office" employment that energizes mixed use areas, we request that this policy explicitly identifies that R&D uses are permitted. We also request that R&D is explicitly allowed in the Mixed Use designations.</p> <p><u>2. Land Use Table LU-1 [Land Use Designations]</u> - We note that the new designations identify height limitations by stories rather than building height. We request discussion of</p>	<p>The comment requests various updates to the proposed General Plan 2040 and its policies and actions. The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>how these story limitations will be implemented in the implementing zoning. We'd like to ensure that if/when height is codified in feet, that it does not cause any surprises. We note that the actual height can vary depending on preferred ceiling heights for varying uses.</p> <p><u>3. Circulation (new policy/action suggestion)</u> - Consistent with efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) articulated in the GPU (for example, Action C 2.3 [Education and Outreach]: "pursue education for developers and employees about programs and strategies to reduce VMT, parking demand, and the resulting benefits" and Policy C 6.7 [Capital Improvement Program]: "Prioritize improvements that increase person throughput in project prioritization to reduce VMT"), we request the City take action to incorporate multi-modal improvements into the Capital Improvement Program so that developer-funded transit, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements will earn Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) credits based on Multimodal Level of Service criteria. We note that this is consistent with Zoning Code Section 27.13.090 which grants credits for improvements that are identified in the Transportation Improvement Fee Technical Report. This is an important step in implementing the transition from automobile focused improvements to multi-modal improvements.</p>	
	<p><u>4. Circulation (new policy/action suggestion)</u> - We recommend that the General Plan reflects and expands policies in transit oriented plans, including the Rail Corridor Plan, that require applicants for new developments within one half mile of a major transit station prepare a parking demand study, rather than impose a specific parking ratio, in recognition of access to mass transit. We recommend that this policy is reflected in the GPU to ensure consistent implementation in transit oriented plans. We also note that</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>this action would be consistent with the intent behind AB 2097, which largely eliminates parking requirements for projects in proximity to major transit.</p> <p><u>5. Conservation Open Space Policy 7.2 (Acreage Standards)</u> - This policy is to "[a]quire or accept for dedication two acres of neighborhood and community parks per 1,000 residents." We note that this standard is highly land consumptive and places a heavy burden on development. If implemented conservatively, it can result in the loss of residential units, which are sorely needed to meet RHNA targets. We have a number of suggestions to make this policy feasible.</p> <p>a. We request that a broad scope of open space is accepted, including plazas, paseos, parklets, trails, courtyards and amenity terraces. We understand that this is consistent with past practice.</p> <p>b. We request that developer funded park improvements that are included in the Parks Master Plan continue to receive credits from park fees.</p> <p>c. Finally, we recommend that this policy is implemented in consideration of park spaces provided in the same service area. For example, if ample parks have been provided in excess of the intended ratio in one service area, that should be considered in relation to other projects in the same service area.</p> <p><u>6. Public Safety Facilities 4.3 [Building Electrification]</u> -This policy is to "[r]equire electrification for new building stock and reduce fossil fuel usage for existing building stock at the time of building alteration." We suggest that a feasibility standard is considered and that exceptions are allowed for affordable housing, commercial kitchens and R&D uses. An electrification requirement imposed on alterations to existing buildings could inhibit the ability and interest in altering existing uses. We anticipate that the alteration and</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>preservation of existing uses, particularly affordable housing, would be encouraged and suggest that feasibility is considered in relation to an existing building alteration project We understand that the San Mateo Sustainability and Infrastructure Commission is currently meeting to discuss and collect and discuss stakeholder input on the "Electrify San Mateo - Building for the Future: City of San Mateo Sustainable Buildings Strategy." In particular, we understand the Commission is seeking input on the impacts of new requirements on existing buildings. Accordingly, we suggest that policy leaves room for stakeholder input and implementation flexibility.</p>	
	<p>With respect to new uses, a natural gas prohibition on some uses, particularly R&D and commercial kitchens, would pose real limitations on the ability to develop and market such uses. We note that other Bay Area cities have provided for exemptions. For example, Santa Clara exempts 11L" occupancies (which includes laboratories}, hotel laundries, commercial kitchens as well as other uses where there is "not an all-electric prescriptive compliance pathway".¹ We recommend similar considerations in adopting electrification requirements.</p>	
	<p>7. Policy N 2.1 [Noise Regulation] - This policy is to "[r]egulate noise in San Mateo to prohibit noise that is annoying or injurious to community members." We would like to ensure that there will still be an opportunity to request construction noise exceptions, pursuant to a City process, for limited periods of time.</p>	
	<p>8. Policy N 2.2: (Minimize Noise Impacts) - This policy is to "(i]ncorporate necessary mitigation measures into new development design to minimize short-term noise impacts. Determine whether new development has the potential to</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>result in a significant noise impact on existing development based on the following standards. Impacts will be analyzed based on long-term operational noise increases at the sensitive receptor property line, or new uses that generate noise levels at the sensitive receptor property line [above 5 dBA, with certain other additional requirements]." We suggest that existing ambient noise levels are considered in the implementation of exterior noise standards. For example, in one such example, 2 in the event the ambient noise level exceeds the otherwise specified noise standards, an "adjusted ambient noise level" is applied as the noise standard. In cases where the noise standard is adjusted due to a high ambient noise level, the noise standard shall not exceed the "adjusted ambient noise level," or 70 dB(A), whichever is less. In cases where the ambient noise level is already greater than 70 dB(A), the ambient noise level is applied as the noise standard. We request a similar consideration and adjustments based on existing ambient noise levels.</p> <p>9. Policy N 2.4: (Traffic Noise] - This policy is to "[r]ecognize projected increases in ambient noise levels resulting from future traffic increases, as shown on Figure N- 2. Promote reduced traffic speeds and the installation of noise barriers or other methods to reduce traffic noise along highways and high volume roadways where noise-sensitive land uses (listed in Table N-1} [of the proposed General Plan] are adversely impacted by excessive noise levels (60 dBA [Ldn] or above)." We suggest that feasibility is considered when implementing this policy. There may be some instances when it is not feasible to install noise barriers given right-of-way or property ownership constraints and, therefore, suggest that this policy is implemented to the extent feasible.</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG2-3	<p>DEIR</p> <p>1. Project Description and Appendix B [Projects Included in Buildout Projections] - We note that Table 3-1 [Proposed General Plan 2040 Buildout Projections] identifies the "total net change" in development from existing conditions. We request clarification on whether the site capacities assumed in the Buildout Projections reflect total capacity or net new capacity. It is well established under CEQA that using "net new" square footage reflects the true change in conditions from existing/prior uses to the ultimate/future use conditions (14 Cal. Code Regs., § 15125, subd. (a)); <i>Fat v County of Sacramento</i> (2002) 97 CA4th 1270).</p>	<p>As discussed in Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i>, on pages 3-19 and 3-20, of the Draft EIR, the buildout projections are not based on capacity, but rather the City's estimation of "reasonably foreseeable" development that could occur over the buildout horizon. The projections do not presume that every parcel is developed to the maximum level allowed under the General Plan. Table 3-1, <i>Proposed General Plan 2040 Buildout Projections in the EIR Study Area</i>, in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR shows the projected net change for each category (i.e., households, housing units, population, and jobs) by area, as well as the total net change for the EIR Study Area and projected buildout in 2040.</p>
ORG2-4	<p>2. Wildfire - For the sake of accuracy, we note that Figure 4.18-5, "Potential Evacuation Routes," does not appear to show that 31st Avenue and 28th Avenue now connect under the Caltrain Tracks as a result of a recent grade separation project. These new road connections may provide additional Potential Evacuation Routes east of the Caltrain tracks.</p>	<p>As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, Figure 4.18-5, <i>Potential Evacuation Routes</i>, in Chapter 4.18, <i>Wildfire</i>, of the Draft EIR has been revised to include 31st Avenue and 28th Avenue as additional evacuation routes.</p>
ORG2-5	<p>We thank you for your time and your consideration and your efforts on the GPU and DEIR.</p>	<p>The comment serves as a conclusion to the preceding comments. Please see Responses ORG2-2 through ORG2-4.</p>
ORG3	11/1/2023	Laurie Hietter, San Mateo Heritage Alliance
ORG3-1	<p>Dear City Council Members:</p> <p>In previous submittals and meetings, the San Mateo Heritage Alliance has stressed the importance of continuing to treat buildings that contribute to historic districts (contributors) as historic resources. The current General Plan and Historic Resources Code includes contributors in the definition of historic resources.</p> <p>We are concerned that subtle words changes in the 2040 General Plan are significantly changing City policy:</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>1. Changing the definition of historic resources to remove contributors to historic districts.</p> <p>2. The word contributor in Chapter 10 Glossary has no bearing on policy</p> <p>3. Changing preservation of historic districts from protecting concentrations of important buildings to protecting concentrations of historic buildings (meaning those buildings already evaluated and designated historic)</p> <p>We request that the Council revisit the policies in the Community Design and Historic Resources Element and make the following changes:</p> <p>Policy CD 5.1: Historic Preservation. Actively identify and preserve historic resources and concentrations of historic resources and concentrations of buildings which convey the flavor of local historical periods, are culturally significant, or provide an atmosphere of exceptional architectural interest or integrity, when they meet national, State, or local criteria. Historic resources include individual properties, districts, and sites that maintain San Mateo’s sense of place and special identity, and enrich our understanding of the city’s history and continuity with the past.</p> <p>Policy CD 5-3: Historic Resources Definition. Define historic resources as buildings, structures, sites, and districts, and contributors to districts that are listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources, designated resources in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, and resources found to be eligible through documentation in a historic resources report.</p> <p>These changes will ensure continued protection of historic districts and the buildings that make the districts special. Additional discussion is included in the attachment. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
<p>ORG3-2</p>	<p>ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES POLICIES Definition of Historic Resources Should Include Contributors to Historic Districts</p> <p>One of the goals of the San Mateo Heritage Alliance is to preserve and protect historic resources and the contributor buildings in historic districts. The City of Redwood City, San Francisco, Portland, and many other cities protect contributors in historic districts. The City’s current policies support protection of contributors in the Downtown and Glazenwood Historic Districts. The General Plan should be clear on this policy.</p> <p>Only the historic district is the historic resource subject to CEQA. Contributors do not qualify as historic resources or the consideration provided historic resources. The City has latitude to designate any important properties as historic resources. The City's policies in the current General Plan and the Historic Resources Preservation Code currently support the protection of contributors as historic resources, as do many cities.</p> <p>The wording changes in the combined Policy CD 5.1 restrict the definition of historic resources and protection to only those resources that are individually eligible for listing on the State or National Register, which is a very high bar to achieve protection. There is no protection at all (even the minimal consideration of a CEQA analysis) for contributor buildings in a district until the point where so many buildings in the district are altered that the historic integrity is lost.</p> <p>The current 2030 General Plan defines historic resources as: C/OS 8.1: Historic Preservation. Preserve, where feasible, historic buildings as follows: d. Historic building shall mean buildings which are on or individually eligible for the National Register of Historic</p>	<p>Chapter 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, of the Draft EIR concluded that implementation of the proposed project, including the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions, would not result in significant impacts to historical resources. District contributors are included by default in the City’s two designated historic districts (Downtown and Glazenwood) because the districts are considered a historic resource. Please see Response ORG1-9 regarding further CEQA review. Please also see Response ORG1-18 regarding recirculation.</p> <p>Comments related to how contributors in historic districts should be addressed in the General Plan pertain to a policy decision, and do not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG3-3	<p>Places, California Register of Historical Resources, or Downtown Historic District contributor buildings as designated in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, or as determined to be eligible through documentation contained in a historic resources report.</p> <p>The 2040 General Plan revised the definition of historic resources to remove the word “contributor:”</p> <p>Policy CD 5-3: Historic Resources Definition. Define historic resources as buildings, structures, sites, and districts that are listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources, designated resources in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, and resources found to be eligible through documentation in a historic resources report.</p> <p>Deciding to treat contributors as historic resources is a policy decision. The language changes in the 2040 General Plan change the level of protection of buildings in historic districts, which is a significant impact not addressed in the Draft EIR. A new significant impact is cause for recirculation of the Draft EIR.</p> <p>The goal to protect contributors to historic districts is consistent with the 2030 General Plan policy O/S 8.2: C/OS 8.2: Historic Districts. Consider the protection of concentrations of buildings which convey the flavor of local historical periods or provide an atmosphere of exceptional architectural interest or integrity, after additional study.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. Comments related to policy and action language in the proposed General Plan pertain to a policy decision, and do not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The proposed project is a program-level document, and specifics related to future individual projects</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>General Plan policy is to protect a group of important buildings. The new language in Policy CD 5.1/2 only protects groups of buildings that meet the definition of historic resources: those that are on or individually eligible for listing on the State or National Register.</p> <p>2030 C/OS 8.1: Historic Preservation. Preserve, where feasible, historic buildings as follows:</p> <p>d. Historic building shall mean buildings which are on or individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, or Downtown Historic District contributor buildings as designated in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report, or as determined to be eligible through documentation contained in a historic resources report.</p> <p>2040 Policy CD 5.2 Historic Resources Preservation. Actively identify and preserve concentrations of historic resources, which convey the flavor of local historical periods, are culturally significant, or provide an atmosphere of exceptional architectural interest or integrity, when they meet national, State, or local criteria.</p> <p>The definition of Historic Resources in the 2040 General Plan Chapter 10 includes contributors only in Downtown and Glazenwood, and is a narrow definition of historic resources. As stated by Joanna Jansen (Placeworks) at the October 30 City Council meeting, the definitions in the Glossary do not represent the policies.</p> <p>2040 Chapter 10 Glossary: Historic Resource. A historic resource is a building, structure, site, or district that has one or more of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Listed in or determined to be on or individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources. 	<p>are not known, so the proposed project assumes conformance with applicable regulations, policies, and standards. CEQA requires further project-level environmental review to evaluate and mitigate the impact of future projects on historical resources. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identified as a Downtown Historic District or Glazenwood Historic District contributor building as designated in the 1989 Historic Building Survey Report. ▪ Determined to be eligible through documentation contained in a historic resources report. 	
	<p>Zoning Code includes Contributors The City of San Mateo Zoning Code sections 27.66.020 Applicability, 27.66.040 Conformance with Standards and Guidelines and 27.66.060 Demolition all treat contributors as historic resources and in the same way as individually eligible properties.</p> <p>27.66.020 APPLICABILITY.</p> <p>(a) Historic Buildings and Downtown Historic District. The provisions of this chapter shall apply to all individually eligible buildings in the City, all individually eligible and contributor buildings within the Downtown Specific Plan area, and all structures located in the Downtown Historic District, as adopted by resolution of the City Council.</p> <p>(b) The City Council by resolution may add to the provisions of this chapter any building which it finds meets the criteria of contributing to the historic importance of downtown and the City. Such an action shall be based on National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources criteria and documented in a form consistent with the City of San Mateo Historic Building Survey.</p> <p>(c) Individually Eligible and Contributor Buildings. For the purposes of this chapter, the terms "individually eligible building" shall mean those buildings as identified in the City of San Mateo General Plan. "Contributor building" shall mean those buildings identified as such and located within the Downtown Historic District as adopted by resolution of the City Council and identified in the City of San Mateo General Plan.</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>(d) For the purposes of this chapter, the terms "individually eligible building" and "contributor building" and "Downtown Historic District" shall mean those buildings and district identified as such by resolution of the City Council or identified in the City of San Mateo Downtown Specific Plan.</p>	
	<p>Discussion at 10/2 City Council Meeting At the City Council Meeting on 10/2 the Council members expressed a lack of understanding about what contributors meant. It was stated that it does not matter if it is in the General Plan or in the implementation language to be addressed later in the ordinance. I strongly disagree. The City currently has a policy to treat contributors as historic resources. The new General Plan dilutes and changes the policy (see above).</p>	
	<p>We were disappointed staff did not describe what contributors mean and that they have no protection under the current language. That discussion would have allowed the City Council to make an informed decision at the time. We request the City Council revisit these policies.</p>	
	<p>Updating the Historic Preservation Ordinance I understand that the City will be updating the Historic Preservation Ordinance next year but I believe the conversation of historic preservation policy in the General Plan 2040 is very relevant right now and should not be delayed to the implementation phase. The General Plan is the place to define policies.</p>	
	<p>Updating the City Website Regarding Historic Districts We understand staff will be updating the City Website with more information about what a historic district contributor is and the ramifications of a property being designated. That is</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>good news for the Baywood community. Many people are looking to the City for clarification of what it means to be in a Historic District. Why can't the City tell us now? Either contributors are protected or they are not. The current plan protects them. The slight changes in the wording in the 2040 General Plan removes the protection.</p> <p>Demolition Policies Policy CD 5.7 Demolition Alternatives. Require an applicant to submit alternatives to preserve a historic resource as part of any planning application that proposes full demolition. Implement preservation methods unless health and safety requirements cannot be met or the City Council makes a finding explaining the specific reasons why the social, economic, legal, technical, or other beneficial aspects of the proposed demolition outweigh the unavoidable adverse impacts to the historic resource. If a designated historic resource cannot be preserved, require City approval before the demolition of a historic resource.</p> <p>What is the definition of demolition for this policy? Leaving one wall is near total demolition. Requiring an alternatives analysis is a good idea. The staff should be empowered to evaluate the alternatives provided by the applicant for veracity, feasibility, and adequacy. There should also be a requirement for mitigation measures. The language should be clarified to add contributors to the definition of historic resources.</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
Members of the Public		
PUB1	8/17/2023	Rowan Paul
PUB1-1	<p>Dear City of San Mateo,</p> <p>I am very concerned about the changed building height limits for new construction.</p> <p>Already for our East 5th avenue house. We have lost sunlight due to the new affordable housing building that came up with more floors than was in the original design that was approved. This is very concerning for the town if this continues.</p>	<p>The comment expresses concerns about the increasing building heights. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB1-2	<p>For the 4th Street building that is coming up and others in the future, I am very concerned about the increased density resulting increased traffic. Increased crime increase noise, decrease sunlight for neighborhoods, and generally a lack of correspondingly increasing infrastructure such as parking, policing, file education, electricity, plumbing, etc. That typically does not keep up with the density increase.</p>	<p>The comment expresses concerns regarding increased density but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. As discussed in Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i>, of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would support programs to reduce overall vehicle usage and impacts would be less than significant. Chapter 4.11, <i>Noise</i>, of the Draft EIR concludes that impacts of the proposed project on the surrounding area would only be significant and unavoidable for traffic noise along 1st Avenue west of B Street. Chapter 4.14, <i>Public Services</i>, and Chapter 4.17, <i>Utilities and Services Systems</i>, of the Draft EIR found that the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts related to public services and utilities and service systems.</p>
PUB1-3	<p>San Mateo is not San Francisco or San Jose. I do not want it to turn into Redwood City which has turned into a personality deficient overcrowded downtown with significantly more crime than San Mateo.</p> <p>Please keep the buildings below five floors, preferably one to three floors.</p>	<p>The comment serves as a conclusion to the preceding comments. Please see Responses PUB1-1 through PUB1-2.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>I am welcome to discussion. Thank you</p>	
<p>PUB2</p>	<p>8/17/2023</p>	<p>Frances Souza</p>
<p>PUB2-1</p>	<p>As a resident of Central San Mateo, I am requesting "RESIDENTIAL LOW I" be used on the south side of E. 4th Avenue, both sides of E. 5th Avenue from S. Delaware to S. Amphlett and on the West side of S. Delaware from E. 5th - 9th Avenue. This is more compatible with our current neighborhood and will help protect and preserve our neighborhood and reduce demolition of our single family homes and small duplexes. This will also support the General Plan's vision to "Enhance San Mateo's Neighborhood Fabric and Quality of Life." It will also address the Plan's goal of preservation of historic areas, as these streets are predominantly beautiful pre-war homes and duplexes which include Craftsmen, Spanish Revival, Tudor Revival and Victorian styles of architecture.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
<p>PUB3</p>	<p>9/11/2023</p>	<p>Jerry Davis</p>
<p>PUB3-1</p>	<p>There are 10,210 vehicles a day on 5th Avenue that's just too much traffic. Whatsmore, [sic] the Nelson Nygaard Central Neighborhood Long Term Strategy January 2006, recommended traffic circles on 5th and 9th Avenues. 5th Avenue is currently a narrow Local street and 9th Avenue is a Collector. We need to keep 5th Avenue as a local street from S Delaware to S Amphlett and keep 9th Avenue as a Collector from S Delaware to S Amphlett. It would also be a good idea to reclassify S Humboldt as a local street from 4th Avenue to 9th Avenue. 5th Avenue is a proposed Bike route which conflicts with the new reclassification. It is currently impossible for me to find parking on my own</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>street South Eldorado. I mostly need to park on 5th Ave. Traffic has already been generated, especially along 4th and 5th Avenues due to the new development in downtown San Mateo. Traffic and trucks west of the Railroad should be route through El Camino Real, 92 and 101 the State Highways, not through 4th, 5th, and 9th Avenues. Residential parking is already a nightmare. We have requested traffic calming since 1991. How can 5th Avenue, a proposed bicycle route exist without traffic calming from S Delaware to S Amphlett? This new classification to Arterial is simply a conflict to the General Plan.</p>	
PUB4	9/11/2023	Francie Souza
PUB4-1	I am a resident of San Mateo and have additional comments on the General Plan, as outlined below:	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB4-2 through PUB2-3.
PUB4-2	<p>4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES My comments relate to POLICE under Public Services in the General Plan.</p> <p>It was noted that the SMPD staffing ratios of 1.07 sworn officers to 1,000 residents is below the national staffing average of 2.0 sworn personnel per 1,000 residents and expansion of SMPD facilities may be needed to accommodate increases in staffing to maintain response times. It was noted that the “proposed project” would increase demand on police protection services, but growth would occur incrementally, therefore minimizing the impact.</p> <p>The EIR states...Payment of police protection impact fees and special taxes, consistency with the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions and compliance with the</p>	<p>Staffing levels are not within the scope of the EIR, as CEQA only considers physical environmental impacts created through the provision of new or physically altered public services facilities. As stated in Chapter 4.14, <i>Public Services</i>, page 4.14-13, of the Draft EIR, any future construction of new or renovated police stations would be subject to separate project-level environmental review pursuant to CEQA, as required, to identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures as needed to reduce potential environmental impacts. This would ensure that potential environmental impacts of future construction would be properly analyzed and mitigated. Furthermore, as shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, Chapter 4.14, <i>Public Services</i>, of the Draft EIR has been revised to include proposed General Plan Action PSF 1.8, <i>Police and Fire Cover Assessments</i>, which requires complete standard of</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>regulations would ensure that the SMPD is involved as future development is allowed under the proposed project. Though SMPD has indicated that existing stations would be inadequate to accommodate future needs, it has not yet developed any specific plans to construct new facilities. Therefore, it would be speculative to assess the physical effects of those future construction projects and the project’s potential contribution to those effects. Pursuant to Section 15145 of the State CEQA Guidelines, if a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, no further evaluation is required. This doesn’t seem wise.</p> <p>With additional comments, it was concluded that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to police protection services and cumulative impacts would be <u>less than significant and no further evaluation is required.</u></p> <p>My request is that we do evaluate our police services more carefully now and determine how we can move toward proactively planning for this increase in demand that will naturally happen with the growth outlined in our state mandated housing plan. The approach in the General Plan seems to “kick the can down the road”. Already, police are stretched when it comes to proactively monitoring firework displays and other safety issues that have to be prioritized “out” for more serious issues.</p>	<p>cover assessments or staffing studies periodically for police and fire services to ensure that appropriate response times, staffing, and levels of service are available to meet community needs as the City’s population grows.</p> <p>The comment also asks how the City can move toward proactively planning for the increase in demand. The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB4-3	<p>Transportation, section 4.15-8 It appears on the map that 5th Avenue and 9th Avenue are designated as “Arterials”. As defined, Arterial streets are ‘signalized’ with higher capacity to accommodate traffic volumes offering continuous movement with coordinated and interconnected signal systems.</p>	Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>5th Avenue and 9th Avenue are neighborhood streets, with traffic circles on 5th to slow traffic and both streets serve as local streets in the Central Neighborhood, which include primarily single family/duplex homes. 5th Avenue is also proposed as a bicycle boulevard with traffic calming from S. Delaware to S. Amphlett, so the Arterial designation is a conflict with the General Plan.</p> <p>Delaware is also designated as an Arterial street in the Draft EIR, but also runs through the Sunnybrae neighborhood, including the area around Sunnybrae Elementary School which has a 15mph speed zone.</p> <p>These Arterial street designations need to be reconsidered in order to protect our neighborhoods, the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists and children in school zones. The reclassification will also increase pollution in the Central Neighborhood which conflicts with our goal of neighborhoods free of environmental health hazards. <u>Please do not reclassify 5th and 9th Avenues to Arterials.</u></p>	
<p>PUB5</p>	<p>9/12/2023</p>	<p>David Light</p>
<p>PUB5-1</p>	<p>Dear San Mateo Planning Commission, I would like to comment on sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Draft General Plan 2040.</p>	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB5-2 through PUB5-3.</p>
<p>PUB5-2</p>	<p>There is a seismic hazard map in Section 4.6 on Geology and Soils showing the risk of soil liquefaction during a major earthquake. In this map of San Mateo the liquefaction risk is divided into two regions, a moderate risk region roughly from the downtown to Hwy 101 and a high risk region from Hwy 101 to the Bay. I am concerned that developers will</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>certainly prefer to locate new multi-story projects on lower risk areas rather than on historic landfill areas that are at higher risk. However, many of our single family and duplex home neighborhoods are currently located on the desirable moderate risk liquefaction areas. These single family home neighborhoods should not be displaced by large developments. San Mateo needs to protect and preserve our charming older homes in single family and duplex neighborhoods that make San Mateo a desirable place to live.</p>	
<p>PUB5-3</p>	<p>Section 4.7 on Greenhouse Gas Emissions discusses the need to reduce carbon dioxide from home appliances, cars and trucks. New developments located near Caltrain or SamTrans public transportation stops are routinely allowed to provide less parking spaces in their plans. However, there is a continued lack of cooperation between Caltrain and BART and there is low ridership on SamTrans and Caltrain, so our city planners need to be realistic about the use of public transportation by workers and residents in San Mateo. New building projects must provide adequate parking spaces and include parking with chargers for electric cars as a more realistic solution to greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments!</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The California Air Resources Board 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality identifies priority strategies for local Climate Action Plans (CAPs) to incorporate to ensure State's carbon neutrality goals, which includes electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure to meet the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen), increase access to clean mobility options, and support new development near transit.</p> <p>As stated in Table 4.7-6, Consistency Analysis with the City of San Mateo Climate Action Plan, in Chapter 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR, future development under the proposed project would be constructed to include enhanced EV charging and EV infrastructure per the City's Reach Code, which would exceed CALGreen's requirements for residential and nonresidential development. For one- and two-family dwelling or townhomes, the City's Reach Code requirements for EV charging infrastructure includes one Level 2 EV Ready space per dwelling unit and one Level 1 EV Ready space if second space is provided. For multi-family buildings, 15 percent of parking spaces are required to be equipped with Level 2 EV Charging Stations and the remaining 85 percent are required to be Level 2 EV Ready. For office buildings, 20</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>percent of parking spaces are required to be equipped with Level 2 EV Charging Stations and 30 percent Level 2 EV Capable.</p> <p>Additionally, San Mateo has a Citywide Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, which includes SMMC Section 27.09.060, Transportation Demand Management, to require all projects with a net increase of 100 PM peak hours trips to include a trip reduction and parking management plan. Implementation of these required TDM strategies will help manage the reduction in parking requirements and reduce citywide transportation related GHG emissions.</p>
PUB6	9/12/2023	Laurie Watanuki
PUB6-1	<p>4.1 AESTHETICS</p> <p>1. San Mateo deserves the best Objective Design Standards since there are many distinct neighborhood zones. Each neighborhood has its own visual and physical character and deserves respect. (Action CD 7.6: Objective Design Standards)</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB6-2	<p>2. Commercial development adjacent to residential. New infill building designs need to respect existing community character, using established building designs found in San Mateo. Encourage new developments to be compatible and harmonious with building types and architectural styles prevalent in San Mateo especially with the surrounding residential neighborhoods and Downtown Historic District. (Action CD 8.7)</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB6-3	<p>3. Project Design Review for proposed projects in the Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods by a qualified historic preservation architect/consultant. Aesthetics of new illuminated contemporary glass buildings will have an impact</p>	<p>The comment is noted. CEQA requires project-level environmental review to evaluate and mitigate the impact of future projects on aesthetics or historical resources. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	on existing older neighborhoods and the Historic Downtown.	
PUB6-4	4. Street lighting standards - More green street lamps are needed at dark residential intersections and longer residential blocks. This impacts safety for pedestrians and bicyclists in Equity Priority and underserved neighborhood areas in the Central Neighborhood and North Central Neighborhood.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB6-5	5. Title 25 Signs - protect the character of older residential neighborhoods, and prohibit neon commercial signs on new tall buildings facing towards surrounding residential neighborhoods at night. Housing is at the upper levels in new buildings. Prohibit older lighted outdoor billboards advertising alcohol in Equity Priority Neighborhoods along 101 which generate blight. (Policy CD 6.5: US 101 Frontage, Policy CD 6.6: Signage, Policy CD 6.10 Nighttime Lighting)	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB6-6	6. Neighborhood Beautification - Encourage drought tolerant green landscaping in residential neighborhoods and commercial projects and expand the tree canopies in front yards and plant more street trees through street tree plan. Especially in Equity Priority Neighborhoods.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB6-7	4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES 1. Neighborhood preservation and protections are needed. We need updated surveys in Central, North Central Neighborhoods, and other older neighborhoods as possible Historic Districts. We need protection of pre-war homes and small duplexes for middle and low-income families in Equity Priority Neighborhoods.	The comment is noted. Proposed General Plan Policy CD 5.2, <i>Historic Preservation</i> , encourages the identification and preservation of historic resources. Proposed Policy CD 5.10, <i>Historic Resources Survey</i> , would require the City to establish and maintain an inventory of architecturally, culturally, historically significant resources by seeking funding opportunities to update the historic survey. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB6-8	<p>2. Avoid demolition of homes in older neighborhoods. Preserve the visible exteriors from the street of existing Craftsmen, Spanish and Tudor Revival, and Victorian homes in older neighborhoods. Follow the existing patterns in the neighborhoods. The home need to be compatible with the existing neighborhood.</p> <p>Historic Resources - Page 189</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB6-9	<p>3. New infill building designs need to respect existing community character, using established building designs found in San Mateo. Encourage new developments to be compatible and harmonious with building types and architectural styles prevalent in San Mateo. Policy LU 4.2 - Quality of Downtown Development.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB6-10	<p>4. There will be a new Historic District called the Yoshiko Yamanouchi House at 1007 East 5th Avenue. There are 9 resources on the property which include: 3 buildings, 3 sites, and 3 structures. Documentation will be provided for the Draft EIR, for protection from adverse environmental impacts.</p>	<p>The comment refers to a new Yoshiko Yamanouchi House historical district, and states that documentation will be provided for the EIR; however, no documentation is provided in this letter. Please see Response ORG1-2 regarding the added discussion of the status of the requests to list the Baywood District and Yoshiko Yamanouchi House in the National Register with the California OHP to the Draft EIR.</p>
PUB6-11	<p>5. Demolition permits should be issued at the same time as building permits, and not before.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB6-12	<p>4.11 NOISE - The impact of the build-out results in the unacceptable cumulative traffic noise within the EIR study areas. No mitigation measures are available according to the EIR.</p>	<p>As stated in Chapter 4.11, <i>Noise</i>, on page 4.11-51, of the Draft EIR, the analysis of project traffic noise is a cumulative analysis in that the transportation modeling also includes the citywide and regional changes in housing units and employment that would occur through the buildout horizon of 2040. The proposed project would result in a significant traffic noise impact to the segment of 1st Avenue between Ellsworth Avenue and B Street; therefore, the proposed project would</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>result in a cumulatively considerable and significant noise impact associated with cumulative traffic noise, as is fully disclosed in the Draft and Final EIR.</p> <p>It is noted that all future projects subject to discretionary review under the proposed project would be required to be evaluated for noise/land use compatibility, including traffic noise/land use compatibility. Proposed General Plan Policy N 1.1, <i>Noise and Land Use Planning</i>, would require the integration of noise considerations into land use planning decisions to minimize new traffic noise impacts to or from new development. Proposed Policy N 1.2, <i>Interior Noise Level Standard</i>, would require the submittal of an acoustical analysis and interior noise insulation for all “noise sensitive” land uses that are determined to likely have an exterior noise level of 60 dBA Ldn or above, as shown on Figure N-2 of the General Plan (Figure 4.11-5, <i>Future Traffic Noise Contours</i>, in Chapter 4.11 of the Draft EIR). Similarly, proposed Policy N 1.3, <i>Exterior Noise Level Standard for Residential Uses</i>, would require the submittal of an acoustical analysis for all new multifamily common open space that have an exterior noise level of 60 dBA Ldn or above, as shown on Figure N-2 of the General Plan (Figure 4.11-5 in Chapter 4.11 of the Draft EIR).</p> <p>The acoustical analyses at the project level would include refined evaluation of noise/land use compatibility in order to more precisely identify the existing ambient noise environment affecting the subject site, typically achieved through baseline noise measurements with a sound level meter and/or calculating traffic noise from surrounding roadway facilities with regulatory traffic noise models. The location-specific baseline noise measurements and/or traffic noise calculations presented in the acoustical analyses either</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>demonstrate the noise/land use compatibility between a proposed land use and location or assist with the characterization of the ambient noise environment in a manner that allows for implementation of the appropriate noise attenuation measures necessary to protect the new noise-sensitive land use. Beyond these protective policy provisions, lead agencies have limited remedies at their disposal to effectively reduce traffic-related noise. Addressing traffic noise at the receiver rather than the source usually takes the form of noise barriers (i.e., sound walls). While constructing noise barriers along streets would reduce noise, the placement of sound walls between existing residences/businesses and local roadways would not be desirable as it would conflict with the community’s aesthetic, design, and character, and is therefore deemed infeasible. Furthermore, such barriers would likely require property owner approval, which cannot be ensured. While measures such as encouraging ridesharing, carpooling, and alternative modes of transportation could reduce vehicle volumes, and are promoted by the City and by the proposed project, such measures cannot be relied upon to demonstrate a reduction in vehicle trips to the extent needed to ensure reduced vehicle noise levels below established thresholds. Therefore, with the proposed policies, the impact to noise has been reduced to the extent feasible and no further mitigation measures exist to reduce this impact to less-than-significant at the programmatic level.</p>
PUB6-13	<p>1. Existing noise contours - the areas along S Amphet/Idaho are in the 65-70 dab range. Since higher sound walls haven’t been constructed along Highway 101, can the City plant more trees along the sound wall between Poplar and 3rd Avenue and 5th Avenue and Folkstone. North Central, Central, and Sunnybrae would benefit. Italian Cypress trees</p>	<p>Vegetative screening, which can sometimes provide some small degree of noise reduction, is not typically considered as an adequate noise-reduction measure. Several reasons contribute to this, including the limited noise reduction capability of trees. While trees primarily act as a visual barrier, and they are not dense enough to effectively block or absorb</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>will grow to 30 feet and will require little maintenance. Ryland Bay in Bay Meadows has trees planted along the sound wall. Page 403.</p>	<p>sound waves. Noise reduction with trees is typically limited to high-frequency sounds, such as those generated by birds, rather than the low-frequency, high-intensity sounds from sources like industrial equipment or traffic. Vegetative screening as a noise reduction mechanism is also limited by seasonal variability such as shedding leaves in the fall and regrowing them in the spring. When deciduous trees are bare during the winter, their noise-reducing capabilities are significantly reduced, and they offer less protection from noise. Additionally, trees take years to mature and grow to a size where they can provide any form of noise reduction, and can suffer mortality.</p>
<p>PUB6-14</p>	<p>2. Temporary construction noise - stagger the projects so the noise, GHG, truck impacts, vibration impacts are not so severe. There will be 17 new projects in Area 4. Five projects have been completed in the Downtown. Can you take the trucks out through state highways through El Camino Real, 92, to 101 to reduce the dust and toxic pollution. There can be up to 90 trucks a day from Windy Hill's Block 21 project. We need to reduce construction impacts in Equity Priority Neighborhoods. Page 408</p>	<p>As a program-level EIR, this EIR cannot predict the sequence of future projects within the EIR Study Area. Development will be permitted throughout the EIR Study Area subject to local review procedures and in compliance with applicable regulations and requirements. For discretionary approvals, applicable CEQA review will involve an evaluation of cumulative impacts, including construction-phase effects such as those noted by the commenter. Regarding construction noise, the City of San Mateo has established and enforces noise standards for construction activity for both daytime and nighttime hours. For instance, SMMC Section 7.30.060 exempts construction noise from noise standards so long as construction activities are restricted to weekdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., on Saturdays between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., and on Sundays and holidays between the hours of noon and 4:00 p.m.; and requires that the construction noise level at any point outside of the construction site does not exceed 90 dBA. It is common for cities to regulate construction noise in this manner because construction noise is temporary, short term, and intermittent in nature, and ceases upon completion of construction.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB6-15	3. Place more receptacles and monitors for noise, construction vibrations and water down dust impacts between 3rd, 4th and 5th Avenues in Central and North Central Neighborhoods to monitor adverse environmental impacts with multiple new construction projects. Noise monitors are lacking on the map on page 394.	<p>Further, the proposed General Plan Noise Element would regulate the construction noise of larger development projects that demand intensive construction periods by requiring construction noise monitoring and reporting of noise levels throughout construction. A monitoring plan would be required to be prepared to include information on the monitoring locations, durations and regularity, the instrumentation to be used, and appropriate noise control measures to ensure compliance with the noise ordinance. Therefore, while the potential exists for construction projects under the proposed project and other foreseeable development to occur simultaneously and in proximity to one another, construction equipment operations would operate within the constraints of the SMMC and proposed General Plan Noise Element.</p> <p>Please see Response PUB6-14. Proposed General Plan Policy N 2.7, <i>Construction Noise and Vibration Monitoring</i>, would require construction noise limits and vibration monitoring around certain sensitive receptors. For larger development projects that demand intensive construction periods and/or use equipment that could create vibration impacts, proposed Policy N 2.7 would require a vibration impact analysis, as well as monitoring and reporting of noise/vibration levels throughout construction, consistent with industry standards.</p> <p>As discussed in Chapter 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i>, of the Draft EIR, future development under the proposed project would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure AQ-2 which requires implementation of Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) best management practices for construction-related fugitive dust emissions. Dust-control measures include soil binders, chemical dust suppressants,</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB6-16	4. Reduce the heights to 3 stories in land-use map especially 4th & 5th Avenues and west side of S Delaware in the Central Neighborhood - (Residential Low II). By reducing heights in (Mixed Use High I and Mixed Use High II) in the Downtown, this will reduce the cut-through traffic volumes and the noise impacts in the Central and North Central Neighborhoods.	covering stockpiles, permanent vegetation, mulching, watering, temporary gravel construction, synthetic covers, and minimization of disturbed area. The comment is noted. As concluded in Chapter 4.11, <i>Noise</i> , and Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i> , of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant noise and traffic impacts with the exception of a significant and unavoidable traffic noise impact to the segment of 1st Avenue between Ellsworth Avenue and B Street for which there are no additional feasible mitigation measures. The comment addresses General Plan policy and includes opinion, but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB6-17	4.15 TRANSPORTATION 1. What does the reconstruction of the 3rd/4th Avenue Interchange consist of? When will this occur? We need better lighting for the pedestrians and bicyclists on the overpass at night. Page 486	The 3rd Avenue interchange location has been identified as a location that needs bicycle and pedestrian improvement as a part of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. A further study will be conducted by Caltrans and/or the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) to identify the physical improvements. The timeline for project construction will be established after the completion and approval of the physical improvements.
PUB6-18	2. Bicycle network - Bicycle boulevards include traffic calming and low traffic volumes such as 5th Avenue from S Delaware to S Amphlett. Keep 5th Avenue as a local street versus an Arterial. This is a conflict in the General Plan and needs to be addressed in the General Plan EIR. Page 494, Page 491 Proposed Street Classification Fig 4.15-1.	Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.
PUB6-19	3. 42% of GHG emissions in San Mateo originate from vehicular trips generated by San Mateo residents and businesses. Why does San Mateo generate such a high percentage of GHG emissions? We need solutions to	As identified in Table 4.7-5, <i>City of San Mateo GHG Emissions Forecast</i> , in Chapter 4.7, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> , of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would be consistent with the current long-term legislative GHG reduction targets under Senate Bill 32 and Assembly Bill 1279, which is attributable to

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	increase deficiencies in transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes. Page 495	statewide emission reduction strategies such as the California Air Resources Board's Advanced Clean Cars II and Advanced Clean Fleets Regulations. These statewide emission reduction strategies would reduce smog-forming emissions, promote zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, and start the initiative toward the increase in sales of zero-emission trucks. Also noted in Chapter 4.7, page 4.7-26, of the Draft EIR, the proposed project contains various policies to minimize mobile-source emissions, including proposed General Plan Policy C 1.4, <i>Prioritize Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Needs</i> , Policy C 1.6, <i>Transit-Oriented Development</i> , and Policy C 2.1, <i>TDM Requirements</i> . The proposed project would encourage new development in designated Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) throughout the EIR Study Area, which would promote the use of public transportation. In addition, the City's proposed CAP update also provides mandates for future development to encourage mobile emission reductions. Clean Transportation Fuels (CF) 2 through CF 4 of the proposed CAP promotes clean transportation fuels and EV charging stations within the community and Sustainable Transportation Fuels (ST) 1 through ST 7 encourages safe, reliable alternative transportation options. The proposed General Plan policies and proposed CAP update would serve to further support potential GHG reductions for future development under the proposed project. Furthermore, implementation of State measures and strategies to reduce Statewide GHG emissions, such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard mandate or Renewables Portfolio Standard requirements, would also aid in reducing future mobile emissions.
PUB6-20	4. The proposed project increases the use of roadway facilities in the EIR study study. <i>[sic]</i> This increases cut-through traffic volumes, GHG emissions, VMT and noise	The Circulation Element promotes various types of TDM measures and active transportation infrastructure that are expected to help reduce trips and, therefore, GHGs in the

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	levels. Why are the current TDM strategies not working well?	future. Also, VMT was analyzed for the project and was determined to be less than significant. However, VMT for individual projects will be analyzed per CEQA requirements to determine individual project impacts. This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required.
PUB6-21	5. Policy C 6.5 states to implement neighborhood traffic calming on residential streets to reduce cut-through traffic volumes to address noise impacts. We need to implement traffic calming on 5th and 9th Avenues from S Delaware to S Amhlett. Do not reclassify these streets to Arterials. Equity Priority Neighborhoods need more traffic calming. Page 500	Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.
PUB6-22	6. Policy C 6.6 - Do not put a truck route on 5th Avenue from S Delaware to S Amphlett on 5th Avenue a proposed bike boulevard. Do not put a truck route on S Humboldt from 4th to 9th Avenue. We need to make the streets safer for the bicyclists on 5th and S Humboldt, to and from the 3rd/4th Avenue overpass.	This comment includes opinion but does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Modifications to the City's current truck route policy and map will require further study and are not included specifically in the General Plan. Information about the City's current truck policy and route map can be found online at: https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/2124/Truck-Route-Program .
PUB6-23	7. Reduce VMT, GHG emissions, traffic volumes, diesel particulates, and noise on 5th and 9th Avenue with traffic circles and keep the 4-way stop signs. San Mateo Glendale Village has traffic circles and 4-way stop signs. Nelson Nygaard suggested long narrow traffic circles on 9th Avenue in the 2006 Central Neighborhood Long Term Strategy report, along with the TAP studies. Page 501 Equity Priority Neighborhoods	The Draft EIR analyses for VMT, GHG emissions, and traffic conclude that impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant. Air quality impacts relating to diesel particulates were found to be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2 and AQ-3. While the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable traffic noise impact to the segment of roadway on 1st Avenue west of B Street, noise impacts on 5th and 9th Avenues were found to be less than significant. Regarding roadway classifications, please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.
PUB6-24	8. Action - C 3.9 - Currently the Downtown Mall is on B Street from 2nd to 3rd Avenues. Please extend this	This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Pedestrian Mall from 3rd Avenue to 5th Avenue to reduce the traffic volumes. Page 502	
PUB6-25	Other Transportation questions in the Draft EIR: 9. Increase Traffic Demand Measures (TDM) measures to reduce vehicle cut-through traffic through residential streets at 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 9th Avenues and reduce traffic noise.	This comment includes opinion but does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required. The Draft EIR acknowledges that TDM mitigation programs will be adopted where feasible for individual projects based on the City’s Transportation Impact Analysis guidelines.
PUB6-26	10. Reduce the heights to 3 stories in land-use map especially 4th & 5th Avenues and west side of S Delaware in the Central Neighborhood - (Residential Low II). By reducing heights in (Mixed Use High I and Mixed Use High II) in the Downtown, this will reduce the cut-through traffic volumes through these streets.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required.
PUB6-27	11. What are the ADT volumes on Peninsula and Poplar Avenues from Delaware to S Humboldt? Are they included in the Draft EIR? It is difficult to locate current ADT traffic volumes information on streets in the Draft EIR. Traffic volumes needs to be listed in the Table of Contents.	Average daily traffic (ADT) volumes are provided in Appendix D, <i>Noise Data</i> , of the Draft EIR, specifically in Appendix D2: Traffic Noise Calculations. As shown in Appendix D2 of the Draft EIR, the existing ADT on Peninsula Avenue between Humboldt Street and Delaware Street is 15,928, and projected to be 17,910 with the General Plan; and existing ADT on Poplar Avenue between Humboldt Street and Delaware Street is 7,823 and projected to be 8,003 with the General Plan.
PUB6-28	12. What is the percentage of Burlingame traffic that use the Poplar Exit in San Mateo?	The traffic model does not readily provide this type of traffic information; and any such information or modeling would be speculative. This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required.
PUB6-29	13. What is the percentage of traffic from the Poplar Exit will redirect to 3rd, 4th, and 5th Avenues if the Peninsula Interchange is built? Has that traffic volume been included in the ADT numbers for 3rd, 4th, 5th Avenues and S Humboldt in the Draft EIR for 2040?	The traffic model does not readily output this information. The cumulative analysis included in the Draft EIR does include the new proposed interchange at Peninsula Avenue and has accounted for shifts in ADT traffic to Peninsula Avenue and to 3rd/4th Street interchanges. It should be noted that while this project is currently on hold, the project-level analysis would

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB6-30	14. We need a separate study for the 6 grade separations. Why do we need these many separations between 1st Avenue and 9th Avenues, if new developments are suppose to use Caltrain? Why doesn't Peninsula Avenue have a grade separation? Grade separations are designed to move more vehicular traffic and grade separations will increase VMT and diesel particulates in the Equity Priority Neighborhoods. What other mitigations do you propose to reduce these additional adverse environmental impacts?	<p>be completed if this project moves forward to identify and address potential operational deficiencies at intersections where traffic has been redirected as a result of the project. This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required.</p> <p>The City is conducting separate grade separation studies independent of the General Plan. More information about the project could be found here: https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/2279/Train-Horn-Noise. This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required.</p>
PUB6-31	15. Central has been an underserved neighborhood and the Equity Priority boundaries should be extended to 9th Avenue (both sides) and include streets from Delaware to S Amphlett. This Draft EIR for 2040 is proposing 5 arterials in the Central Neighborhood with no residential protections. We do not want any parking removed on 5th Avenue or adding more traffic lanes. We need to reduce the traffic noise and volume, decrease the VMT, and the diesel particulates. In 2006, the TAP studies gave us 2250 to 3390 cars on 5th and now this will increase to 10,210 ADT with existing and new projects. Do not reclassify 5th and 9th Avenues, but keep the current street classifications for these 2 streets.	<p>Equity Priority Communities are those that are disproportionately burdened by environmental pollution and negative socioeconomic outcomes. The proposed General Plan 2040 identifies Equity Priority Communities based on both local knowledge and CalEnviroScreen 4.0, a tool that measures pollution and population characteristics using 21 indicators, such as air quality, hazardous waste sites, asthma rates, and poverty. The cumulative CalEnviroScreen percentile score for the Census tract referenced in this comment is 48, meaning that 52 percent of California Census tracts have greater pollution and socioeconomic burdens. The Central neighborhood does not currently meet the criteria that General Plan 2040 uses to identify Equity Priority Neighborhoods.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.</p>
PUB6-32	16. What is causing traffic to decrease on 3rd and 4th Avenues between S	<p>The traffic information is listed by segment and not time period. Traffic increase and decrease by segment depends on</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>Humboldt and Delaware and increase on 5th Avenue a local street east of S Delaware in these projections? Traffic has increased on S Delaware between 5th and 9th Avenues since 2015, and construction workers are now parking on S Delaware between 7th and 9th Avenues, and 7th Avenue between Delaware and Eldorado.</p> <p>Developers need a parking plan for their construction workers, or park on the vacant lot at Block 21. Page 993</p>	<p>the proximity to major land use and roadway intersections. Please also see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required.</p>
PUB6-33	<p>17. Neighborhood Traffic Management Program is a living document and needs to be updated to better address cut-through traffic volumes. It needs more flexibility to address the traffic impacts on local, collector and arterials in residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>As described in Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications, two related actions have been added to the proposed General Plan 2040 following the publication of the Draft EIR. Proposed Action C 6.9 has been added to explore whether traffic calming should be provided on neighborhood streets designated as minor arterials and collectors, and proposed Action C 6.13 has been added based on the City's intention for its Complete Streets Plan to be used for roadway classifications within the city. Please see Master Response 2 for additional information related to roadway classifications and volumes.</p>
PUB7	9/12/2023	Michael Weinbauer
PUB7-1	<p>Commissioners - I'm writing to comment on the draft General Plan 2040 EIR, specifically sections 4-2 Air Quality, 4-3 Biological Resources, 4-5 Energy, 4-10 Land Use and Planning, and 4-13 Population and Housing.</p>	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB7-2 through PUB7-27.</p>
PUB7-2	<p>Overall, this EIR and the proposed General Plan make a lot of assumptions that people will not drive, and that transportation will be readily available - these are not reasonable current or foreseeable future realities. This EIR and the GP plan for unlikely and extreme levels of growth - 40%! - that will materially worsen air quality, traffic, and other key areas as indicated by "significant and unavoidable" determinations. Why are we planning for such absurd</p>	<p>The buildout projections included and analyzed in the Draft EIR represent an estimate of the level of growth that may occur in the EIR Study Area by 2040. Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i>, page 3-19, of the Draft EIR states: "The projections represent the City's estimation of 'reasonably foreseeable' development that could occur over the next 20 years under the General Plan and are used as the basis for the EIR's environmental assessment." Buildout of the proposed</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>growth levels?</p> <p>This EIR and the proposed General Plan focus a lot on per capita statistics. We cannot lose sight of the absolute numbers here, however. Growth/worsening/increases in population</p>	<p>project does not commit the City to constructing new development. Potential future developments under the proposed project would be subject to federal, State, and local regulations, including the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions, should the proposed project be approved and implemented.</p>
<p>PUB7-3</p>	<p>This EIR and the proposed General Plan claim throughout to require balancing jobs and office. Given the massive current imbalance, the focus should be almost entirely on housing. And not luxury, rental-only housing - affordable housing. And existing housing stock should be preserved as it is generally more affordable, and gets replaced (gentrified) by unaffordable housing, of which there is no shortage in San Mateo.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
<p>PUB7-4</p>	<p>Furthermore, this report uses a lot of non-committal language - "suggest", "promote", "support", "encourage". These are meaningless without concrete legislation, quantifiable targets that someone is accountable for, and funding to ensure aspirational plans are actually put in place, and impacts are truly understood and mitigated. We've seen way too many examples of pie-in-the-sky desires that never materialize because of language like this. You get your project, developers get rich - what do our neighborhoods get? Blight, noise, pollution, traffic, crime, displacement...the list goes on and on.</p>	<p>This comment asserts that certain language used in the Draft EIR is non-committal and hence meaningless. The language referred to is used due to the Draft EIR quoting specific goals, policies, and actions from the proposed General Plan. Both proposed General Plan 2040 and this EIR are based on the assumption that the City has invested time and resources into crafting goals, policies, and actions in the proposed General Plan that will be adopted and implemented, consistent with State law. The General Plan sets policy and hence the policy language provides general guidance and direction. The implementation of a General Plan occurs through standards and requirements within the municipal code and other technical documents. For most topics analyzed in the Draft EIR, the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions are supported and reinforced by other adopted City standards and procedures, as well as by regional, State, and federal regulations and plans.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.3 regarding streamlining for infill projects--which, given the built-out nature of San Mateo, almost all future projects in San Mateo would be--recognizes and encourages the use of "uniformly applicable development policies or standards" and defines these as: "policies or standards adopted or enacted by a city or county, or by a lead agency, that reduce one or more adverse environmental effects. Examples of uniformly applicable development policies or standards include, but are not limited to: (A) Regulations governing construction activities, including noise regulations, dust control, provisions for discovery of archeological and paleontological resources, stormwater runoff treatment and containment, protection against the release of hazardous materials, recycling of construction and demolition waste, temporary street closure and traffic rerouting, and similar regulations. (B) Requirements in locally adopted building, grading and stormwater codes. (C) Design guidelines. (D) Requirements for protecting residents from sources of air pollution including high volume roadways and stationary sources. (E) Impact fee programs to provide public improvements, police, fire, parks and other open space, libraries and other public services and infrastructure, including transit, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and traffic calming devices. (F) Traffic impact fees. (G) Requirements for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, as set forth in adopted land use plans, policies, or regulations. (H) Ordinances addressing protection of urban trees and historic resources." The City of San Mateo has adopted uniformly applicable development policies and standards in each of these categories to further support and enforce the policies and actions of the General Plan as individual development projects are proposed and considered.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB7-5	<p>Calls for "decarbonizing housing stock" are rife in this document. We have very serious doubts about rushing the timelines for electrification, given PG&E's inability to support existing demand, as well as significant costs to property owners for conversion if forced. This should be more of a carrot (incentive-based) than stick approach.</p>	<p>As noted in Table 4.7-3, <i>Priority Strategies for Local Government Climate Action Plans</i>, in Chapter 4.7, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>, of the Draft EIR, the California Air Resources Board recommends priority strategies for incentive programs to implement energy efficiency retrofits (e.g., weatherization and replacing energy-intensive appliances with more efficient systems) and to electrify all appliances and equipment in existing buildings. The increase in electricity demand for the EIR Study Area is approximately 0.1 percent of PG&E's projected energy supply in 2035, therefore there will be sufficient electrical supply and existing infrastructure to serve the future increase in population within PG&E's service areas. Potential future development would be required to comply with current and future updates to the California Energy Code and CALGreen, which would contribute to reducing overall energy demand. In addition, the City encourages the installation of local renewable resources, such as rooftop solar energy systems, which will reduce the cost of electricity for the community and enhance the local economy. By expanding on-site electricity generation and storage, San Mateo will help minimize the impact of grid failures and power disruptions.</p>
PUB7-6	<p>Central will be heavily impacted by the proposed general plan, with distorted zoning categories that effectively eliminate instead of protect our neighborhoods (eg Residential Low I is 1-3 stories and 9 units/acre) - there needs to be a Residential Low 1a - 1-2 stories max category).</p> <p>Roughly 1/3 of Central is considered an environmental justice/overburdened/equity priority community (Railroad to 101, 4th-5th), 100% is within 4 blocks. Central has a high percentage of rentals, a high concentration of construction projects, lower income residents, higher traffic volumes and</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment expresses concerns regarding the potential impacts of the proposed project and associated policies related to heights and densities, but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>accident rates, and is in the 70-80th percentile for air quality. As such, our neighborhood should be considered for any and all mitigation policies and actions tied to those communities listed in this EIR.</p>	
<p>PUB7-7</p>	<p>Specifically with regard to 4-2 Air Quality: Placement of AQ receptors and ongoing monitoring and remediation (page 25) - it is important these are funded, implemented, monitored and enforced. Language needs to be stronger, quantifiable, and should have funding and accountability defined.</p>	<p>BAAQMD’s Planning Health Places provides a list of recommendations for lead agencies to use for projects that introduce new sensitive receptors within certain screening distances. These best practices include tactical practices and technologies that reduce local traffic emissions, increase site buffering between receptors and emission sources, or alter the design of proposed projects to remove receptors from locations expected to experience the highest pollutant concentrations.</p> <p>Furthermore, Mitigation Measure AQ-3, as outlined in Chapter 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i>, on page 4.2-61, of the Draft EIR, would require future projects that could potentially exceed BAAQMD's adopted operation threshold of significance to incorporate mitigation measures to reduce long-term air pollutant emissions during operational activities. These identified measures shall be included as part of the conditions of approval or the MMRP adopted for the project as part of the project CEQA review (see Appendix H, <i>Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program</i>, of this Final EIR).</p> <p>Lastly, proposed General Plan Policy COS 4.4, <i>Activity Near Sensitive Receptors</i>, and Policy COS 4-8, <i>Truck Facilities</i>, would aid in reducing the exposure of sensitive receptors specifically in Equity Priority Communities and Overburdened Communities to Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) and particulate matter (PM2.5). These proposed policies aim to limit truck idling within the EIR Study Area and overall support the BAAQMD rules to reduce emissions from mobile sources. The</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB7-8	<p>Central's Air Quality 70-80th percentile (page 27) High (50th percentile) incidence of asthma (page 28) High concentration of "permitted stationary sources" of pollutants (ie gas stations, diesel generators, body shops, dry cleaners, manufacturing/light industrial/car repair)</p>	<p>proposed policies also require collaboration efforts with BAAQMD and the City to reevaluate permit processes, outline objectives and strategies for monitoring air pollution, and monitor key health indicators to measure the success of the outcome of the proposed General Plan policies and implementation actions.</p>
PUB7-9	<p>Page 39 - mentions the expected buildout under the proposed project would exceed the Plan Bay Area 2040 regional growth projections for housing by 32 percent and population by 25 percent. Why aren't we scaling this back given population decreases in CA and the Bay Area, coupled with the significant impacts on our neighborhoods?</p>	<p>As discussed in Chapter 4.13, <i>Population and Housing</i>, on page 4.13-9, of the Draft EIR, the regional projections used to compare growth at the city level were from Plan Bay Area 2040 and not the updated Plan Bay Area 2050, which does not provide growth projections at the city level to enable comparison to local plans. However, housing and job growth as a result of implementation of the proposed General Plan 2040 would be within Plan Bay Area 2050 projections of a 48 percent increase of housing units and 29 percent increase of jobs at the county level. Please also see Response PUB7-2 regarding planned growth. As stated on page 4.13-9 of the Draft EIR, approximately 33 percent of projected residential growth would come from the City's 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of 7,015 units, which is housing capacity required by the California Housing Law and not by the City.</p>
PUB7-10	<p>Page 43 - calls for human scale design, active use facilities, GD-6: develop and maintain an active urban fabric that reflects San Mateo's unique visual and architectural character.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The City Council, on November 20, 2023 adopted Objective Design Standards for new residential and mixed use projects in the city. The comment does not</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>We need high quality, community-accepted, objective design standards and other mechanisms to ensure this happens beyond lip service.</p>	<p>address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
<p>PUB7-11</p>	<p>Page 46 CD-3 - Protect heritage trees, street trees, street tree equity. We specifically asked that some trees from Block 21 be protected. Some had to be over 25 years old, and were healthy. Instead, they were all cut down, and now we have a dozen+ tree stumps and a dirt lot. We need to do better.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
<p>PUB7-12</p>	<p>Page 49 - VMT grows from 2.7m to 3.5 in 2040, an increase of nearly 30%! Regardless of VMT per capita, this will still worsen traffic and air quality.</p>	<p>The Draft EIR discloses VMT effects, and the increase in total VMT was accounted for in the transportation and air quality analyses in the Draft EIR in Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i>, and Chapter 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i>, respectively. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required.</p>
<p>PUB7-13</p>	<p>The proposed General Plan results in ~50% growth in air pollutants, ESP COMPARED TO NO PROJECT where they decrease (below). While we realize no project isn't viable, there is a more moderate growth path that maintains or even improves AQ.</p> <p>AQ-3-6 are all "significant and unavoidable" impacts. Any way you slice this, air quality gets worse!</p>	<p>The comment states that implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in approximately 50 percent growth in criteria air pollutants. As shown in Table 4.2-10, <i>Proposed Project Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Forecast (Scenario 1, Comparison to Existing Conditions)</i>, and Table 4.2-11, <i>Net Change in Regional Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Forecast (Scenario 2, Comparison to Future No Project Conditions)</i>, in Chapter 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i>, of the Draft EIR, criteria air pollutants would increase for all criteria air pollutants with implementation of the proposed project, but not at a rate of a 50 percent increase. When compared to Scenario 2 (Future No Project Conditions), the proposed project scenario would lead to an increase in volatile organic compounds from consumer products used in residential development and a decrease in nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions despite the growth associated with the proposed project. The comment incorrectly states</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>that impact discussions AQ-3 through AQ-6 in Chapter 4.2 of the Draft EIR concluded with significant and unavoidable impacts. Impact discussion AQ-5 in Chapter 4.2, page 4.2-68, of the Draft EIR concluded a less-than-significant impact regarding odor emissions affecting a substantial number of people. Although the other impact discussions were determined to have a significant and unavoidable impact, Mitigation Measures AQ-2, AQ-3, AQ-4, and implementation of the proposed General Plan policies identified in Chapter 4.2 of the Draft EIR would serve to minimize potential adverse impacts related to short-term and long-term regional criteria air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible compared to a No Project scenario.</p>
<p>PUB7-14</p>	<p>Specifically with regard to 4-3 Biological Resources: Again trees are highlighted - preservation, planting, replacement, street tree equity, etc. As per above, we need to do better.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
<p>PUB7-15</p>	<p>Specifically with regard to 4-5 Energy: The EIR claims decreased usage per capita - but absolute usage will increase dramatically - upwards of 40%.</p>	<p>As shown in Table 4.5-3, <i>Year 2040 Forecast Electricity Consumption</i>, in Chapter 4.5, <i>Energy</i>, of the Draft EIR, total electricity usage would increase by 177,799,653 kWh per year, a 33-percent increase from existing conditions. However, service population would also increase by 68,940 people at forecast year 2040. Therefore, with consideration of service population growth, the per service population electricity consumption was estimated to decrease from 3,140 kWh per person per year in 2019 to 2,979 kWh per person per year in 2040 (a reduction of approximately 161 kWh annually).</p>
<p>PUB7-16</p>	<p>Again with "decarbonizing housing stock" - We have very serious doubts about rushing the timelines for electrification, given PG&E's inability to support existing demand, as well as significant costs to property owners for</p>	<p>The comment expresses concern regarding decarbonization but does not express a specific concern regarding the analysis in the Draft EIR. Please see Response PUB 7-5 regarding electricity demand.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB7-17	<p>conversion if forced. This should be more of a carrot (incentive-based) than stick approach.</p> <p>MTA/ABAG/CCAG etc focus on PDA/TPA - We do not have good transit, and it's not getting better. If anything it's getting worse with BART, CalTrain, and SamTrans ridership woes. Without T - ToD is just "D". Build the T, then let's talk about ToD, otherwise every assumption here is wrong. TDM - great idea in theory but there are numerous developments using TDM already. Where's the data on this - is it really working before we bet heavily on it?</p>	<p>The transportation analysis accounts for all future transit programs by BART, Caltrain, and SamTrans. Building near existing transit is reflected in the improved mode split for transit and non-motorized modes.</p> <p>The Draft EIR acknowledges that TDM mitigation programs are challenging to measure and monitor at a citywide scale due to multiple influences, externalities, and causality with the limited research and guidance available. However, on a development scale, TDM does result in trip and VMT reduction.</p>
PUB7-18	<p>(Page 26) Goal C-5: Make transit a viable transportation option for the community by supporting frequent, reliable, cost-efficient, and connected service.</p> <p>Policy C 5.1: Increase Transit Ridership. Support SamTrans and Caltrain in their efforts to increase transit ridership.</p> <p>The above is very aspirational. Again w the "supporting" verbiage - need concrete commitments/requirements</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB7-19	<p>Specifically with regard to 4-10 Land Use and Planning: GP 2030 is cited a lot in here - is this a typo? Should be 2040?</p>	<p>References to General Plan 2030 in Chapter 4.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, of the Draft EIR are correct and not a typo. These references pertain to the current General Plan and existing land use designations.</p>
PUB7-20	<p>Measure Y - This paragraph is incomplete, and Y does not allow for off-site development - requires onsite and no in-lieu fees paid. Please fix this so the public is properly and accurately informed.</p>	<p>As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, the information provided on Measure Y in Chapter 4.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, of the Draft EIR has been revised to complete the paragraph.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB7-21	<p>Proposed zoning categories are distorted and effectively eliminate single family zoning. Furthermore, categories don't mention state density bonus and state laws that grant additional stories and floor area BY RIGHT. This is not what San Mateans want. They support growth along with preservation of neighborhoods and historic assets. That is why Measure Y was passed, and has been renewed in essence, for 25 years. It is also important to realize that Measure Y helps affordable housing ACTUALLY GET BUILT, instead of allowing developers to pay significantly cheaper in-lieu fees to avoid it. Finally Measure Y stipulates that any zoning over the limits specified by Measure Y will require approval of the voters, which absent a good General Plan that is acceptable to a majority of voters, is unlikely to happen.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB7-22	<p>Balance (Page 14) - restatement of same goal of balancing housing and office and housing diversity. This EIR and the proposed General Plan claim throughout to require balancing jobs and office. Given the massive current imbalance, the focus should be almost entirely on housing. And not luxury, rental-only housing - affordable housing. And existing housing stock should be preserved as it is generally more affordably, and gets replaced (gentrified) by unaffordable housing, of which there is no shortage in San Mateo.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB7-23	<p>Specifically with regard to 4-13 Population and Housing: Page 39 - As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Population and Housing, of this Draft EIR, the expected buildout under the proposed project would exceed the Plan Bay Area 2040 regional growth projections for housing by 32 percent and population by 25 percent. Why are we building so much given all the negative impacts?</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted. Please see Response PUB7-2 regarding planned growth and Response PUB7-9 regarding regional growth projections.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB7-24	Page 12 - Community benefits - in addition to design standards, quantify and enumerate "community benefit" and get input from community as to what qualifies. "Give to get" from developers.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB7-25	<p>Page 13 - Goal LU-13</p> <p>Goal LU-13: Maintain Development Review and Building Permit processes that are comprehensive and efficient. § Policy LU 13.1: Development Review Process. Review development proposals and building permit applications in an efficient and timely manner while maintaining quality standards in accordance with City codes, policies, and regulations, and in compliance with State requirements.</p> <p>With regard to the above - the planning process should be efficient, but should NOT attempt to short-circuit public input, as this commission has suggest/attempted to do.</p>	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB7-26	This EIR suggests that there wouldn't be displacement. The reality is that development almost always means displacement and gentrification. Existing affordable units being replaced by office and luxury housing doesn't help the affordability crisis or the jobs/housing imbalance.	As concluded in Chapter 4.13, <i>Population and Housing</i> , page 4.13-13, of the Draft EIR, future development under the proposed project is anticipated to result in a net increase in density and utilization of infill or underutilized sites in existing urban areas, primarily in the ten General Plan Land Use Study Areas. Therefore, displacement of people or housing would be temporary as redevelopment occurs. While the proposed project focuses on infill development that may occur as redevelopment, it does not call for any large-scale development that would be considered to result in substantial displacement of existing housing. The scale of temporary removal of housing would be typical for urban development projects. Furthermore, small levels of displacement that may occur would be addressed through compliance with proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB7-27	It's critical we get this right. Thank you for your consideration, and for considering the needs and desires of ALL San Mateans.	The comment serves as a conclusion to the preceding comments. Please see Responses PUB7-1 through PUB7-26.
PUB8	9/18/2023	Lisa Taner
PUB8-1	<p>All,</p> <p>The enormity of detail in the General Plan Update and process is enough to spin heads, and the average resident would need to play a lot of catch up to understand some of the greater points, much less the finer ones. While staff has done a tremendous amount of work, and there has been an endeavor to work with the community, it is a glaring failure to note the limited options of only 'maximum growth' or 'no growth' as presently reflected in the Draft EIR.</p> <p>The residents have been clear in their desire to have moderate growth in their city, and if this failure was known more widely, there would be a clamoring of upset folks knocking on your doors. There is time to rectify this. Please return to the drawing board and ensure that more options are fleshed out to incorporate the wishes of your taxpayers.</p>	Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.
PUB9	9/19/2023	Keith Weber
PUB9-1	<p>Attached please find my letter regarding the San Mateo General Plan Draft EIR. The focus of the letter is the absence of "reasonable" alternatives as required by CEQA.</p> <p>Although Alex is not directly involved in the EIR process, I have copied him on this email because the lack of reasonable alternatives has a "thumb on the scale" effect regarding Measure Y and the clear preference of voters for moderate growth.</p>	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB9-2 through PUB9-5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIR. Keith Weber</p>	
<p>PUB9-2</p>	<p>The Draft EIR (DEIR) for the 2040 Draft General Plan is inadequate and incomplete because it fails to evaluate a “reasonable range” of alternatives as required by CEQA.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.</p>
<p>PUB9-3</p>	<p>During the public outreach phase of the General Plan, the City identified four feasible alternatives: the “No Project” alternative plus three others (Alternatives A, B, and C), each with incrementally greater growth potential and impacts. All four alternatives met or exceeded the housing and economic growth objectives of the General Plan revision. The City Council chose the alternative with the maximum development potential as their preferred alternative (the “project”).</p>	<p>The General Plan Update process included the creation and evaluation of three land use and transportation alternatives, Alternatives A, B, and C. All three alternatives had similar amounts of job growth. Alternative A allowed the least amount of residential growth and the lowest densities and heights. Alternative A was projected not to meet anticipated future RHNA cycles beyond 2031 and to result in fewer residents within close proximity to transit. Alternatives B and C were projected to be likely to meet and exceed, respectively, anticipated future RHNA cycles. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
<p>PUB9-4</p>	<p>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the analysis of a “range of reasonable alternatives to the project which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”</p> <p>The Draft EIR evaluates only two alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Project 2. Reduced Traffic Noise Alternative, which, according to the EIR, “would accommodate the same amount of proposed development as the proposed project.” <p>CEQA considers alternatives to involve changes to the project’s “scope, design, extent,” and “intensity.” But, the</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>DEIR fails to offer alternatives that address these possible changes. Instead, it gives us the same amount of development as the project - an alternative in name only. By disregarding the less impactful alternatives offered to the public and preferred by much of the citizenry, the DEIR provides an all-or-nothing choice between maximum buildout or no project at all. The clear message voters sent to City Hall with the passage of Measure Y is their wish to accommodate moderate growth - to find a compromise between extreme growth and no growth. The DEIR is a tone deaf failure in this regard, presenting the public with only a choice between two extremes.</p> <p>One of the purposes of an EIR is to identify alternatives to a proposed project and evaluate the comparative merits of feasible alternatives. Instead of providing the public with seriously considered alternatives, the DEIR offers a Sophie's choice. CEQA requires more and the public deserves better.</p>	
PUB9-5	<p>In order to satisfy the CEQA requirement that "an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project," the feasible alternatives previously identified publicly as Alternatives A and B, must be evaluated and the Draft EIR recirculated for it to meet the threshold of adequacy demanded by CEQA and expected by the public. The additional alternatives analysis represents significant new information and therefore requires recirculation of the Draft EIR, as explained in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. RECIRCULATION OF AN EIR PRIOR TO CERTIFICATION.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative. A lower growth alternative was considered but rejected because it was infeasible and would not meet project objectives nor reduce the significant effects of the proposed project. Please also see Response ORG1-18 regarding recirculation.</p>
PUB10	9/22/2023	Lisa Maley
PUB10-1	<p>Dear Manira, Please find my comments on the DEIR below.</p>	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB10-2 through PUB10-5.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>Thank you. Lisa</p>	
<p>PUB10-2</p>	<p>Response to Draft EIR The Noise Element in the DEIR does not address the harmful effects of low frequency noise or discuss the mitigation of such. Besides traffic as a source, HVAC heatpump units are a common source of low frequency noise pollution. San Mateo’s Climate Acton Plan (CAP) requires the installation of electric appliances or the conversion of gas appliances to electric appliances. Many heat pumps will be located inside and outside of residences and will not only affect inhabitants but neighboring properties.</p>	<p>Stationary sources of noise, including HVACs and other mechanical equipment, are addressed in Chapter 4.11, <i>Noise</i>, pages 4.11-35 and 4.11-36, of the Draft EIR. As described, SMMC Chapter 7.30 establishes regulations to protect the inhabitants of the city against all forms of nuisances, including stationary sources noise such as HVAC equipment and heat pump units. Stationary sources of noise that are identified as exceeding the noise standards established by SMMC Chapter 7.30 are required to implement noise-reduction measures in order to reduce their noise to acceptable levels.</p>
<p>PUB10-3</p>	<p>The potential noise problem from the humming of multiples air source heat pumps has prompted an official UK government review (2023) by the Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs. Low Frequency Noise is recognized by the WHO as an environmental problem and states the following in their publication on Community Noise: "It should be noted that low frequency noise, for example, from ventilation systems can disturb rest and sleep even at low sound levels" "For noise with a large proportion of low frequency sounds a still lower guideline (than 30dBA) is recommended" "When prominent low frequency components are present, noise measures based on A-weighting are inappropriate" "Since A-weighting underestimates the sound pressure level of noise with low frequency components, a better assessment of health effects would be to use C-weighting" "It should be noted that a large proportion of low frequency components in a noise may increase considerably the adverse effects on health"</p>	<p>Please see Response PUB10-2 regarding the analysis related to noise sources and compliance with the City’s noise standards.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB10-4	<p>"The evidence on low frequency noise is sufficiently strong to warrant immediate concern" Europe, ahead of us in terms of heat pump use, is dealing with the noise complaints associated with them: German Environment Agency guideline information March 2017 Complaints about low-frequency humming noises have become more frequent in recent years – especially in residential areas. The quiet, constant hum of air source heat pumps, air-conditioning systems or district heating stations in otherwise quiet neighbourhoods is often considered disturbing, even if the noise levels comply with statutory limit values. A guide by the German Environment Agency (UBA) advises all the parties of construction projects to consider the noise emissions of such large facilities in the early planning phase of a project. Once systems which hum are in operation, there are virtually no technical means to eliminating low-frequency noise.</p> <p>The EIR states that the San Mateo Noise Ordinance will protect people from health impacts however this ordinance is nearly 20 years old and does not even address interior noise in single family homes generated outside the property. It falls short in many other areas especially when compared to other newly adopted ordinances of surrounding Cities and the latest medical studies. The ordinance specifically states the regulations apply to a “reasonable person of normal sensitivities” which excludes those with misophonia or hyperacusis, both considered a disability by the ADA. The potential liability of this bias should be reason enough for San Mateo to update their noise ordinance.</p> <p>The current ordinance does not account for low frequency/tonal noise or the cumulative impacts from</p>	<p>The comment is noted. Additionally, it is noted that proposed General Plan Policy N 1.2, <i>Interior Noise Level Standard</i>, states that the maximum interior noise level within any sensitive receptor shall not be exposed to 45 dBA (Ldn) by new development in any habitable rooms, as established by the California Building Code.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>multiple heat pumps. If the EIR contemplates the noise ordinance as a mitigation measure to protect the health of the community it should consider that the current noise ordinance needs to be updated to address the impacts of the 2040 General Plan.</p>	
<p>PUB10-5</p>	<p>The EIR states that the “noise in the community has often been cited as a health problem, not in terms of physiological damage” however several studies have shown that community noise is associated with cardiovascular problems. The Internal Journal of Preventive Medicine 2022 article (Foroughharmajda, Asadya, Pereirab, Fuentec), Is enough Attention Paid to the health effects of low-frequency noise in today’s society? It is cited that exposure to lower frequency airborne pressure wave can cause cellular and tissue damage along with widespread vascular involvement.</p>	<p>The comment references a section of Chapter 4.11, <i>Noise</i>, of the Draft EIR that discusses community noise. As stated in Chapter 4.11, pages 4.11-1 and 4.11-2, of the Draft EIR, community noise varies continuously over a period of time with respect to the contributing sound sources of the community noise environment. Community noise is primarily the product of many distant noise sources, which constitute a relatively stable background noise exposure, with the individual contributors unidentifiable. The background noise level changes throughout a typical day, but does so gradually, corresponding with the addition and subtraction of distant noise sources such as traffic and atmospheric conditions. What makes community noise constantly variable throughout a day, besides the slowly changing background noise, is the addition of short duration single event noise sources (e.g., aircraft flyovers, motor vehicles, sirens), which are readily identifiable to the individual receptor. These successive additions of sound to the community noise environment vary the community noise level from instant to instant, requiring the measurement of noise exposure over a period of time to legitimately characterize a community noise environment and evaluate cumulative noise impacts.</p> <p>As stated in Chapter 4.11, page 4.11-4, of the Draft EIR, "Noise in the community has often been cited as a health problem, not in terms of actual physiological damage, such as hearing impairment, but in terms of inhibiting general well-being and contributing to undue stress and annoyance. The health</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>effects of noise in the community arise from interference with human activities, including sleep, speech, recreation, and tasks that demand concentration or coordination. Hearing loss can occur at the highest noise intensity levels." A review of the Internal Journal of Preventive Medicine article, "Is Enough Attention Paid to the Health Effects of Low-Frequency Noise in Today's Society" identifies a discussion of the potential negative effects of noise exposure that does not necessarily contradict the Draft EIR. Additionally, the article notes that, "more studies are needed to examine how ILFN [Infrasound and Low Frequency Noise] affects body tissues from a biological and pathobiological point of view" and that, "it should be noted that not many studies have been done on the relationship between LFN [Low Frequency Noise] exposure and hearing loss." Currently, there is a lack of consensus within the scientific community regarding the potential health effects of low-frequency noise. Some studies report associations between infrasound exposure and certain symptoms, while others find no significant effects. The variability in study designs, methodologies, and sources of infrasound contributes to the complexity of the issue. Due to the uncertainties surrounding the effects of low-frequency noise, the proposed General Plan does not set standards for exposure limits. Due to the still speculative inquiry related to the potential negative effects of low-frequency noise, it is overly speculative and inappropriate to analyze as an impact of the proposed project impact.</p>
<p>PUB11</p>	<p>9/23/2023</p>	<p>Erika Gomez</p>
<p>PUB11-1</p>	<p>We recognize this can sometimes be a thankless job. So let me first say Thank You for considering our neighborhood concerns.</p>	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB11-2 through PUB11-4.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB11-2	<p>We looked at the GP2040 and it appears that 9th. Ave and 5th Ave are being proposed as “Arterials”.</p> <p>In a city that has worked for decades to keep our streets safe for pedestrians, such as the Traffic Action Plans (TAPs) reclassifying 9th Ave to be able to carry from a max of 10,000 cars up to 50,000 cars goes against all the hours our neighborhood, staff and numerous city council members have invested to prevent additional degradation of local street surfaces and safety of our elderly, kids and general population when residents walk to medical appointments, school or work. Is this long term tradeoff worth whatever short term benefit city administrators anticipate?</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.</p>
PUB11-3	<p>Has a Health Risk Analysis (HRA) associated with Allowing up to 50,000 cars in our little neighborhood been done? I cannot imagine that it would Not have a long term detrimental effect on our general population’s health.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications, regarding roadway classification mapping.</p> <p>To determine cancer and noncancer health risks, the location, velocity of emissions, meteorology and topography of the area, and locations of receptors should be known to quantify toxic air contaminant (TAC) concentrations and subsequent health effects. Since individual development timelines and locations are unknown at this time, a health risk assessment (HRA) was not required nor feasible.</p> <p>The white paper prepared by the Association of Environmental Professionals’ Climate Change Committee, <i>We Can Model Regional Emissions, But Are the Results Meaningful for CEQA</i>, describes several of the challenges of quantifying local effects—particularly health risks—for large-scale, regional projects, and these are applicable to both criteria air pollutants and TACs. Similarly, the two amicus briefs filed by</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>the air districts on the Friant Ranch case describe two positions regarding CEQA requirements, modeling feasibility, variables, and reliability of results for determining specific health risks associated with criteria air pollutants (refer to Appendix C, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data, of the Draft EIR).</p> <p>The carcinogenic TACs that constitute the majority of the known health risks are from motor vehicle traffic. BAAQMD's Planning Health Places provides a list of recommendations for lead agencies to use for projects that introduce new sensitive receptors near areas with high levels of air pollution or near local sources of air pollution. These best practices include tactical practices and technologies that reduce local traffic emissions, increase site buffering between receptors and emission sources, or alter the design of proposed projects to remove receptors from locations expected to experience the highest pollutant concentrations. Moreover, the proposed General Plan Policy COS 4.4, Activity Near Sensitive Receptors, and Policy COS 4.8, Truck Facilities, would aid in reducing the exposure of sensitive receptors specifically in Equity Priority Communities and Overburdened Communities to TACs and PM_{2.5}. These proposed policies aim to limit truck idling within the EIR Study Area and overall support the BAAQMD rules to reduce emissions from mobile sources.</p> <p>Although mobile sources of air toxics (e.g., truck idling) are not regulated directly by BAAQMD, CARB has rules to limit vehicle idling and the proposed project would not increase traffic volumes enough to generate CO hotspots (refer to Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR). Furthermore, individual development projects that have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
<p>PUB11-4</p>	<p>This type of drastic change goes against the City’s Vision, Safety and Noise GP goals.</p> <p>Please let’s stop letting the “car centric” mentality we fought so hard to get away from drive decisions for our community’s future.</p> <p>I wish you would get the opinions of the mail carriers and package delivery personnel. Recently a car flipped on 7th and El Dorado after nearly hitting people and actually hitting multiple cars, before flipping. I spoke to the delivery personnel at the crash site and they said it is amazing how often they see people speeding and ignoring stop signs in our neighborhood.</p> <p>I would like close by sharing a photo of an adult resident riding their electric scooter on 5th and El Dorado. Something we see on 9th and Fremont all the time as well. Why do adults still rides bikes And scooters on the sidewalk during traffic hours? Because they are afraid, even with all the bike lanes in the street.</p>	<p>equipped with transport refrigeration units and are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use would be required under Mitigation Measure AQ-4 to prepare a site-specific health risk assessment to determine and mitigate potential health risk effects generated by an individual projects.</p> <p>The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>


RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		
<p>PUB12</p>	<p>9/23/2023</p>	<p>Rowan Paul</p>
<p>PUB12-1</p>	<p>My wife and I are dismayed to see yet more proposed erosion of our neighborhood at 5th and Delaware with The Draft 2040 General Plan and Draft EIR. The definition of Arterial is 10,000 - 50,000 vehicles a day. There has been no collaboration on this reclassification. I oppose this reclassification and strongly feel that 5th avenue remain a neighborhood street given that we have families, neighbours with kids and families that have lived here for decades.</p>	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB12-2 through PUB12-5. Regarding roadway classifications, please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.</p>
<p>PUB12-2</p>	<p>How do we address this increased cut-through traffic? We need assurances for traffic calming for both 5th and 9th Avenues. A class III Bike Boulevard is proposed for 5th Avenue which means we need lower traffic volumes for safer streets for pedestrians and bicyclists. Other cities in San Mateo County plant a tree in the center of the intersection to reduce cut-through traffic and improve air quality. I recommended we do that and add speed bumps or rumble strips. We are thankful for new pavement and repainted bike strips. To</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	reclassify as an arterial would be devastating, contradictory and a move in the wrong direction.	
PUB12-3	In addition, 4th and 5th Avenues are included in the Equity Priority Neighborhoods. We request that the boundaries of the Equity Priority Neighborhoods be extended to 9th Avenue and include streets from S Delaware to S Amphlett for more residential protections.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB12-4	<p>Our 5th avenue neighborhood is a close one where we all know our neighbors. We do NOT want this to turn into a high density housing project with 7 floor new housing developments as you have been building near the tracks, some without concession or requirement for more parking or significant city infrastructure which is frankly ridiculous. Our neighbourhood is already taking a big hit and we WILL not stand for further erosion.</p> <p>I have attached an example of the damaging effect of traffic on our neighborhood. This is my neighbor's Porsche that was subject to a hit and run RIGHT OUTSIDE his and our houses. Can you imagine if there was a child playing on the sidewalk?</p> <p>Again as a reminder, our son got run over by a car at 5th and Clairmont just 2 blocks from our house. NOTHING was done by the city to increase safety at this intersection or in our neighborhood despite token lip service phone call with Lisa Nash and Eric Rodriguez at the time when it happened.</p>	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB12-5	Needless to say, we are sufficiently energized to fight this proposal. Please do the right thing for the invested locals.	The comment serves as a conclusion to the preceding comments. Please see Responses PUB12-1 through PUB12-4.
PUB13	9/23/2023	Evan Powell
PUB13-1	Thank you for your public service.	The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to the outrageous proposal that 9th and 5th avenues be reclassified to accept more cut through traffic.</p>	<p>in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted. Regarding roadway classifications, please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.</p>
	<p>The Central Neighborhood already bears the brunt of the increased development in San Mateo. Countless times we have been reassured that our neighborhood would be protected with Vision Zero and traffic impact funds and so on. And yet we see that noise, pollution, accidents, and so on are all more prevalent in the Central Neighborhood than most other neighborhoods. Last week down the street from our house in Central Neighborhood a family was out walking when they were nearly killed by cut-through traffic, the incident of which is only increasing due to pro-development policies. Please see attached for a photo of the accident - imagine this was your reality, your neighborhood. Would you feel safe?</p>	
		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB14	9/24/2023	Chris and Wayne Rango
PUB14-1	I have been a resident of the Central Neighborhood for almost 40 years. What is being proposed in the General Plan and the Draft EIR is preposterous!	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB14-2 through PUB14-4.
PUB14-2	Specifically, reclassifying 5th Ave, the street I live on, and 9th Ave to become Arterials is not in any neighborhood's best interest, let alone mine. To permit between 10,000 to 50,000 vehicles per day on these two neighborhoods' streets will only ADD an incredible amount of noise that already exists. It will increase greater danger for pedestrians as well as drivers not to mention decreasing our property value.	Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.
PUB14-3	This proposal will also allow 8-10 story buildings in my neighborhood! Are you kidding me? I am becoming more and more appalled at the attempts to RUIN our quaint neighborhood.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB14-4	Please do not allow this damage to happen.	The comment serves as a conclusion to the preceding comments. Please see Responses PUB14-1 and PUB14-3.
PUB15	9/24/2023	Dave Santos
PUB15-1	The EIR is a tremendous amount of information to digest.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB15-2 through PUB15-4.
PUB15-2	I want to acknowledge staff contributions to this effort and while there has been a modest attempt to reach out to the community, the report presents limited growth options. Is there not a middle ground of moderate growth as a viable alternative to maximum growth or no growth options? Why hasn't a moderate growth option been explored? I believe that is what Measure Y is all about, moderate growth.	Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB15-3	<p>I also wonder why the San Mateo Foster City School District was not consulted for input if the San Mateo Union High School District was. Adding 26,000 people to the population will affect the SMFCSD as well as the high school district.</p>	<p>The San Mateo Foster-City School District (SMFCSD) was contacted but there was no reply. Therefore, as cited in Chapter 4.14, <i>Public Services</i>, of the Draft EIR, information was obtained from the SMFCSD website and documents such as the SMFCSD Facilities Master Plan and the SMFCSD Strategic Plan 2022-2027. As discussed in impact discussion PS-5 in Chapter 4.14 of the Draft EIR, the projected increase in students across the EIR Study Area would be gradual and proposed Policy PSF 5.1, <i>Equitable Facilities</i>, Policy PSF 5.7, <i>Incentives for Public Facilities</i>, Policy PSF 6.1, <i>School Assistance</i>, and Policy PSF 6.6, <i>School District Collaboration</i>, in combination with the mandatory payment of developer impact fees would work to ensure that there are adequate school facilities during the buildout horizon of the proposed General Plan. Future construction of new or renovated school facilities to accommodate growth under the proposed project would be subject to separate project-level environmental review pursuant to CEQA, as required, to identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures as needed to reduce potential environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>
PUB15-4	<p>I think it is wishful thinking to believe that the addition of 26,000 will not have more effect on the environment.</p> <p>In reviewing the document, input of residents (stakeholders) needs to be considered.</p> <p>I would like to recommend a rewrite that lists moderate growth options that are supported by the community along with a specific mechanism to solicit residents <i>[sic]</i> input.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB16	9/25/2023	Karen Herrel
PUB16-1	As a former San Mateo Planning Commissioner (14 years total, 1970's and 1990's) I am familiar with large EI R's. I've reviewed them by the inch and the pound! This current one for the proposed General Plan (over 1000 pages) is well beyond what most everyone - me included - will want to review and comment on, page by page. Instead I am focusing on two issues.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB16-2 through PUB16-5.
PUB16-2	Noise is a significant issue in San Mateo. Much <i>[sic]</i> of the noise we experience is related to traffic (another significant issue). I reviewed the noise studies and am puzzled that a better range of locations and a better choice of duration and times of day and days of the week were not used. It is usually most helpful to start "at home", with what we know best, so I looked very closely at the noise study on the upper part of West Hillsdale Blvd. The proposed General Plan will allow for greatly intensified development in the W. Hillsdale Blvd/Campus Drive area. Any such increase will certainly funnel much larger volumes of traffic onto Hillsdale Blvd (and likely 31st Ave.) toward the east of the area, especially since the alternative, State Route 92, is so frequently congested. So what evaluation does the DEIR give us? Fifteen minutes on a late Friday morning in mid November on the flat (therefore quieter) part at 931 W. Hillsdale. May I point out that this timing avoids the morning and afternoon commutes - both for CSM, other local schools and the regular workforce. Using a Friday, in a time when work from home was common, especially toward the end of the week, also creates an understatement of the existing conditions. and using a flat spot, when much of Hillsdale has steep roadway (in excess of 14%) also avoids revealing the effect of increased engine noise going uphill and the combined	The comment questions the methodology of the noise monitoring survey conducted for the Draft EIR, suggesting it is not robust enough to provide a reasonable sense of the ambient noise environment influencing San Mateo. The noise monitoring survey is intended to provide a representative snapshot of typical community noise experienced at several points throughout the EIR Study Area. The baseline noise measurement conducted at 931 W Hillsdale Boulevard identified a typical noise level of 61.6 decibels. However, the noise monitoring survey is not intended to provide a representation of the typical ambient noise environment on its own. In order to augment the results of the noise monitoring survey, existing traffic noise on W Hillsdale Boulevard between Alameda de las Pulgas and Campus Drive (along with many other roadway segments throughout the city) was calculated using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108) (see Appendix D2, Traffic Noise Calculations, of the Draft EIR) and traffic volumes from Kittleson Transportation Consultants that were measured prior to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. The predicted noise levels from this segment of roadway, which encapsulates 931 W Hillsdale Boulevard, generally verified the baseline noise survey with a calculation of 62.1 decibels. Thus, it is important to examine

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>engine/tire noise from increased speed going both uphill and downhill. The measurement did manage to capture one of the buses that now use this route every 20 minutes - from 6AM to 11 PM!, but missed the common noisy situation of 2 buses passing each other. All in all, a pretty useless baseline evaluation for this location. I can only wonder what people who live near the other areas the DEIR evaluated would think of where/when/how those measurements were taken.</p>	<p>both the noise monitoring survey and the modeled traffic noise in order to formulate a general understanding of the ambient noise environment influencing San Mateo.</p>
<p>PUB16-3</p>	<p>Project Alternatives are very poorly chosen for a project this all encompassing. The community has been discussing a range of alternative development intensities (often called A, Band C for land use) which would result in a range of impacts. Those impacts are not necessarily a smooth continuum as development increases. In many community situations there is an as of now unidentified "tipping point" where impacts become much greater and require much stronger alternate mitigations, as opposed to "more of the same". Ignoring the community understanding of the proposed General Plan in favor of a less than adequate "alternative" of reduced noise (largely through reduced traffic) is not responsive to the CEQA guidelines for requirements in the DEIR. This "alternative" suggests "enhanced" TOM mitigations like subsidies for transit passes, e-bikes, ride sharing and bicycles. Those tools, and many others, should be an automatic part of our city process. employed right now, aside from any connection to a new General Plan. Even back before 2000, project approvals included conditions for TDM measures, across properties and area boundaries. How does this kind of already existing approach rise to the level of the basis for a project alternative? It doesn't.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB16-4	Of course the alternatives also make mention of the environmentally superior choice. This is given lip service by saying it aligns with the only alternative "studied", thus skirting any real discussion. It probably would have been omitted altogether if not for the clear requirement in CEQA guidelines.	Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection be disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative to the proposed project that would be expected to generate the least number of significant impacts. As described in Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i> , page 5-27, of the Draft EIR, identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure. Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.
PUB16-5	The bottom line for me is that you have a DEIR which does not meet legal requirements and which relies on inadequate studies. This document needs a major overhaul prior to certification.	The comment serves as a conclusion to the preceding comments. Please see Responses PUB16-1 through PUB16-4.
PUB17	9/25/2023	Maxine Turner
PUB17-1	Dear Ms. Sandhir - The purpose of CEQA is to give decision-makers adequate information upon which to base decisions that minimize negative impacts to the community. The Draft EIR (DEIR) for the 2040 Draft General Plan is so filled with vague statements about future actions as to be useless. Words like "suggest, promote and encourage" are meaningless. This DEIR does not give policy makers the data to evaluate the long-term impacts of their proposed GP Project. It is an insult to the residents and businesses in San Mateo who will have no idea of the true fiscal and environmental impacts of the proposed Project nor of viable alternatives that will lessen these impacts. The consultants can and must do better.	Please see Response PUB7-4.
PUB17-2	Staff knows that the City Council can still approve a project with "significant impacts" by making statements of overriding consideration. But misleading the public and decision-makers by avoiding discussion about the true	This EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines to determine if approval of the identified discretionary actions and related subsequent development could have any significant impacts on the

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>impacts is unconscionable. This adds to the mistrust of government and threatens our fragile democracy. This DEIR must be rewritten and recirculated.</p>	<p>environment. The comment expresses concern regarding the conclusions in the Draft EIR but does not state a specific concern regarding the analysis in the Draft EIR. Therefore, a more detailed response cannot be provided. Please also see Response ORG1-18 regarding recirculation.</p>
<p>PUB17-3</p>	<p>THE DEIR IS INADEQUATE AND INCOMPLETE BECAUSE IT FAILS TO: 1 - Identify which program level environmental effects City staff intends to utilize as having been addressed as “specifically and comprehensively as is reasonably possible” in this program EIR so that later activities may qualify for a streamlined environmental review process or may be exempt from environmental review. The DEIR does not provide the supporting data for the “no significant impact” conclusions related to land use and zoning, traffic, air quality, noise, infrastructure capacity and water availability, public services and hydrology. If the consultants have given these details to the City this data must be included for public review and the DEIR recirculated.</p>	<p>As described in Chapter 2, <i>Introduction</i>, page 2-2, of the Draft EIR, later activities that are within the 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. 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.</p> <p>Regarding the comment's assertion that the Draft EIR does not provide supporting data for the "no significant impact" conclusions related to land use and zoning, traffic, air quality, noise, infrastructure capacity, water availability, public services, and hydrology, the impact analyses of these topics can be found in Chapter 4.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i>, Chapter 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i>, Chapter 4.11, <i>Noise</i>, Chapter 4.17, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>, Chapter 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>, and Chapter 4.14, <i>Alternatives</i>, of the Draft EIR, respectively. These chapters reference appendices with supporting data as appropriate. The comment does not specify what supporting data is missing; therefore, no further response is warranted. Please also see Response ORG1-18 regarding recirculation.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB17-4	<p>2 - Evaluate a “reasonable range” of alternatives as required by CEQA. The GP land use map chosen by the City Council as the “Project” was the highest level of development considered during the public input phase. This high-development project results in Significant and Unavoidable (SU) impacts in Air Quality, Noise, and Wildfire even with mitigations. The DEIR does not adequately evaluate other alternatives that can lessen these and other impacts to less than significant levels. Alternatives A and B were considered during the public input phase of the GP UPDATE with much public support and these should be evaluated for potentially less impacts in the EIR. A highest development level ‘Project’ or no project is not adequate.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.</p>
PUB17-5	<p>3 - Note specifically in the Land Use Regulations Measure Y paragraph that General Plan 2030 is Measure Y, approved by the voters in 2020, and a vote of San Mateo residents will be required to approve any changes to Measure Y heights and densities in the Project General Plan 2040. Identify specifically where land use changes increase the heights or densities allowed under Measure Y. The DEIR paragraph on Measure Y is inaccurate, incomplete and missing information on the Strive website and must be rewritten. Measure Y is of vital interest to a majority of the voters in San Mateo and needs to be clearly and accurately described in the DEIR.</p> <p>Rewrite the Measure Y paragraph to also note that it better supports affordable housing than the state density bonus law. The Measure Y General Plan 2030 requires that 10% of new residential development be for affordable units built on-site at the same time as the market rate units are constructed. Note how many affordable units have been built in San Mateo under Measure Y. It does not allow off-</p>	<p>As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, the paragraph on Measure Y in Chapter 4.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, has been revised to be completed and impact discussion LU-2 has been revised to include a consistency analysis between the proposed project and Measure Y.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB17-6	<p>site or in-lieu fee payments that can sit in a pot for years. The state density bonus law only requires 10% affordable units yet gives the developer 2 extra floors of height for doing what is already required in San Mateo. Also note that the Measure Y density allowances result in a larger number of 2-3 bedroom family sized units than the higher density bonus units have resulted in.</p>	<p>As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, impact discussion LU-2 in Chapter 4.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, has been revised to include a consistency analysis between the proposed project and Measure Y.</p>
PUB17-7	<p>4- Justify how the conclusion of LU-2 “The proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect” was determined. Clearly, GP 2040 land uses conflict with Measure Y unless a mitigation is added to phase the high-development land use changes in the Project to after Measure Y ends in 2030. Staff notes that the current RHNA cycle housing requirements can be met under Measure Y. Projections for the next RHNA cycle will most likely be reduced. Much impact language throughout the DEIR notes that build-out will not occur all at once so this mitigation will not significantly impact GP 2040 policies.</p> <p>5 - Identify the conflicts between the Project’s high-level of development land uses in the Downtown with the goals of pedestrian oriented and preserving historic and cultural resources. Compare the likely wind and shadow impacts of higher heights, including density bonuses, to existing plan heights on outdoor seating and walking.</p>	<p>A consistency analysis of the proposed project and pedestrian circulation is provided in Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i>, pages 4.15-19 through 4.15-22, of the Draft EIR and concluded that implementation of proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions would improve the pedestrian network and support programs to pedestrian travel. As discussed in Chapter 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, pages 4.4-10 through 4.4-16, of the Draft EIR, the proposed project was concluded to have less-than-significant impacts on historical and archaeological resources and human remains due to mandatory regulatory procedures, as well as compliance with the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>The comment also claims that the Draft EIR fails to compare the wind and shadow impacts of developments under the proposed project. The analysis presented in the Draft EIR was prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Environmental Checklist, which does not identify creating wind and shadow impacts as environmental impacts. The proposed General Plan however includes Policy CD 11.12, <i>Sustainable Design</i>, encouraging the integration of sustainable design features and elements into the design of new buildings which can minimize environmental impacts such as flooding, wind, shadows, etc.</p>
PUB17-8	6 - Identify the true potential heights with the density bonus increases in heights. Maximum height potential MUST include the density bonus heights.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB17-9	7 - Identify specifically what increased service needs (fire, police, parks, recreation, and libraries) will be required by the high level of new development and how funding will be provided. These service impacts are one of the “Standards of Significance” that the “no significant impact” was based on. More importantly, identify at what level of new development (population or structures) WHEN new “staffing, facilities and equipment” will be needed. Policy LU 12.1 states: “Retain and grow existing businesses and attract new businesses that can generate and diversify the City’s tax revenue and increase job opportunities to ensure the City has adequate resources for infrastructure improvements and essential City services, such as police, fire, parks, recreation, and libraries.” If new staffing and equipment does not exist to maintain a less than significant impact, will project approvals be delayed until adequate staffing, equipment and facilities are in place? Perhaps this should be	The comment requests identification of what increased service needs will be required and how funding will be provided. Please see Master Response 1, Standards for Responses to Comments, regarding additional analysis. As discussed in Chapter 4.14, <i>Public Services</i> , of the Draft EIR, individual project plan review by SMC Fire, payment of development impact fees, consistency with the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions, and compliance with the existing regulations would ensure that SMC Fire and SMPD are involved as future development is allowed under the proposed project. Furthermore, as shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i> , of this Final EIR, Chapter 4.14, of the Draft EIR has been revised to include proposed General Plan Action PSF 1.8, <i>Police and Fire Cover Assessments</i> , which requires complete standard of cover assessments or staffing studies periodically for police and fire services to ensure that appropriate response times, staffing, and levels of service are

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>added as a mitigation.</p> <p>For example, fire services currently closely meet the standard set by the National Fire Protection Association that there be one firefighter for every 1,000 population. At what specific new level of project development and population growth would new facilities, staffing and equipment be required? How tall can buildings be to be served by existing fire trucks? The “no significant impact” conclusion in the DEIR only refers to the construction impacts of new facilities, not the lack of services which negatively impact the community. “PS-1 The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection services.”</p> <p>The same is true for police services. “SMPD has identified that its staffing level has decreased since 2020, and an increase in population would result in a need for increased staffing. Physical expansion of SMPD facilities may be needed to accommodate increases in staffing and maintain response times. The SMPD has indicated that existing stations would be inadequate to accommodate future needs; due to this, a new police substation or substantial adjustments, expansions, or renovations to the existing police headquarters facility have been identified as needed.”</p> <p>If new staffing and equipment does not exist to maintain a less than significant impact, will project approvals be delayed until adequate staffing, equipment and facilities are in place? Perhaps this should be added as a mitigation.</p>	<p>available to meet community needs as the City’s population grows. Please see Response PUB17-3 regarding further CEQA review and streamlining.</p> <p>The comment also points out that the Draft EIR only analyzes the impacts of constructing new facilities, not the lack of services which would impact the community. Under the provisions of CEQA (Public Resources Code 21002.1[a]), the purpose of an EIR is to identify the significant effects of a project on the environment, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided. Existing impacts to the community that are not caused by the project are not within the scope of this EIR.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB17-10	<p>Current services are adequately funded by existing revenues. The DEIR makes clear that the large increase in population and structures will require more funding for services. There is no data about how much revenue will be lost or gained by the Project land use changes. How much sales tax revenue will be lost by upzoning downtown and El Camino Real small businesses for housing or office? How much property tax increase stays with the city as opposed to sales, hotel, business and other taxes? This is fundamental information needed by decision makers prior to approving the High-Development 2040 General Plan.</p>	<p>Fiscal impacts are outside the scope of this EIR. Therefore, no further response is warranted. The General Plan staff is conducting additional fiscal analysis with consultant support that will be considered by the City Council as part of the General Plan adoption process.</p>
PUB17-11	<p>The DEIR does not provide the public nor decision-makers with the data they need to approve the Project. There is no information about how water will be provided, traffic impacts reduced, the jobs/housing balance maintained, and displacement of affordable housing and small businesses avoided. Every resident, voter and taxpayer in San Mateo understands the Project high-level of development will negatively impact their lives. This DEIR does not meet legal requirements and it must be revised and recirculated.</p>	<p>As discussed in Chapter 4.17, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>, pages 4.17-20 through 4.17-29, of the Draft EIR, water services in the City of San Mateo are provided by California Water Service Company, Mid-Peninsula District (Cal Water - MPD) and Estero Municipal Improvement District (EMID) with water purchased from San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). While there is expected to be a shortage of water supplies to meet the demand with the proposed buildout for normal years and single and multiple dry years in the Cal Water - MPS service area and single and multiple dry years in the EMID service area, the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions would serve to minimize impacts of future development to water supplies. The City will continue to coordinate with Cal Water - MPD and EMID regarding conservation efforts, demand management measures promoted by the water districts, and implementation of water use restrictions as per the Water Shortage Contingency Plans. Additionally, future development under the proposed project would be required to obtain will-serve letters, implement water efficient requirements, and prepare a Water Supply Assessment that demonstrates that the project water demands would not exceed water supplies, as applicable.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>Existing developments can be expected to decrease their water demands in the future as a result of the implementation of water conservation practices. Furthermore, Cal Water, EMID, and SFPUC plan to have implemented alternative water supply programs by 2040. As the City of San Mateo is not a water provider for the EIR Study Area and has limited capacity to directly control water use and water supply planning, the measures described above represent the best water conservation and water supply measures available and the impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>Proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions that would serve to reduce traffic impacts are identified in Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i>, pages 4.15-13 through 4.15-27, of the Draft EIR. It is concluded that the proposed project would not conflict with existing programs and policies. Through implementation of the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions, the proposed project supports public transit, improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. It would also promote and direct the City to expand the pedestrian and bicycle network, close gaps in the transportation network, and coordinate with regional agencies to improve the transit network. Buildout of the proposed project is anticipated to generate per capita VMT below the City's established impact thresholds, as the implementation of the proposed General Plan 2040 would support VMT reduction, and result in reducing VMT per capita and VMT per employee. The proposed project was also found to promote the design of improvements to the transportation network that are safe for all modes of travel and address emergency access by considering access routes, developing and updating emergency response plans, and incorporating emergency access considerations in the design of future street</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>improvements. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant transportation impacts.</p> <p>Analysis of the job/housing balance maintenance of the proposed project is not required under CEQA; however, housing growth is considered in Chapter 4.13, <i>Population and Housing</i>, pages 4.13-9 and 4.13-10, of the Draft EIR. The proposed project estimates an overall increase of 21,410 housing units in the EIR Study Area by 2040, of which 33 percent would come from the City's 2023-2031 RHNA allocation of 7,015 units, which is housing capacity that the City must accommodate as required under State law. The proposed General Plan 2040 includes goals, policies, and actions that strive to attract business and employment opportunity, while maintaining a reasonable balance between income levels, housing types, and housing costs within the City.</p> <p>Please see Response PUB7-26 regarding displacement of affordable housing as a result of implementation of the proposed project. CEQA considers the displacement of people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Displacement of small businesses would be a market analysis outside of the scope of this EIR.</p> <p>Please see Response ORG1-18 regarding recirculation.</p>
<p>PUB18</p>	<p>9/25/2023</p>	<p>Naomi Ture</p>
<p>PUB18-1</p>	<p>I write with high hopes that our planning manager and city council will listen to the neighborhood voices, over the developer voices.</p> <p>I write to oppose Draft General Plan and Draft EIR, and to</p>	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB18-2 through PUB18-10.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB18-2	<p>request that you protect the tree-lined neighborhood that we love. My home is at 614 E 5th Avenue. We moved here because it is a friendly, safe, tree-lined street with a bike lane. It's filled with families and folks who have lived here for decades and are proud of this neighborhood. Many people use our street to live, bike, and to walk to downtown San Mateo and the park.</p>	<p>Please see Response PUB6-31 regarding equity priority community boundaries and Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.</p>
PUB18-3	<p>This is my request - Please protect our neighborhood by including the following boundaries in the Equity Priority Neighborhood: 5th to 9th Avenue and S Delaware to S Amphlett and provide us with the following residential protections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please install the traffic calming measures including speed humps on 5th Avenue that you promised us after multiple people have been hit by cars. 	<p>Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.</p>
PUB18-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not allow 5th and 9th to become classified as arterials (this is the opposite of what you promised) • Keep 5th Avenue as a local street and 9th Avenue as a collector 	<p>Bike improvement projects within the City are considered capital improvements and considered by City Council through the Capital Improvement Program, which is updated every five years. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no further response is required.</p>
PUB18-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install the proposed class III Bike Boulevard on 5th Avenue 	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>
PUB18-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please ensure that height limitations within the boundaries of our neighborhood are 2 stories • Please ensure height limitations right outside our neighborhood are 4-6 stories. • Please stop ignoring the citizens and pleasing the developers by allowing them to construct 8-10 story structures. 	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB18-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please make it harder for developers to construct massive structures near our neighborhood without implementing what the citizens demand - safety, ample parking, and height limitations. 	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB18-7	The planning commission and city have shown in recent years that you are working against neighborhoods and in collaboration with developers, to create 8-12 story structures next to a neighborhood of single-story single-family homes. You are ignoring our pleas and exacerbating problems such as overcrowding, parking issues, traffic, safety and dangerous roadway conditions.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB18-8	The planning commission and city promised to work with our neighborhood to install traffic calming after cars are repeatedly hitting pedestrians. You have not added even one speed hump to 5th Avenue.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB18-9	The planning commission and the city promised to work with our neighborhood regarding 8-12 story high rises. Instead, the city is working WITH developers and AGAINST residents to build as many high rises as it can fit near our neighborhood without regard for parking, traffic and safety issues.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB18-10	Please listen to the people who live and work here now. Please protect us, your neighbors, over the developers. Please tell me exactly how you will protect my beloved neighborhood.	The comment serves as a conclusion to the preceding comments. Please see Responses PUB18-1 through PUB18-9.
PUB19	9/25/2023	Naomi Ture
PUB19-1	I just took this photo yesterday, of a dad riding his 2 kids along our tree-lined 5 th Avenue. Please protect our neighborhood. Picture removed	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB19-2 through PUB19-3.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB19-2	In order to assure us that you have no intention of altering 5th and 9th, do not reclassify <i>[sic]</i> 5th and 9th Avenues as arterials.	Please see Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications.
PUB19-3	In addition, please assure us that you will slow down development, not the opposite (i.e. Kiku Crossing) so that we can prevent increases in air pollution, noise, traffic, safety issues and wildfire risk.	The comment requests assurance that the City will slow down development to prevent environmental impacts. The comment has been noted. Impacts from the General Plan Update to air quality, noise, traffic and safety, and wildfires have been fully disclosed within the Draft and Final EIR. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB20	10/1/2023	Mavridis
PUB20-1	<p>The city needs to put a beneficial pause on the General Plan & Draft EIR. We the People of the City of San Mateo have not had an ample opportunity to review and comment on this drastic change to our city. The magnitude of these plans is an assault on our way of life, liberty, pursuit of happiness, public health and safety.</p> <p>The bulk of these plans have been put through during the unprecedented Covid-19 public health emergency. As many people were distracted by fearing for their lives, safety, family and businesses, we did not have the opportunity to thoroughly analyze and provide input on 1,000-page documents which have major ramifications to the city and its residents.</p>	Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15105(a), the public review period for a Draft EIR submitted to State Clearinghouse for State review shall not be less than 45 days. The public review period for the Draft EIR was from August 11, 2023, to September 25, 2023, satisfying the 45-day requirement.
PUB20-2	We the People of the City of San Mateo should not have to bear the burden of Sacramento and San Francisco’s mismanagement. The common theme appears to be just sardine pack everyone into San Mateo and figure it out from there. There have been no plans to require the major tech companies to move some of their offices to neighboring cities in order to help alleviate traffic congestion in the Bay Area, given they are one of the leading causes of this traffic	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB20-3	<p>as the jobs are all concentrated in one area. It is easier for these trillion-dollar corporations to help the environment and shorten the commute times by spreading out their offices, instead of requiring the residents of San Mateo to accept lower environmental quality and thus lowering the quality of life. The city has failed to consider and advocate for this less harmful alternative and instead is assaulting our way of life and drastically changing the fabric of San Mateo.</p> <p>During the 9/12/2023 Planning Commission meeting, one of the commissioners themselves said “I still have a lot of questions...air quality and noise impacts are being flagged as significant and unavoidable”. The Environmental Impact Report, has looked at things such as air quality, pollution, noise, etc. Another commissioner claims “the greenhouse gas emissions will be lower by adopting the General Plan update”, the public needs to verify these outrageous claims that contradict logic and common sense.</p>	<p>The comment expresses concerns regarding the impacts of the proposed project and the conclusions in the Draft EIR. The analysis in the Draft EIR includes substantial evidence to support the conclusions relating to air quality, noise, and greenhouse gas emissions. Since the comment does not provide any specific concerns on the analysis in the Draft EIR, a more detailed response cannot be provided.</p>
PUB20-4	<p>A consultant from ECORP Consulting confirms that “the updated plan does increase population and traffic, and that the plan allows for more population increase than the old plan”, and a commissioner confirms. In addition, the consultants struggled to explain the logical contradictions and admitted that without modeling the existing plan they can’t say whether the environmental impact would be the same as in the updated plan. Furthermore, the consultants admitted that “my assumption is that this (new) general plan is really looking to maximize the benefits of getting people out of cars”. Since this seems to be the core principle, the entire assumptions and math need to be revisited.</p>	<p>In compliance with CEQA requirements, Chapter 4.11, <i>Noise</i>, of the Draft EIR, evaluates potential impacts associated with buildout of the proposed project as compared against baseline conditions, not what is presented in the existing General Plan. Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i>, of the Draft EIR evaluates a No Project Alternative, which would maintain the current adopted General Plan. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1), the no project alternative analysis is not the baseline for determining whether the proposed project’s environmental impacts may be significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis which does establish that baseline.</p> <p>As stated in Chapter 4.11, pages 4.11-28 and 4.11-29, of the Draft EIR, the proposed General Plan does not propose</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>specific development projects; however, for the purposes of environmental review, the EIR discloses and evaluates potential buildout in the EIR Study Area under the proposed project. This represents a level of development that the City has projected can reasonably be expected to occur through the buildout horizon of 2040. To capture the potential impact of future development under the proposed project, the Draft EIR utilizes the baseline existing conditions and analyzes the impacts of urban development through the projection period ending in 2040. Roadside noise levels were calculated for the same roadways analyzed for the transportation analysis in Chapter 4.15, <i>Transportation</i>, of the Draft EIR. The street segments selected for analysis are those forecast to experience the greatest percentage increase in traffic generated by future development under the proposed project and are therefore expected to be most directly impacted.</p> <p>As the lead agency, the City has discretion on the methodology and approach utilized to evaluate the impacts based on substantial evidence to support its conclusions. The Draft EIR and Final EIR provide a detailed analysis to justify the conclusions in the document.</p>
PUB20-5	<p>During the same 9/12/2023 Planning commission comment period after returning from break, a commissioner said “I don’t have any comments”. A 1,000-page document and a commissioner doesn’t comment at all on a plan that would fundamentally change the entire landscape of San Mateo? Then right after a commissioner says “I don’t consider myself an expert in EIR (environmental impact reports), so I wouldn’t, I don’t feel confident enough to get into too many weeds with things where I just don’t have much reason to disagree with what was written”. This is precisely why we need to place a beneficial pause on such plans, since even</p>	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB20-6	<p>the commissioners do not have the proper knowledge to weigh the impacts to the residents of San Mateo.</p> <p>Thus, again these are major drastic changes to the city and its residents. To not give the public more time to educate themselves coming out of a historic pandemic is a travesty and breach of public trust. We are constantly told that the State of California has passed laws requiring densification of housing development. However, what we are not told and omitted from the conversation is this key sentence: “The city or county is not required to waive or reduce development standards that would cause a public health or safety problem, cause an environmental problem, harm historical property, or would be contrary to law”, as stated in the California density bonus law.</p> <p>The city has been forced to try and pass an \$8 increase to help fund and fix the crumbling infrastructure which led to major flooding recently. The city’s budget does not have the capacity to help support such population increase. Will the city be forced to raise taxes to help fund emergency services on already burdened residents or risk creating dangerous conditions of public property?</p> <p>Like Gulliver tied down by thousands of little strings, we lose our freedom one regulation at a time.</p>	<p>Fiscal impacts are outside the scope of this EIR. Therefore, no further response is warranted. The General Plan staff is conducting additional fiscal analysis with consultant support that will be considered by the City Council as part of the General Plan adoption process.</p>
PUB21	10/8/2023	Meg Spicer
PUB21-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I am a resident of San Mateo. Own a storefront business in San Mateo 	<p>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB21-2 through PUB21-6.</p>
PUB21-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I am discouraged (dismayed, troubled, etc.) I couldn’t participate in the building heights survey. ◆ District 5 (our district) is far more impacted by taller buildings than other districts ◆ I support residential building heights of 2 stories. 	<p>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB21-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I do not support buildings that are predominantly non-residential exceeding 5 stories or Measure Y limits in height. ◆ I also advocate for the preservation of single-family home neighborhoods, along with small businesses and retail. 	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB21-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I do not support additional housing units beyond what is required by the State 	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB21-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The DEIR should have looked at a moderated option, not just the maximum development. 	Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.
PUB21-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I am concerned about how services and infrastructure for all the new development will be paid for. 	Fiscal impacts are outside the scope of this EIR. Therefore, no further response is warranted. The General Plan staff is conducting additional fiscal analysis with consultant support that will be considered by the City Council as part of the General Plan adoption process.
PUB22	10/9/2023	No Name
PUB22-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I am a resident of San Mateo. 	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB22-2 through PUB22-6.
PUB22-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I am discouraged (dismayed, troubled, etc) I couldn't participate in the building heights survey ◆ District 5 (our district) is far more impacted by taller buildings than other districts ◆ I support residential building heights of _____ stories. ◆ I do not support buildings that are predominantly non-residential exceeding 5 stories or Measure Y limits in height. 	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB22-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I also advocate for the preservation of single-family home neighborhoods, along with small businesses and retail. 	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB22-4	♦ I do not support additional housing units beyond what is required by the State	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.
PUB22-5	♦ The DEIR should have looked at a moderated option, not just the maximum development.	Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.
PUB22-6	♦ I am concerned about how services and infrastructure for all the new development will be paid for	Fiscal impacts are outside the scope of this EIR. Therefore, no further response is warranted. The General Plan staff is conducting additional fiscal analysis with consultant support that will be considered by the City Council as part of the General Plan adoption process.
PUB23	10/12/2023	Lisa Maley
PUB23-1	Dear Councilmembers, I have the following comments regarding building heights and the 2040 General Plan:	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB23-2 through PUB23-4.
PUB23-2	Building heights and density: District 5 is disproportionately affected by the growth proposed in the General Plan yet very few neighbors received the survey regarding building heights. I believe that the survey sampling will not reflect the views of residents. I favor increasing building heights over Measure Y limits only for residential buildings (or Mixed use with over 80% residential). I support a maximum of 8-stories for a residential building (including any density bonus height) and only if required to meet RHNA housing numbers. The General Plan included over 21,410 new dwelling units and RHNA requirements are closer to 15,000 dwelling units. This is a 40% buffer and given the latest State population projections the next cycle should be less than 8,000 dwelling units. I am inclined to only support a ballot measure to	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is warranted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>increase building heights that place a threshold on the dwelling units built, such as 15,000.</p>	
<p>PUB23-3</p>	<p>GP and DEIR The DEIR evaluated only a maximum project or no project. Given that there are “Unavoidable” Significant Noise and Air quality impacts associated with greater health risks, it would have made sense to study a more moderate alternative.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.</p>
<p>PUB23-4</p>	<p>It also seems completely inconsistent that these significant impacts are caused by traffic, but traffic itself is not a significant impact. Policy LU 6.1 Rail Corridor Plan speaks of “maintaining and improving the quality of life for those who already live and work in the area” but the increase of noise and air quality impacts indicated by the DEIR are in complete contradiction to this statement. I suspect that future traffic congestion and inadequate parking will also reduce the quality of life among residents.</p>	<p>The comment questions why air quality and noise impacts are found to be significant and unavoidable due to traffic, but transportation impacts were found to be less than significant. It is possible to have significant air quality and noise impacts with less-than-significant transportation impacts. The Draft EIR concluded that the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts because construction and operation of future development under the proposed project would exceed the BAAQMD’s regional significance thresholds and contribute to the nonattainment designations and health risk in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. As detailed in Chapter 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i>, pages 4.2-35 and 4.2-36, of the Draft EIR, transportation is not the only factor that contributes to air quality impacts. While the air quality modeling utilizes trip generation and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the EIR Study Area’s criteria air pollutant emissions inventory also considers energy, off-road equipment, and area sources. The Draft EIR also concluded that the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts due to an increase of more than 5.0 dBA Ldn over existing conditions along one roadway segment (1st Avenue west of B Street) within the EIR Study Area. Similar to air quality modeling, the noise model includes factors other than trip generation, such as average speeds, roadway geometry,</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		<p>and environmental site conditions (see Chapter 4.11, <i>Noise</i>, page 4.11-37, of the Draft EIR).</p> <p>Senate Bill 743 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) have revised the methodology for assessing transportation impacts, shifting the focus to the VMT, which considers the number of daily trips and the distance traveled by those trips to their destinations. The provision of mixed-use and transit-oriented development reduces user travel distances, leading to a lower VMT. For Draft EIR, the VMT impacts were evaluated using VMT per capita and VMT per employee consistent with the guidance provided by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research.</p>
Public Hearing Oral Comments		
PH1	9/12/2023	San Mateo Planning Commission
PH1-1	<p>Maurine Killough asserts that San Mateo deserves the best objective design standards since there are many distinct neighborhood zones and each neighborhood has its own visual and physical character and deserves respect. Killough also points out that, with regard to commercial development adjacent to residential new infill building, designs need to respect existing community character using established designs found in San Mateo. Killough requests the City encourage new developments to be compatible and harmonious with building types and architecture styles prevalent in San Mateo especially with the surrounding residential neighborhoods and downtown historic district. Killough also requests the City consider a project design review for proposed projects in the downtown and surrounding neighborhoods by a qualified historic preservation architect consultant. Killough asserts that aesthetics of new illuminated contemporary glass buildings</p>	<p>Regarding the commenter’s concerns about aesthetics, please see Responses PUB6-1 and PUB6-2. Regarding the commenter’s concerns about historic resources, lighting, signage, and landscaping, please see Responses PUB6-3, PUB6-4, PUB6-5, and PUB6-6, respectively.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PH1-2	<p>will have an impact on existing older neighborhoods and the historic downtown and points out that a consultant could creatively bridge the design look between existing historic architecture and new buildings. Killough expresses concerns regarding street lighting standards and asserts that more green street lamps are needed at dark residential intersections and longer residential blocks, as this impacts safety for pedestrians and cyclists in the equity priority and underserved neighborhood areas in Central and North Central neighborhoods. Killough requests the City protect the character of older residential neighborhoods and prohibit neon commercial signs on the new tall buildings facing towards surrounding residential neighborhoods at night, as housing is at the upper level in these buildings, and prohibit older lighted outdoor billboards advertising alcohol and equity priority neighborhoods along 101 which generate blight. Killough also requests the City encourage drought tolerant green landscaping in residential neighborhoods and commercial projects and expand the tree canopies and front yards and plant more street trees through Street Tree Plan especially in equity priority neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Regarding the commenter’s concerns about geologic and seismic hazards, please see Response PUB5-2. Regarding the commenter’s concerns about greenhouse gas emissions, please see Response PUB5-3. Regarding the commenter’s concerns about historic resources, please see Responses PUB6-7 through PUB6-11.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>developments. Light asserts that San Mateo needs to protect and preserve charming older homes in single-family and duplex neighborhoods that make San Mateo the desirable place that it is to live. Light refers to Chapter 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR discusses the need to reduce carbon dioxide from cars and trucks. Light notes that new developments located near Caltrain or SamTrans public transportation stops are routinely allowed to provide less than adequate parking spaces in their plans; however, there's continued lack of cooperation between Caltrain and BART with low ridership decreasing on SamTrans and Caltrain. Light asserts that city planners need to be realistic about the use of public transportation and that new building projects should provide adequate parking spaces and include parking with chargers for electric cars as a more realistic solution to greenhouse gas emissions. Light asserts that electric cars are much quieter than traditional internal combustion engine cars. Light also requests more neighborhood preservation and protection, updated surveys in Central and North Central neighborhoods and older neighborhoods as potential historic districts, protection of historic pre-war homes and small duplexes for middle and low-income families in the equity priority neighborhoods, avoidance of demolition of homes in older neighborhoods (especially on the east side of San Mateo), and preservation of the street level exteriors of existing Craftsman Spanish and Tudor Revival and Victorian homes. Light asserts that new construction should be compatible with the existing neighborhoods and respect existing community character. Light requests the City encourage new developments to be compatible and harmonious with building styles and Architectural Styles prevalent in San Mateo.</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PH1-3	<p>Laurie Watanuki states that the impact of the buildout results in unacceptable cumulative traffic noise within the EIR study area and notes that no mitigation measures are available, according to the EIR. Watanuki points out that temporary construction noise can be reduced by staggering the projects and that taking the trucks out through the state highways (El Camino Real, 92, 101) would reduce the toxic dust pollution. Watanuki argues for reduced construction impacts in the equity priority neighborhoods and reduced heights of three stories in the land use map along 4th and 5th Avenue and the west side of South Delaware in the central neighborhood, as well as reduced heights of Mixed Use High I and Mixed Use High II in Downtown. Watanuki notes that bicycle boulevards are described in the Draft EIR and it says to include traffic calming on low traffic volumes. Watanuki also notes that 5th Avenue as described as a traffic boulevard from Delaware to South Amphlett. Watanuki requests the City keep 5th Avenue as a local street, versus having it reclassified as an arterial. Watanuki asserts that this conflict is in the General Plan and needs to be addressed. Watanuki points out that Central neighborhood has been an underserved neighborhood an equity priority boundary should be extended to 9th Avenue include streets from Amphlett to Delaware. Watanuki points out that the General Plan policy states to implement traffic calming on residential streets to reduce the cut through traffic and traffic noise. Watanuki requests the City install traffic circles on 9th Avenue and 5th Avenue from Delaware to South Amphlett, to keep the four-way stop signs, to not reclassify these streets to arterials, to do not put a truck route on 5th Avenue from South Delaware to South Amphlett on 5th Avenue (since it's going to be a proposed bike boulevard), and to not put a truck route on South</p>	<p>Regarding the commenter’s concerns about noise and construction impacts, please see Responses PUB6-12, PUB6-14, and PUB6-16. Regarding the commenter’s concerns about traffic calming, truck routes, traffic management, and grade separations, please see Responses PUB6-21, PUB6-22, PUB6-23, and PUB6-30, as well as Master Response 2, Roadway Classifications. Regarding Equity Priority Communities, please see Response PUB6-31.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PH1-4	<p>Humboldt between 4th and 9th. Watanuki asserts that the City needs to make these streets safer for the bicyclists. Watanuki states that the neighborhood traffic management program is a living document and asserts that it needs to be updated to better address the cut through traffic volumes and provide more flexibility to address traffic impacts on local streets collectors and arterials in residential neighborhoods. Watanuki questions the ADT volumes on Peninsula and Popular Avenues from Delaware to South Humboldt and whether this is included in the Draft EIR. Watanuki also questions the percentage of Burlingame traffic that uses the Popular exit in San Mateo. Watanuki requests the City perform a separate study for the six grade separations and questions why there are so many grade separations between 1st and 9th and why Peninsula Avenue doesn't have grade separations.</p>	<p>The passing of a ballot measure would not affect the City's ability to meet the RHNA, the General Plan itself, or the Draft EIR. As shown in Chapter 3, <i>Revisions to the Draft EIR</i>, of this Final EIR, impact discussion LU-2 in Chapter 4.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, has been revised to include a consistency analysis between the proposed project and Measure Y. Any components in the proposed General Plan that are inconsistent with Measure Y would require voter approval before they can take effect. Proposed General Plan Policy LU 1.9, <i>Voter-Approved Growth Limits</i>, requires that, for the duration that Measure Y is in effect, any inconsistency between the measure and other provisions of the General Plan's Land Use Element shall default to the provisions specified in Measure Y.</p>
PH1-5	<p>Michael Weinbauer expresses concerns about the accessibility of the Draft EIR and notes that it's very</p>	<p>Please see Responses PUB 7-2 though PUB7-5 regarding the commenter's concerns about the impacts of growth and the</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>technical and includes a lot of acronyms. Weinhauer asserts that the Draft EIR does not adequately address issues and makes unreasonable assumptions that people will not drive and alternative modes of transportation would be readily available. Weinhauer also asserts that the General Plan and Draft EIR plans for extreme levels of growth (about 40 percent) that would worsen air quality, traffic, noise, and other key areas and questions why the City is planning for absurd growth levels. Weinhauer also points out that the General Plan and EIR focused on per capita statistics and asserts that we should not lose sight of absolute numbers. Weinhauer notes that the General Plan and EIR claims to require balancing jobs and offices and asserts that given the massive imbalance, it should be focused on housing (not only luxury and rental-only housing, but also affordable housing) and existing housing stocks should be preserved, as it gets gentrified and replaced with unaffordable housing, which there is no shortage of in San Mateo. Weinhauer asserts that the non-committal language used in the Draft EIR are meaningless without concrete legislation, quantifiable targets that someone is accountable for, and funding to ensure aspirational plans are actually put into place and impacts are truly understood and mitigated. Weinhauer points out that the Draft EIR calls for decarbonizing housing stock but there are serious doubts around PG&E's abilities to export to support the existing demand, much less doubling that demand and the significant costs to property owners.</p>	<p>language used in the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 3, Lower Growth Alternative.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

This page intentionally left blank.