

2 REPORT SUMMARY

This summary presents an overview of the analysis contained in Chapter 4: Environmental Evaluation. CEQA requires that this chapter summarize the following: 1) areas of controversy, 2) significant impacts, 3) unavoidable significant impacts, 4) implementation of mitigation measures, and 5) alternatives to the project. Amended

A. Project Under Review

This Draft EIR provides an assessment of the potential environmental consequences of adoption of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the Climate Action Plan (CAP). The Draft 2030 General Plan is intended to serve as the principal policy document for guiding future conservation and development in the City of San Carlos. The Draft 2030 General Plan includes objectives, goals, policies and actions which have been designed to implement the City's and community's vision for San Carlos. The policies and actions would be used by the City to guide day-to-day decision-making so there would be continuing progress toward the attainment of the Plan's goals. The Draft 2030 General Plan proposes land use designations to implement the overall goals and vision. In conjunction with the Draft 2030 General Plan, the City prepared a CAP. The CAP augments the objectives, goals, policies and actions of the General Plan related to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP are further detailed in Chapter 3 of this EIR.

B. Areas of Controversy

The City issued a Notice of Preparation on March 3, 2009 and held a scoping meeting on March 16, 2009. The scoping period for this EIR was between March 3, 2009 and April 3, 2009, during which interested agencies and the public could submit comments about the Draft 2030 General Plan. The comments received focused primarily on the following issues:

- ◆ Annexation of unincorporated areas adjacent to the city, particularly concerning the provision of wastewater services.

- ◆ Increased traffic on regional and local roadways.
- ◆ Cumulative impact of growth on gas and electric facilities.

All of these issues were addressed in the Draft 2030 General Plan process. To the extent that these issues have environmental impacts, they are also addressed in this EIR.

C. *Significant Impacts*

Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance.

Implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, in combination with long-term, region-wide growth and development, has the potential to generate environmental impacts in a number of areas. However, the growth envisioned under the Draft 2030 General Plan would result in regional benefits by promoting growth that encourages less automobile dependence and supports regional transit systems, which could reduce air quality and noise impacts associated with population growth and non-residential development. Encouraging infill growth in the Downtown area and other designated areas and maintaining the City's open space designations would help to preserve open space at the urban fringe and reduce development pressures on lands outside the city limit. For these reasons, the growth-inducing effects of implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan would be beneficial to the city and surrounding areas. The Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP have been developed to be largely self-mitigating, and as a result, there are very few impacts that would occur solely on the basis of the implementation of the two plans.

Nonetheless, the implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan has the potential to generate two significant environmental impacts which are listed below:

- ◆ Air Quality
- ◆ Transportation and Circulation

As shown in Table 2-1, each of the impacts listed would be considered significant and unavoidable.

D. Mitigation Measures

This Draft EIR suggests mitigation measures that would reduce five impacts to less-than-significant levels. These mitigation measures are summarized Table 2-1 at the end of this chapter. They will form the basis of a Mitigation Monitoring Program which will be published in the Final EIR and implemented in accordance with State law.

E. Unavoidable Significant Impacts

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. As described in Chapter 4, and shown in Table 2-1, two significant unavoidable impacts were identified in the areas of air quality and transportation and circulation.

F. Alternatives to the Project

This Draft EIR analyzes alternatives to the Draft 2030 General Plan. Three alternatives to the Draft 2030 General Plan are considered and described in detail in Chapter 5:

- ◆ Existing General Plan Alternative (No Project Alternative)
- ◆ Limited Commercial Development Alternative

◆ Maximum Commercial Growth Alternative

The CAP is assumed to be included in both the Limited Commercial Development Alternative and the Maximum Commercial Growth Alternative. As shown in the alternatives analysis in Chapter 5, the Limited Commercial Growth Alternative has the least environmental impact and is therefore the environmentally superior alternative. This alternative largely maintains the industrial uses on the east side of San Carlos and adds a limited amount of commercial development. By limiting commercial development, this alternative avoids the significant and unavoidable impacts that have been identified in relation to air quality and traffic. However, the Limited Commercial Growth Alternative would result in 229,760 fewer square feet of commercial uses which is not in line with the economic objectives of the City. The Existing General Plan Alternative and the Maximum Commercial Growth Alternative would have greater impacts than the Draft 2030 General Plan.

G. Summary Table

Table 2-1 presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified in this report. It is organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4.

The table is arranged in four columns: 1) environmental impacts; 2) significance prior to mitigation; 3) mitigation measures; and 4) significance after mitigation. For a complete description of potential impacts, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapter 4.

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Significant Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
Since there are no significant impacts related to aesthetics as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.			
AIR QUALITY			
AIR-1: The Draft 2030 General Plan would be inconsistent with applicable clean air planning efforts of the BAAQMD, since projected vehicle miles traveled that could occur under the Draft 2030 General Plan would increase at a greater rate than population growth. The projected growth in vehicle travel could lead to an increase in regional vehicle miles traveled, beyond that anticipated in the BAAQMD's clean air planning efforts. As a result, development in San Carlos would contribute to the on-going air quality issues of attaining ozone ambient air quality standards in the San Francisco Bay Area.	S	<u>AIR-1:</u> There are no feasible measures to reduce this impact.	SU

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (CONTINUED)

Significant Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AIR-2: The proposed 2030 General Plan does not provide adequate buffers between new or existing sources of toxic air contaminants and odors and new or existing residences or sensitive receptors.	S	Mitigation Measure AIR-2: Policies EM-6.4 and EM-6.5 should be added to the Environmental Management Element as follows: Policy EM-6.4. Implement Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) guidelines that establish minimum screening or buffer distances between emissions sources and sensitive receptors. Exceptions may be made for projects that do not meet the distance requirements, but can be determined compatible with adjacent uses through a project-specific study that determines potential health risk. Mitigation measures shall be required to reduce these risks to acceptable levels.	LTS
AIR-3: Construction associated with the proposed 2030 General Plan build out would result in emissions of dust and equipment exhaust that may contribute to violations of ambient air quality standards or expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.	S	Mitigation Measure AIR-3: Policy EM-6.6 should be added to the Environmental Management Element as follows: Policy EM-6.6. BAAQMD recommended measures to reduce PM10 and exhaust emissions associated with construction shall be applied to new development in San Carlos.	LTS

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Since there are no significant impacts related to biological resources as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (CONTINUED)

Significant Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Since there are no significant impacts related to cultural resources as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.			
GEOLOGY, SOILS AND MINERAL RESOURCES			
Since there are no significant impacts related to geological and soil conditions as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.			
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
Since there are no significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.			
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
HYDRO-1: The Draft 2030 General Plan does not provide adequate protection of water quality during construction activities.	S	Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1: Policy EM-5.10 should be added to the Environmental Management Element as follows: Policy EM-5.10. Require property owners developing sites of less than one acre to prepare a stormwater pollution prevention plan, including use of best management practices, to control erosion and sedimentation during construction.	LTS
HYDRO-2: The Draft 2030 General Plan does not provide adequate protection of groundwater quantity during construction activities.	S	Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2: Policy EM-5.11 should be added to the Environmental Management Element as follows: Policy EM-5.10. Require the evaluation of potential groundwater depletion that could occur from new development through dewatering.	LTS
LAND USE			
Since there are no significant impacts related to land use as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.			

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

**CITY OF SAN CARLOS
DRAFT 2030 GENERAL PLAN EIR
REPORT SUMMARY**

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (CONTINUED)

Significant Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
NOISE			
Since there are no significant impacts related to noise as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.			
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
Since there are no significant impacts related to population and housing as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.			
PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION			
Since there are no significant impacts related to parks and recreational facilities as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.			
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION			
<p>TRA-1: Freeway Operations. The project would contribute traffic to the following freeway segments operating unacceptably under existing conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Highway 101 between Hillsdale Boulevard and Ralston/Harbor ◆ Highway 101 between Ralston Avenue/Harbor Boulevard and Holly Street ◆ Highway 101 between Holly Street and Brittan Avenue ◆ Highway 101 between Brittan Avenue and Whipple Avenue ◆ Highway 101 between Whipple Avenue and State Route 84 	S	<p>TRA-1: The mitigation necessary to reduce significant impacts upon the freeway segments is the widening of the freeway. Due to the substantial cost and right-of-way impacts, this measure is not considered feasible.</p>	SU
<p>TRA-2: Intersection Operations. The project would contribute traffic to the following intersections operating unacceptably under existing conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ El Camino Real and Holly Street ◆ Old County Road and Holly Street 	S	<p>TRA-2: The following mitigation measures would apply to the intersections operating at unacceptable level of service under existing conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 1. El Camino Real and Holly Street and 2. Old County 	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (CONTINUED)

Significant Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Industrial Road and Holly Street ◆ El Camino Real and Brittan Avenue ◆ Old County Road and Brittan Avenue ◆ Industrial Road and Brittan Avenue 		<p>Road and Holly Street. An alternative to implementing physical improvements at these intersections would be implementation of TDM programs that would reduce projected future traffic volumes. With implementation of TDM programs that would reduce future development trips by 20 percent, these intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service under 2030 General Plan conditions.</p> <p>◆ 3. Industrial Road and Holly Street. Improvements have been identified that would maintain operation levels at the intersection of Industrial Road/Holly Street within acceptable levels (mid-level LOS D or better) under future traffic conditions. These improvements (referred to as the Holly Street improvements) consist of the widening of Holly Street, west of Industrial Road, and modifying the Highway 101 interchange at Holly Street. The modifications to the Highway 101 interchange at Holly Street would consist of widening the eastbound Holly Street to northbound Highway 101 loop on-ramp from one to two lanes, eliminating the northbound 101 to westbound Holly Street loop off-ramp, widening the northbound 101 off-ramp to eastbound Holly Street from one to two lanes, and installing a traffic signal at the new Highway 101/Holly Street (E) intersection. Widening Holly Street, west of its intersection with Industrial Road, and converting the Holly Street/Highway 101 interchange to a partial cloverleaf design, would maintain acceptable operations at the Industrial Road/Holly Street intersection while in-</p>

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (CONTINUED)

Significant Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>creasing capacity at the Holly interchange. Level of service calculations showed that with implementation of the Holly Street improvements, the intersection of Industrial Road/Holly Street would operate at an acceptable LOS D (V/C 0.83 during the PM peak hour) under 2030 General Plan conditions.</p> <p>On June 11, 2007, the City Council included the Holly Street improvements in the City’s Capital Improvement Plan. A Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Plan has been established and adopted by the City to fund the Holly Street Improvements. Therefore, proposed development under the 2030 General Plan would be required to contribute a fair share amount of the projected costs of the Holly Street Improvements, as prescribed in the City’s Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Plan.</p>
<p>◆ 4. El Camino Real and Brittan Avenue and 5. Old County Road and Brittan Avenue.</p>		<p>An alternative to implementing physical improvements at these intersections would be implementation of TDM programs that would reduce projected future traffic volumes. With implementation of TDM programs that would reduce future development trips by 20 percent, these intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service under 2030 General Plan conditions.</p>
<p>◆ 6. Industrial Road and Brittan Avenue.</p>		<p>Improvements have been identified that would maintain operation levels</p>

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (CONTINUED)

Significant Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>at the intersection of Industrial Road/Brittan Avenue within acceptable levels (mid-level LOS D or better) under future traffic conditions. These improvements (referred to as the Brittan Avenue improvements) would maintain acceptable operations at the Industrial/Brittan intersection while accommodating future growth in the East Side area of San Carlos. The necessary improvements to mitigate the projected impact at this intersection consist of the addition of a second northbound left-turn lane on Industrial Road and a separate eastbound right-turn lane on Brittan Avenue. The implementation of these improvements would improve intersection level of service to an acceptable LOS C (V/C 0.80 during the PM peak hour) under 2030 General Plan conditions.</p>	

UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Since there are no significant impacts related to utilities and infrastructure as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Since there are no significant impacts related to GHG emissions as a result of the Draft 2030 General Plan and the CAP, no mitigation measures are required.

CITY OF SAN CARLOS
DRAFT 2030 GENERAL PLAN EIR
REPORT SUMMARY