

Executive Summary

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the environmental effects of the City of Daly City General Plan Update, hereafter referred to as the proposed General Plan. The City of Daly City is the “lead agency” for this EIR, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). As the lead agency, the City is required to evaluate the potential effects of the proposed General Plan, which is presented in this EIR.

An EIR is intended to inform decision-makers and the general public of the potential significant environmental impacts of a proposed project. No feasible mitigations are identified. Impacts have either been addressed through policies in the existing plans and/or policies in the proposed General Plan, or are identified as significant and unavoidable. The EIR also evaluates reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that may reduce or avoid one or more significant environmental effects. These alternatives must include a “No Project” alternative that represents the result of not implementing the project and a reasonable alternative to the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.¹ Based on the alternatives analysis, an environmentally superior alternative is identified.

This EIR is a program EIR that examines the potential effects resulting from implementing designated land uses and policies in the proposed General Plan. The impact assessment evaluates the proposed General Plan as a whole and identifies the broad effects that may occur with its implementation. As a programmatic document, this EIR does not assess site-specific impacts. Any future development project made possible by the proposed General Plan will be subject to individual, site-specific environmental review, as required by State law. Project-level environmental review will need to focus on project-scale impacts; cumulative and city-wide impacts (such as traffic) would not need to be evaluated, provided the data and assumptions used in this EIR remain current and valid.

Proposed General Plan

Daly City is located immediately south of San Francisco at the northernmost edge of San Mateo County and extends from the Pacific Ocean on the west to nearly reach the San Francisco Bay on the east. The city shares municipal boundaries with the City and County of San Francisco to the north, the City of Brisbane to the east, the Town of Colma and City of South San Francisco to the southeast, and the City of Pacifica to the southwest. Additionally, unincorporated San Mateo County lands exist adjacent to the city, along with an island of unincorporated San Mateo County lands

¹ CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(a)

(known as the “Broadmoor” neighborhood) within Daly City. These unincorporated areas are within Daly City’s Sphere of Influence.

PLAN PURPOSE

The proposed General Plan is intended to respond directly to changes experienced in Daly City since the adoption of the current General Plan elements that the City adopted between the years 1987 and 1994. New policies are introduced to respond to the City’s changing demographic environment, land use demands, as well as State and federal laws.

Plan policies respond to key ideas from the community that were identified and developed as a part of Envision Daly City, a public input effort initiated by the City at the outset of the General Plan update process. The proposed General Plan focuses on the direction of future growth, the revitalization opportunities in the city, the provision of different housing options, and improving the quality of life for residents. It also addresses environmental resource conservation and the health and safety needs of residents. Lastly, it responds to resident preferences about where different land uses such as shopping, public services, parks and recreation, housing, and other resources should be located and how best the City could achieve the Plan’s goals.

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the proposed General Plan are:

- To enable the community, speaking through the Planning Commission and City Council, to agree on long- and short-term policies related to each of the elements encompassed within the General Plan;
- To establish a vision for the physical nature of Daly City in the future and set the tone for the corresponding land use and related policies required to advance this vision; and
- To provide a basis for determining whether private development proposals and public projects are in harmony with the policies of the Plan.

ESTIMATED BUILDOUT

New development is expected to occur on “land use opportunity sites” which consist of vacant and underutilized sites. These sites have been identified through a combination of ways, including field reconnaissance, past development proposals, and research into individual parcels. Table ES-1 shows a summary of the potential residential units, non-residential development, population, and jobs that could result from buildout of the proposed General Plan.

TABLE ES-1: POPULATION, HOUSING UNITS, HOUSEHOLDS AND JOBS AT BUILDOUT

	<i>Existing (2008)</i>	<i>Buildout (2030)</i>	<i>Increase</i>	<i>Increase (percent)</i>	<i>Annual Increase (percent)</i>
Housing Units	31,778	33,935	2,157	6.8%	0.3%
Households ¹	31,090	32,239	1,149	4.8%	0.2%
Population ²	101,123	106,388	5,265	5.2%	0.3%
Jobs	17,656	21,646	3,990	22.6%	1.0%

¹ Buildout households were estimated as 95 percent of the total housing units, assuming a 5 percent vacancy rate.

² Buildout population was calculated assuming 3.3 persons per household.

Source: City of Daly City, 2012; ABAG Projections 2007; Census 2010; Dyett & Bhatia, 2012.

Alternatives to the Proposed General Plan

The following alternatives, as shown in Table ES-2, are described and evaluated in this EIR:

COMMERCIAL FOCUSED ALTERNATIVE

The CF Alternative assumes an overall similar amount of development potential as the proposed General Plan. It assumes that future development along major corridors such as Mission Street will be more focused on commercial development compared to the proposed General Plan. The CF Alternative results in 18 fewer housing units and 10,000 square feet more commercial uses when compared to the proposed General Plan. The number of hotel rooms will be the same as the proposed General Plan.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative assumes continuation of land use development under the 1987 General Plan. The No Project Alternative results in the lowest amount of new development when compared to the proposed General Plan and CF Alternative. The No Project results in 360 fewer housing units and 22,500 square feet less commercial uses when compared to the proposed General Plan. The number of hotel rooms will be the same as the proposed General Plan.

TABLE ES-2: COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES AT BUILDOUT

	<i>No Project</i>	<i>Proposed General Plan</i>	<i>Commercial Focused Alternative</i>
Population and Housing			
Housing Units	33,575	33,935	33,917
Households ¹	31,897	32,239	32,222
Population ²	105,259	106,388	106,331
Non-Residential Development and Jobs			
Non-Residential (sf)	9,042,230	9,064,730	9,074,730
Hotel (rooms)	883	883	883
Jobs	21,601	21,646	21,651

¹ Households are estimated as 95 percent of the total housing units, assuming a 5 percent vacancy rate.

² Buildout population was calculated assuming 3.3 persons per household.

Source: Dyett & Bhatia, 2012; City of Daly City, 2012.

Summary of Impacts & Environmentally Superior Alternative

Table ES-3 presents the summary of the proposed General Plan impacts identified in the EIR and the proposed General Plan policies that reduce these impacts. Because many of the proposed General Plan’s policies are designed to avoid or minimize impacts, the proposed General Plan is self-mitigating with respect to all impacts with feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR. The significance of each impact with implementation of the proposed General Plan policies is also shown in Table ES-3. The level of significance is determined by comparing the impact to the significance criteria described in Chapter 3.

Based on the comparative analysis in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR, and setting aside the No Project alternative (as provided by CEQA), the Commercial Focused Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Nonetheless, the proposed General Plan does a better job at achieving its purpose. While the Commercial Focused Alternative achieves the goal of economic development and redevelopment along the major corridors, it is less successful in achieving the housing and land use goal in the proposed General Plan. The city’s major corridors, such as Mission Street, are already heavily developed with commercial uses. Additional commercial uses without the supportive housing would not result in the creation of vibrant streets with a mix of uses as called for in the proposed General Plan. The Housing and Land Use Goal established by the community calls for diverse housing choices with a good balance between ownership and rental units. As much of Daly City is developed with single-family residential units, which are traditionally ownership units, the development of higher density units would have to occur along these major corridors, which are in turn supported by transit. By focusing on commercial development along major corridors, the Commercial Focused Alternative is less successful in accommodating long term regional housing needs for Daly City and at fostering a mix of uses along Daly City’s major corridors.

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

<i>#</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>
3.1 Aesthetics				
3.1-1	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not affect scenic vistas to the coast and ocean, and San Bruno Mountain.	Policies RME-16, CST-12, HE-31, LU-23 Tasks RME-16.1, RME-16.2, CST-12.1, CST-12.2, CST-12.3, CST-12.4, HE-31.1, LU-23.1	Less than Significant	None Required
3.1-2	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not result in the substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the city.	Policies LU-3, LU-4, LU-7, LU-8, LU-16, HE-3, HE-31, CE-13, CE-16, RME-20 Tasks LU-3.2, LU-3.3, LU-3.4, LU-4.2, LU-7.1, LU-7.2, LU-8.2, LU-16.1, LU-16.2, LU-16.3, HE-3.2, HE-31.1, CE-13.1, CE-13.2, CE-13.5, CE-16.1, CE-16.2, CE-16.3, CE-16.4, CE-16.5, CE-16.6, CE-16.7, CE-16.8, CE-16.9, RME-20.1, RME-20.2, RME-20.3, RME-20.4	Less than Significant	None Required
3.1-3	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not result in increased light and glare.	Policies HE-3, HE-31, RME-20 Tasks HE-3.2, HE-31.1, RME-20.1, RME-20.2	Less than Significant	None Required
3.2 Air Quality				
3.2-1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in an implementing document that is consistent with the goals and control measures of the Clean Air Plan.	Policies CE-1, CE-2, CE-3, CE-4, CE-5, CE-6, CE-7, CE-8, CE-9, CE-10, CE-11, CE-13, CE-14, CE-15, CE-16, CE-17, CE-18, CE-19, CE-21, CE-22, HE-2, HE-5, HE-25, HE-27, LU-4	No Impact	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

#	Impact	Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact	Significance	Mitigation
3.2-2	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not significantly contribute to the increase of traffic, and thereby will not significantly exacerbate air quality problems.	Policies CE-9, CE-1, CE-2, CE-3, CE-4, CE-5, CE-6, CE-7, CE-8, CE-9, CE-10, CE-11, CE-13, CE-14, CE-15, CE-16, CE-17, CE-18, CE-19, HE-2, HE-5, HE-25, HE-27, LU-4	Less than Significant	None Required
3.2-3	Implementation of the proposed General Plan addresses Toxic Air Contaminant sources and sensitive receptors in its goals, policies and objectives.	Policies SE-4.6, RME-5, RME-7 Tasks RME-5.1, RME-5.2, RME-5.3, RME-5.4, RME-5.5, RME-7.1, RME-7.2, RME-7.3	Less than Significant	None Required
3.2-4	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not expose substantial numbers of people to objectionable odors.	Policies RME-6 Tasks RME-6.1, RME-6.2	Less than Significant	None Required
3.3 Biological Resources				
3.3-1	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not have a significant adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG and USFWS.	Policies RME-8, LU-17, LU-18, LU-22, LU-23, RME-10, RME-16, RME-17, CST-4, CST-5, CST-6 Tasks RME-8.1, LU-18.1, LU-22.1, LU-23.2, RME-10.1, RME-17.1, CST-4.1, CST-5.1, CST-5.2, CST-6.1, CST-6.2, CST-6.3	Less than Significant	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

<i>#</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>
3.3-2	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not significantly interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	Policies HE-25 Tasks HE-25.1, HE-25.2	Less than Significant	None Required
3.3-3	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not conflict with the provisions of the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan.	Policies LU-23, RME-16	Less than Significant	None Required
3.4 Cultural and Historic Resources				
3.4-1	Future development under the proposed General Plan does not have the potential to significantly adversely affect historic resources that appear on State historical inventories or may be eligible for inclusion on such lists.	Policies RME-19, RME-20 Tasks RME-19.1, RME-19.2, RME-19.3, RME-19.4, RME-19.5, RME-20.1, RME-20.2, RME-20.3, RME-20.4	Less than Significant	None Required
3.4-2	Future development under the proposed General Plan does not have the potential to significantly adversely affect undiscovered archaeological or paleontological resources and human remains	Policy LU-19 Task LU-19.1	Less than Significant	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

#	Impact	Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact	Significance	Mitigation
3.5 Geology and Soils				
3.5-1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not expose people or structures to significantly adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known fault, strong seismic ground shaking, landslides or lateral spreading.	Policies SE-1.1, SE-1.2, SE-1.3, SE-1.4, SE-1.5, SE-1.6, SE-6.1, SE-6.2, SE-6.4	Less than Significant	None Required
3.5-2	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not be significantly impacted by unstable geologic unit or soil.	Policies SE-1.1, SE-1.2, SE-1.3, SE-1.4, SE-1.5, SE-1.6, SE-6.1, SE-6.2, SE-6.4	Less than Significant	None Required
3.5-3	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not be significantly impacted by expansive soils	Policies SE-1.1, SE-1.2, SE-1.3, SE-1.4, SE-1.5, SE-1.6, SE-6.1, SE-6.2, SE-6.4	Less than Significant	None Required
3.6 Greenhouse Gases and Energy				
3.6-1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not result in wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.	Policies HE-23, HE-24, HE-28 Tasks HE-23.1, HE-23.2, HE-24.1, HE-24.2, HE-28.1, HE-28.2, HE-28.3, HE-28.4	Less than Significant	None Required
3.6-2	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in a ratio of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions to service population not exceeding 6.6 MTCO ₂ e.	Policies LU-2, LU-4, LU-6, HE-2, HE-23, CE-24, HE-28 CE-7, CE-8, CE-9, CE-13, CE-14, CE-15, CE-16, CE-17, CE-19 Tasks HE-23.1	Less than Significant	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

<i>#</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>
3.6-3	Implementation of the proposed General Plan would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.	N/A	No Impact	None Required
3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
3.7-1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, including through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	Policies LU-18, SE-4.1, SE-4.2, SE-4.3, SE-4.4, SE-4.5, SE-4.6	Less than Significant	None Required
3.7-2	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not result in significant hazardous emissions or significant handling hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	Policies LU-18, SE-4.1, SE-4.2, SE-4.3, SE-4.4, SE-4.5, SE-4.6	Less than Significant	None Required
3.7-3	Implementation of the proposed General Plan could allow development on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	Policies LU-18, SE-4.1, SE-4.2, SE-4.3, SE-4.4, SE-4.5, SE-4.6	Less than Significant	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

#	Impact	Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact	Significance	Mitigation
3.7-4	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	Policies SE-3.2, SE-3.3, SE-3.4, SE-3.5	Less than Significant	None Required
3.8 Hydrology, Flooding, and Water Quality				
3.8-1	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not significantly violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise significantly degrade water quality.	Policy RME-8, RME-9 Tasks RME-8.1, RME-8.2, RME-8.3, RME-8.4, RME-8.5, RME-9.1	Less than Significant	None Required
3.8-2	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not significantly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.	Policy RME-8, RME-9 Tasks RME-8.1, RME-8.2, RME-8.3, RME-8.4, RME-8.5, RME-9.1	Less than Significant	None Required
3.8-3	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not significantly alter existing drainage patterns of the area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	Policy RME-8, RME-9 Tasks RME-8.1, RME-8.2, RME-8.3, RME-8.4, RME-8.5, RME-9.1	Less than Significant	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

<i>#</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>
3.8-4	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not expose people to significant risk of flooding or tsunami inundation	Policy SE-2.1, SE-2.2, SE-2.3, SE-2.4, SE-2.5, SE-5.1, SE-5.2, SE-5.3, SE-5.4, SE-5.5, SE-5.6, SE-5.7	Less than Significant	None Required
3.9 Land Use and Housing				
3.91	The proposed General Plan does not make substantial changes to the types of land uses in an area that may physically divide an established community.	Policy LU-4, LU-6,	Less than Significant	None Required
3.9-2	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, population, or jobs.	Policy LU-1, LU-2, LU-4, HE-20 Tasks LU-2.1, HE-20.1	Less than Significant	None Required
3.9-3	The proposed General Plan does not conflict with existing local plans and zoning ordinances	Tasks HE-6.2, HE-6.5, LU-2.1, LU-2.2, LU-4.4, LU-7.1, LU-11.1, LU-12, LU-14.1, LU-23.2, HE-6.4, HE-6.6, HE-7.1, HE-8.1, HE-9.1, HE-9.2, HE-11.4, HE-14.1, HE-14.3, HE-14.4, HE-15.3, HE-15.4, HE-16.2, HE-20.1, HE-21.1, HE-25.1, HE-28.4, CE-10.2, CE-10.4, CE-11.3, CE-15.2, RME-9.3, RME-16.2, RME-20.2, CST-5.1, CST-5.2, CST-6.1, CST-6.2, CST-8.1, CST-8.2, CST-8.4, CST-8.5, CST-9.1, CST-9.2, CST-12.1, CST-12	Less than Significant	None Required
3.9-4	The proposed General Plan does not create conflicts with height limits established for the San Francisco International Airport airspace.	Policies LU-21, NE-10	Less than Significant	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

#	Impact	Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact	Significance	Mitigation
3.9-5	The proposed General Plan does not create conflicts with land use policies in the California Coastal Act.	Policies CST-5, CST-6, CST-8 CST-11	Less than Significant	None Required
3.10 Noise				
3.10-1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the city vicinity above acceptable noise levels, which would impact existing and anticipated sensitive receptors.	Policies LU-18, HE-4, NE-1, NE-2, NE-3, NE-4, NE-5, NE-6, NE-7, NE-8, NE-9, NE-10, NE-11, NE-12, NE-13 Tasks LU-18.1. HE-4.1, HE-4.2, HE-4.3, NE-1.1, NE-1.2, NE-2.1, NE-3.1, NE-3.2, NE-4.1, NE-5.1, NE-6.1, NE-6.2, NE-7.1, NE-8.1, NE-8.2, NE-9.1, NE-10.1	Significant and Unavoidable	None. Despite implementation of the proposed General Plan policies, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.
3.10-2	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not result in a significant temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above current levels.	Policies LU-18, HE-4, NE-1, NE-2, NE-3, NE-4, NE-5, NE-6, NE-7, NE-8, NE-9, NE-10, NE-11, NE-12, NE-13 Tasks LU-18.1. HE-4.1, HE-4.2, HE-4.3, NE-1.1, NE-1.2, NE-2.1, NE-3.1, NE-3.2, NE-4.1, NE-5.1, NE-6.1, NE-6.2, NE-7.1, NE-8.1, NE-8.2, NE-9.1, NE-10.1	Less than Significant	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

<i>#</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>
3.10-3	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not result in the exposure of persons to, or generation of, significantly excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.	Policies LU-18, HE-4, NE-1, NE-2, NE-3, NE-4, NE-5, NE-6, NE-7, NE-8, NE-9, NE-10, NE-11, NE-12, NE-13 Tasks LU-18.1. HE-4.1, HE-4.2, HE-4.3, NE-1.1, NE-1.2, NE-2.1, NE-3.1, NE-3.2, NE-4.1, NE-5.1, NE-6.1, NE-6.2, NE-7.1, NE-8.1, NE-8.2, NE-9.1, NE-10.1	Less than Significant	None Required
3.10-4	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not result in the exposure of persons to, or generation of, significantly excessive levels of noise from BART train operations.	Policies LU-18, HE-4, NE-1, NE-2, NE-3, NE-4, NE-5, NE-6, NE-7, NE-8, NE-9, NE-10, NE-11, NE-12, NE-13 Tasks LU-18.1. HE-4.1, HE-4.2, HE-4.3, NE-1.1, NE-1.2, NE-2.1, NE-3.1, NE-3.2, NE-4.1, NE-5.1, NE-6.1, NE-6.2, NE-7.1, NE-8.1, NE-8.2, NE-9.1, NE-10.1	Less than Significant	None Required
3.10-5	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not result in the exposure of persons to significantly excessive airport noise levels.	Policies LU-18, HE-4, NE-1, NE-2, NE-3, NE-4, NE-5, NE-6, NE-7, NE-8, NE-9, NE-10, NE-11, NE-12, NE-13 Tasks LU-18.1. HE-4.1, HE-4.2, HE-4.3, NE-1.1, NE-1.2, NE-2.1, NE-3.1, NE-3.2, NE-4.1, NE-5.1, NE-6.1, NE-6.2, NE-7.1, NE-8.1, NE-8.2, NE-9.1, NE-10.1	Less than Significant	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

#	Impact	Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact	Significance	Mitigation
3.11 Public Services and Facilities				
3.11-1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will increase the demand for fire and police protection services.	Policies SE-3.1, SE-3.2, SE-3.3, SE-3.4	Less than Significant	None Required
3.11-2	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not result in increased demand for school facilities beyond existing capacity.	N/A	Less than Significant	None Required
3.11-3	Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not result in an unmet need for parkland in the city.	Policies RME-11, RME-12, RME-13, RME-14, LU-20 Tasks RME-11.1, RME-12.1, RME 13.1 Program RME-3	Less than Significant	None Required
3.12 Traffic and Circulation				
3.12-1	Future development under the proposed General Plan, along with regional population and employment growth, will result in an increase in traffic and cause intersection LOS standards established by the proposed General Plan to be exceeded.	Policy CE-1 Task CE-1.2	Significant and Unavoidable	None. Potential mitigation measures (such as road widening) were found to be in contravention to the proposed General Plan or infeasible, given economic, environmental, and legal factors, indicating that the impact remains significant.

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

<i>#</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>
3.12-2	Future development under the proposed General Plan, along with regional population and employment growth, will not result in a significant conflict with San Mateo and San Francisco Congestion Management Program standards.	Policies CE-5, CE-6 Tasks CE-5.1, CE-5.2, CE-6.3, CE-6.3	Less than Significant	None Required
3.12-3	The proposed General Plan will not significantly conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities	Policies CE-7, CE-8, CE-9, CE-13, CE-14, CE-15, CD-16, CE-17, CE-18, CE-19, CE-20, CE-21, CE-22	Less than Significant	None Required
3.13 Utilities and Services Systems				
3.13-1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan does not require additional water supply beyond that available from existing entitlements and resources, as planned for in the Urban Water Management Plan, or cause an exceedance of distribution capacity.	Policy RME-1, RME-2, RME-3, RME-4 Tasks RME-1.1, RME-1.2, RME-1.3, RME-2.1, RME-2.2, RME-4.1, RME-4.2	Less than Significant	None Required
3.13-2	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not cause wastewater treatment capacity of the WWTP to be exceeded and will not require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of facilities.	Policy RME-8, RME-9, CST-7 Task RME-8.1, RME-8.2, RME-8.3, RME-8.4, RME-8.5, RME-9.1, RME-9.2, RME-9.3,	Less than Significant	None Required

TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT

#	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>
3.13-3	Future development under the proposed General Plan will be served by a landfill with adequate permitted capacity and will not fail to comply with regulations related to solid waste.	Policy SE-4.4	Less than Significant	None Required
3.14 Impacts Not Potentially Significant				
3.14-1-1	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not affect agriculture and forest resources.	N/A	No Impact	None Required
3.14-2-1	Future development under the proposed General Plan will not affect mineral resources	N/A	No Impact	None Required