

2. Executive Summary

This chapter presents an overview of the proposed General Plan 2040 and Downtown Precise Plan, herein referred to separately, or together referred to as the “proposed project.” This executive summary also provides a summary of the alternatives to the proposed project, identifies issues to be resolved, areas of controversy, and conclusions of the analysis in Chapters 4 through 4.18 of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). For a complete description of the proposed project, see Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR. For a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project, see Chapter 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, of this Draft EIR.

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

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

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

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

- To disclose to decision-makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
- To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
- To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- To enhance public participation in the planning process.

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

2.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction.** Provides an overview describing the Draft EIR document.
- **Chapter 2: Executive Summary.** Summarizes environmental consequences that would result from implementation of the proposed project, describes recommended mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of environmental impacts with and without mitigation.
- **Chapter 3: Project Description.** Describes the proposed project in detail, including the characteristics, objectives, and the structural and technical elements of the proposed action.
- **Chapter 4: Environmental Analysis.** Organized into 18 subchapters corresponding to the environmental resource categories identified in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Environmental Checklist, this chapter provides a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published and by referencing historic conditions that are supported with substantial evidence, from both a local and regional perspective. Additionally, this chapter provides an analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and recommended mitigation measures, if required, to reduce the impacts to less than significant where possible, and to reduce their magnitude or significance when

³ CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

impacts cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The environmental setting included in each subchapter provides baseline physical conditions, which provide a context, which the lead agency uses to determine the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Each subchapter also includes a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project; and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project.

- **Chapter 5: Alternatives to the Proposed Project.** Considers alternatives to the proposed project, including the CEQA-required “No Project Alternative” and “environmentally superior alternative.”
- **Chapter 6: CEQA-Required Conclusions and Findings.** Discusses growth inducement, cumulative impacts, unavoidable significant effects, and significant irreversible changes as a result of the proposed project.
- **Chapter 7: Organizations and Persons Consulted.** Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR for the proposed project.
- **Chapter 8: Common Acronyms and Abbreviations.** Lists the common acronyms and abbreviations found in this Draft EIR
- **Appendices:** The appendices for this document contain the following supporting documents:
 - Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Scoping Comments
 - Appendix B: Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies, and Programs
 - Appendix C: Staff Recommended Land Use Map Changes
 - Appendix D: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data
 - Appendix E: Biological Resources Data
 - Appendix F: Cultural Resources Data
 - Appendix G: Hazardous Materials Data
 - Appendix H: Noise Data
 - Appendix I: Transportation Data

2.3 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THIS DRAFT EIR

As described in the CEQA Guidelines, different types of EIRs are used for varying situations and intended uses. Because of the long-term planning horizon of the proposed project and the permitting, planning, and development actions that are related both geographically and as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions for implementation, this Draft EIR has been prepared as a program EIR for the proposed project, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. Once the program EIR has been certified, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether additional CEQA review is needed. However, where the program EIR addresses the program’s effects as specifically and comprehensively as is reasonably possible, later activities that are within scope of the effects examined in the program EIR, may qualify for a streamlined environmental review process or may be exempt from environmental review. When a program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into the

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

subsequent activities.⁴ If a subsequent activity would have effects that are not within the scope of the program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR unless the activity qualifies for an exemption. For these subsequent environmental review documents, this program EIR will serve as the first-tier environmental analysis to streamline future environmental review.

2.4 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would replace the City's existing General Plan, which has a buildout horizon to 2020, with an updated General Plan and a new Downtown Precise Plan. The proposed project would also introduce new zoning provisions in the Downtown Precise Plan Area, including development regulations and design standards that implement the Downtown Precise Plan.

The existing General Plan 2020 was prepared in 2004. It involved a major overhaul and modernization of the prior General Plan 2000 that was adopted in 1988. The City determined that the General Plan 2020 provided a good foundation for General Plan 2040. The General Plan 2020 included a comprehensive review process, resulting in a broad range of community goals and policies. Many of the community issues vetted in General Plan 2020 are still relevant, well addressed, and do not require major change. Therefore, the approach to the proposed General Plan 2040 is not a comprehensive update, rather, it builds off of the current General Plan 2020 by incorporating the topics that are now required by State mandate and revises relevant policies and programs to meet those requirements. It also incorporates regional forecasts for 2040, thus moving the planning horizon forward by 20 years. Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR includes a detailed description of the proposed project.

2.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

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

- **Alternative A: No Project (Current General Plan).** Consistent with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, Alternative A presents the No Project scenario. Accordingly, under this alternative the proposed project would not be adopted or implemented, and further development in the city would continue to be subject to existing policies, regulations, development standards, and land use designations under the existing General Plan 2020.
- **Alternative B: Greater Residential Growth.** Alternative B presents greater residential and fewer jobs when compared to the proposed project. This alternative would increase the number of housing units

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

and population but would reduce the number of employees when compared to the proposed project. This alternative would include the same proposed General Plan 2040 land use designations as the proposed project except for two additional locations that do not currently allow for housing. Under this alternative, these two locations would allow for housing. Because this alternative includes more housing, at least some light industrial, office, and retail land uses would potentially be displaced.

- **Alternative C: Lower Residential Growth.** Alternative C presents a fewer residential and greater jobs when compared to the proposed project. This alternative would reduce the number of housing units and population but would increase the number of employees when compared to the proposed project. This alternative excluded several Housing Element sites and Downtown Precise Plan sites included in the proposed project. This alternative would convert less commercial acreage to housing. This alternative would include the same proposed General Plan 2040 land use designations as the proposed project and differ only in the presumed rate of growth.

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

2.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

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

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

2.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The City issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on March 29, 2019. The CEQA-mandated scoping period for this EIR was between March 29, 2019, and April 29, 2019, during which interested agencies and the public could submit comments about the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. During this

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

time, the City received comment letters from a variety of State and local agencies as well as several organizations and members of the public.

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

- Potential barriers to implementing evacuation plans in the event of wildfire.
- Watershed restoration.
- Status of air quality and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Provision of adequate housing.
- Protection of the shoreline and of development related to sea level rise.
- Vehicular circulation and traffic impacts.
- Visual impacts of higher-density development.
- Impacts of development on public services.
- Effects of cumulative development.

2.8 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 2-1 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis in this Draft EIR and presents a summary of significant impacts and mitigation measures identified. It is organized to correspond with the environmental issues where impacts were found to be significant. These topics include air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise and vibration, and transportation. All other topics were determined to be less than significant, and no mitigation measures were required. Table 2-1 is arranged in four columns: (1) impact; (2) significance without mitigation; (3) mitigation measures; and (4) significance with mitigation. For a complete description of potential impacts, including those where no mitigation measures are required, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapters 4.1 through 4.18.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
4.3 AIR QUALITY			
Impact AIR-2.1: Construction activities associated with potential future development could potentially violate an air quality standard or cumulatively contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.	S	Mitigation Measure AIR-2.1: To reduce temporary increases in criteria air pollutant emissions (NO _x) during the construction phase for discretionary development projects that are subject to CEQA which exceed the screening sizes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines, the City shall adopt the following General Plan Program to support Policy C-2.4 (Particulate Matter Pollution Reduction) to be implemented as part of the project approval process: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ New Program: Require projects that exceed the BAAQMD screening sizes to evaluate project-specific construction emissions in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology and if construction-related criteria air pollutants exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, require the project applicant to mitigate the impacts to an acceptable level.	LTS
Impact AIR-2.2: Operational activities associated with potential future development could cumulatively contribute to the non-attainment designations of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.	S	Mitigation Measure AIR-2.2: To reduce long-term increases in air pollutants during the operation phase for discretionary development projects that are subject to CEQA which exceed the screening sizes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines, the City shall adopt the following General Plan Program to support Policy C-2.2 (Land Use Compatibility and Building Standards) be implemented as part of the project approval process: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ New Program: Require projects that exceed the BAAQMD screening sizes to evaluate project-specific operation emissions in conformance with BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, and if operation-related air pollutants exceed the BAAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, require the project applicants to mitigate the impact to an acceptable level.	SU
Impact AIR-3.1: Construction activities associated with potential future development could expose nearby receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants.	S	Mitigation Measure AIR-3.1a: Implement Mitigation Measure AIR-2.1. Mitigation Measure AIR-3.1b: To ensure sensitive receptors are not exposed to toxic air contaminant emissions during the construction phase for discretionary development projects that are subject to CEQA that exceed the screening sizes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines, the City shall adopt the following General Plan Program to	LTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
<p>Impact AIR-3.2. Operational activities associated with potential future development could expose sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air contaminant concentrations from nonpermitted sources.</p>	S	<p>support Policy C-2.2: (Land Use Compatibility and Building Standards) be implemented as part of the project approval process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Program: As recommended by the California Air Resources Board, require projects that would result in construction activities within 1,000 feet of residential and other land uses that are sensitive to toxic air contaminants (e.g., hospitals, nursing homes, day care centers), as measured from the property line of the project, to prepare a construction health risk assessment in accordance with policies and procedures of the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines that identifies mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0). <p>Mitigation Measure AIR-3.2: To ensure sensitive receptors are not exposed to toxic air contaminant emissions during the operation phase for discretionary development projects that are subject to CEQA which exceed the screening sizes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines, the City shall adopt the following General Plan Program to support Policy C-2.2: (Land Use Compatibility and Building Standards) be implemented as part of the project approval process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Program: Require applicants for industrial or warehousing land uses or commercial land uses that would generate substantial diesel truck travel (i.e., 100 diesel trucks per day or 40 or more trucks with diesel-powered transport refrigeration units per day) to contact BAAQMD to determine the appropriate level of operational health risk assessment (HRA) required. If required, the operational HRA shall be prepared in accordance with the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and BAAQMD requirements and mitigated to an acceptable level. 	SU
4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact BIO-1: Impacts to special-status species or the inadvertent loss of bird nests in active use, which would conflict with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, could occur as a result of potential new development.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-1: To ensure sensitive species of any kind are not adversely impacted by implementation of the proposed project, the City shall adopt revisions to General Plan Program C-1.13B and shall adopt a new Program or modify an existing program to clarify the need for special-status species surveys and to ensure avoidance of nests of native birds in active use to support Policy C-1.13 (Special Status Species). Revisions to Program C-</p>	LTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		<p>1.13B are shown in <u>double-underlined</u> text while the new Program is in standard text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modified Program C-1.13B: Surveys for Special-Status Species. Require that sites <u>with suitable natural habitat, including creek corridors through urbanized areas,</u> be surveyed for the presence or absence of special status species prior to development approval. Such surveys should <u>be conducted by a qualified biologist and</u> occur prior to development-related vegetation removal <u>or other habitat modifications.</u> ▪ New or Modified Program: Avoidance of Nesting Birds. Nests of native bird nests in active use should be avoided in compliance with State and federal regulations. For new development sites where nesting birds may be present, vegetation clearing and construction should be initiated outside the bird nesting season (March 1 through August 31) or preconstruction surveys should be conducted by a qualified biologist in advance of any disturbance. If active nests are encountered, appropriate buffer zones should be established based on recommendations by the qualified biologist and remain in place until any young birds have successfully left the nest. 	
<p>Impact BIO-2 Impacts to riparian areas, drainages, and sensitive natural communities could occur from potential future development where natural habitat remains.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2: To ensure sensitive riparian areas, drainages, and sensitive natural communities are not impacted through implementation of the proposed project, the City shall adopt the following General Plan Program or amend other programs to support Policy C-1.12 (Native or Sensitive Habitats) to ensure that sensitive natural communities are identified and addressed as part of future development review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New or Modified Program: Surveys for Sensitive Natural Communities. Require that sites with suitable natural habitat, including creek corridors through urbanized areas, be surveyed for the presence or absence of sensitive natural communities prior to development approval. Such surveys should be conducted by a qualified biologist and occur prior to development-related vegetation removal or other habitat modifications. 	LTS
<p>Impact BIO-3 Potential future development could result in direct and indirect impacts to wetland habitat.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3: To ensure that sensitive wetland habitats are not impacted directly or indirectly through implementation of the proposed project, the City shall adopt the following General Plan Program or amend other programs to support Policy C-1.1 (Wetlands Protection) to ensure that</p>	LTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
<p>Impact BIO-4 Potential future development in the EIR Study Area could result in impacts on the movement of wildlife and potential for increased risk of bird collisions.</p>	S	<p>jurisdictional waters are identified and addressed as part of future development review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New or Modified Program: Surveys for Regulated Waters. Require that sites with suitable natural habitat, including creek corridors through urbanized areas, be surveyed for the presence or absence of regulated waters prior to development approval. Such surveys should be conducted by a qualified wetland specialist and occur prior to development-related vegetation removal or other habitat modifications. <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-4: To ensure that potential future development under implementation of the proposed project does not result in impacts on the movement of wildlife, the City shall adopt the following General Plan programs or amend other programs to support Policy C-1.11 (Wildlife Corridors) so that important movement corridors and the potential for increased risk of bird collisions are identified and addressed as part of future development review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New or Modified Program: Surveys for Wildlife Movement Corridors. Require that sites with suitable natural habitat, including creek corridors through urbanized areas, be surveyed for the presence or absence of important wildlife corridors prior to development approval. Such surveys should be conducted by a qualified biologist and occur prior to development-related vegetation removal or other habitat modifications. ▪ New or Modified Program: Consider Risk of Bird Collision. Require that taller structures be designed to minimize the potential risk of bird collisions using input from the latest bird-safe design guidelines and best management practice strategies to reduce bird strikes. ▪ New Program: Bird Safe Design Ordinance. Develop and adopt a Bird Safe Design ordinance to provide specific criteria and refined guidelines as part of design review of new buildings and taller structures. 	LTS
<p>4.5 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</p>			
<p>Impact CULT-1: Future development in San Rafael on sites that contain a historic resource may cause the demolition, destruction, or alteration of a historic resource such that the significance of the resource is</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure CULT-1: To ensure sites that contain a historic resource that are subject to demolition, destruction, or alteration, are mitigated to an acceptable level, the City shall amend Program CDP-5.1A (Preservation Ordinance).</p>	SU

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
"materially impaired." Such adverse changes or potential adverse changes in the significance of a CEQA-defined historic resource would constitute a significant impact.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modified Program CDP-5.1A: Update Historic Preservation Ordinance. The City of San Rafael shall modify the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance to include updated procedures to mitigate impacts from the demolition, destruction, or alteration of historic resources. 	
Impact CULT-2: Implementation of the proposed project could have the potential to cause a significant impact to an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	S	<p>Mitigation Measure CULT-2: To ensure sites where archeological resources are unearthed during the construction phase of development projects are mitigated to an acceptable level, the City shall amend Program CDP-5.13A (Archeological Resources Ordinance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modify Program CDP-5.13A: Update Archeological Resources Ordinance. The City of San Rafael shall modify the City's Archeological Resources Ordinance to include construction best management practices to follow if a potentially significant archaeological resource is encountered during ground disturbing activities. 	LTS
Impact CULT-3: Ground-disturbing activities as a result of future development in the EIR Study Area could encounter human remains, the disturbance of which could result in a significant impact under CEQA.	S	<p>Mitigation Measure CULT-3: To ensure human remains that are unearthed during the construction phase of development projects are protected, the City shall adopt a new Program to support Policy CDP-5.13 (Protection of Archaeological Resources).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Program: Human Remains. Any human remains encountered during ground-disturbing activities would be required to be treated in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA), which state the mandated procedures of conduct following the discovery of human remains. 	LTS
Impact CULT-4: Ground-disturbing activities as a result of future development under the proposed project could encounter Tribal Cultural Resources, the disturbance of which could result in a significant impact under CEQA.	S	Mitigation Measure CULT-4: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-2 and CULT-3.	LTS
4.7 GEOLOGY SOILS			
Impact GEO-6: Construction activities associated with potential future development could have the potential to	S	Mitigation Measure GEO-6: To ensure sensitive and unique paleontological resources are not directly or indirectly affected in the event that such resources are unearthed during project grading, demolition, or building (such	LTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
directly or indirectly affect a unique paleontological resource.		as fossils or fossil-bearing deposits), the City shall adopt the following new General Plan Policy and associated Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Policy: Paleontological Resource Protection. Prohibit the damage or destruction of paleontological resources, including prehistorically significant fossils, ruins, monuments, or objects of antiquity, that could potentially be caused by future development. ▪ New Program: Paleontological Resource Mitigation Protocol. The City shall prepare and adopt a list of protocols in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards that protect or mitigate impacts to paleontological resources, including requiring grading and construction projects to cease activity when a paleontological resource is discovered so it can be safely removed 	
4.8 GHG Emissions			
Impact GHG-1: Implementation of the proposed project may not meet the long-term GHG reduction goal under Executive Order S-03-05.	S	Implementation of the General Plan 2040 goals, policies, and programs would ensure that the City’s GHG emissions are reduced to the degree feasible. Policy C-5.1, Climate Change Action Plan, requires the City maintain and periodically update the CCAP. Policy C-5.1 is supported by Programs C-5.1A, C-5.1B, and C-5.1C, which require annual progress reports, quarterly forums, and identification of funding sources. Implementation of this Policy and its associated Programs would ensure the City is monitoring the CCAP’s progress toward achieving the City’s GHG reduction target and requires amendments if the CCAP is not achieving the specified level. The update would ensure the CCAP is on the trajectory consistent with the GHG emissions-reduction goal established under Executive Order S-03-05 for year 2050 and the latest applicable statewide legislative GHG emission reduction that may be in effect at the time of the CCAP update (e.g., Senate Bill 32 for year 2030). GHG inventories of existing and forecast year GHG levels. However, at this time, there is no plan that extends beyond 2030 that achieves the long-term GHG reduction goal established under Executive Order S-03-05. As identified by the California Council on Science and Technology, the state cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advancements in technology. Advancement in technology in the future could provide additional reductions to allow the state and City to meet the 2050 goal; however, no additional statewide measures are currently available.	SU

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
<p>Impact HAZ-4: Potential future development could result in construction and operation activities on sites with known hazardous materials and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: To ensure that construction on sites with known contamination pursuant to the lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, which include, but are not limited to, the Department of Toxic Substance Control’s online EnviroStor database and the State Water Resource Control Board’s online GeoTracker database, do not result in or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, the City shall adopt the following General Plan programs to support Policy S-5.4 (Development on Formerly Contaminated Sites) to be implemented as part of the project approval process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Program: Environmental Site Management Plan. Require the preparation of an Environmental Site Management Plan (ESMP) in consultation with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and/or the Department of Toxic Substance Control, for proposed development on sites with known contamination of hazardous materials pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, which include, but are not limited to, the Department of Toxic Substance Control’s online EnviroStor database and the State Water Resource Control Board’s online GeoTracker database. ▪ New Program: Soil Vapor Intrusion Assessment. For sites with potential residual contamination in soil or groundwater that are planned for redevelopment with an overlying occupied building, a soil vapor intrusion assessment shall be performed by a licensed environmental professional. If the results of the vapor intrusion assessment indicate the potential for significant vapor intrusion into an occupied building, project design shall include vapor controls or source removal, as appropriate, in accordance with regulatory agency requirements. 	LTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
4.13 NOISE AND VIBRATION			
<p>Impact NOISE-1: Construction activities associated with potential future development could expose sensitive receptors in close proximity to a construction site to noise that exceed the City’s noise limits established in San Rafael Municipal Code Chapter 8.13, Noise.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: To ensure receptors that are sensitive to construction noise are not exposed to unacceptable construction noise levels as defined in San Rafael Municipal Code Chapter 8.13, Noise, for discretionary development projects that are subject to CEQA the City shall amend Program N-1.9B (Construction Noise) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modified Program: Construction Best Management Practices. The City shall establish a list of construction best management practices to be implemented during the construction phase and incorporated into San Rafael Municipal Code Chapter 8.13, Noise. The City of San Rafael Building Division shall verify that these notations, as appropriate, are on the demolition, grading, and construction plans prior to issuance of demolition, grading and/or building permits. 	LTS
<p>Impact NOISE-2a: Construction activities associated with potential future development could generate excessive short-term vibration levels during project construction.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure NOISE-2a: To ensure receptors, both buildings and people, that are sensitive to vibration from construction noise are not exposed to unacceptable vibration levels from discretionary development projects that are subject to CEQA the City shall revise General Plan Program N-1.11A (Vibration-Related Conditions of Approval) to support Policy N-1.11 (Vibration) be implemented as part of the project approval process. Revisions to Program N-1.11A are shown in <u>double-underlined</u> text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modified Program N-1.11A: <u>Construction Vibration-Related Conditions of Approval.</u> Adopt standard conditions of approval <u>in San Rafael Municipal Code Chapter 8.13, Noise, that require the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria for acceptable levels of groundborne vibration for various types of buildings be applied</u> to reduce the potential for vibration-related construction impacts for development projects near sensitive uses such as <u>older or historically significant buildings and structures</u>, housing, and schools. <u>If vibration levels exceed the FTA limits, the condition of approval shall identify alternative uses, such as drilling piles instead of pile driving and static rollers instead of vibratory rollers.</u> <u>Construction vibration impacts shall be considered as part of project level environmental evaluation and approval for individual future projects.</u> 	LTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
Impact NOISE-2b: Operational activities associated with potential future development could generate excessive long-term vibration levels.	S	<p>Mitigation Measure NOISE-2b: To ensure receptors that are sensitive to operational vibration from commercial or industrial uses are not exposed to unacceptable vibration levels from discretionary development projects that are subject to CEQA the City shall, shall adopt the following General Plan Program to support Policy N-1.11 (Vibration) be implemented as part of the project approval process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Program: Adopt standard conditions of approval in San Rafael Municipal Code Chapter 8.13, Noise, that require the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria for acceptable levels of groundborne vibration from commercial or industrial uses to reduce long-term vibration impacts at existing or potential future sensitive uses such as uses with vibration-sensitive equipment (e.g., microscopes in hospitals and research facilities) or residences. Operational vibration impacts shall be considered as part of project level environmental evaluation and approval for individual future projects. 	LTS
4.16 TRANSPORTATION			
Impact TRAN-1a Implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant land use VMT impact for Total VMT and Work VMT due to forecast land use growth through 2040, based on a comparison of the VMT rate increment for Total VMT Per Service Population and Work VMT Per Employee to the corresponding average baseline rates for the full nine-county Bay Area.	S	<p>Mitigation Measure TRAN-1a: To reduce vehicle miles traveled the City shall modify Program M-3.3A (TDM Program Guidelines) to support achievement of the VMT reduction Standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modified Program 3-3A: Update Trip Reduction Ordinance. Develop TDM Program Guidelines. The City of San Rafael shall modify the Trip Reduction Ordinance (TRO) to reflect General Plan 2040 Policy M-3.1 and focus on VMT reduction measures. The amended TRO shall include the City’s VMT reduction thresholds, VMT reduction measures and program guidelines, and a VMT trip reduction monitoring process. The TRO shall be updated a minimum of every five years to reflect changes in baseline VMT values, VMT thresholds, VMT reduction measures, and the monitoring process. The modified TRO shall reflect the process and methodology for conducting the VMT analysis for development projects as described in the City’s Transportation Analysis (TA) Guidelines. 	SU
Impact TRAN-1b: Implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant road network VMT impact due to the planned capacity of the roadway system.	S	Mitigation Measure TRAN-1b: Implement Mitigation Measure TRAN-1a.	SU

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
Impact TRAN-6: Implementation of the proposed project could cumulatively contribute to regional VMT.	S	Mitigation Measure TRAN-6: Implement Mitigation Measure TRAN-1a.	SU