

CITY OF ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA

# **2350 Fifth Street (Bottle Parcel) Rezoning Project**

INITIAL STUDY &  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

AUGUST 2020



# California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Initial Study/Environmental Checklist

**1. Project Title:** 2350 Fifth Street (Bottle Parcel) Rezoning

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

City of Alameda  
Planning Division  
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 190  
Alameda, CA 94501

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Andrew Thomas, Planning Director  
(510) 747-6881  
[athomas@alamedaca.org](mailto:athomas@alamedaca.org)

**4. Project Location:**

Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 74-1356-23

The project site is located at 2350 Fifth Street in the City of Alameda. The site is situated approximately 300 feet south of the intersection of Fifth Street and Willie Stargell Avenue, in the West End planning subarea of the City. Regional access is provided by State Route 260, the Posey and Webster Tubes, located about 0.3-mile to the north, and Interstate 880 (Nimitz Freeway), located about 1.1 mile to the north.

**5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

City of Alameda  
Planning Division  
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 190  
Alameda, CA 94501

Andrew Thomas, Planning Director  
(510) 747-6881  
[athomas@alamedaca.org](mailto:athomas@alamedaca.org)

**6. General Plan Designation:**

Medium-Density Residential

**7. Zoning:**

MX (Mixed Use)

## **8. Description of Project:**

The proposed project is a Zoning Map amendment to change the Zoning designation for the subject property from Mixed Use (M-X) to R-4 Neighborhood Residential District. The 35,556-square-foot (0.82-acre) property is currently vacant. The proposed rezoning would facilitate the use of the property for residential use and development. The location of the property is shown on Figure 1.

The M-X zoning designation is intended for large sites that will be developed over several phases with a mix of uses. The M-X Mixed Use zoning requires preparation of a Master Plan prior to development. Once the Master Plan is completed and reviewed by the Planning Board and approved by the City Council, the M-X zoning requires the property owner to submit a Development Plan for the site and a Design Review application for each phase of development on the site. All these steps must be completed and approved before the property owner may submit for a building permit.

Similar to the M-X Zoning District, the proposed R-4 residential zoning allows residential development of the site with a maximum residential density of one unit per 2,000 square feet. The R-4 Zoning differs from the M-X Zoning District in that the R-4 Zoning District requires only Design Review approval before issuance of building permits.

Based on the allowable density in the R-4 district, the 35,556-square-foot site would allow development of up to 17 dwelling units on the site. With the State Affordable Housing Density Bonus, up to 25 dwelling units would be allowed. Although a specific development proposal has not been submitted to the City for approval, this Initial Study evaluates potential environmental effects that could result from the construction and operation of 25 multi-family residential units on the site.

### ***Planning Approvals***

Zoning Amendment: Pursuant to Alameda Municipal Code Chapter XXX, Article I, Section 30-22, the project would require approval of a Zoning Map amendment by the City Council to change the project site to an R-4 Neighborhood Residential District.

Design Review: Future development of the site with a residential use would require review and approval by the Planning Director or the Alameda Planning Board, pursuant to Chapter XXX, Article II, Sections 30-36 and 30-37 of the Alameda Municipal Code. However, the currently proposed rezoning project would not require Design Review approval.

## **9. Project Setting**

The approximately 0.82-acre (35,556-square-foot) project site, roughly triangular in shape, is located on the northwestern edge of the College of Alameda campus. It is situated immediately to the west of the campus running track and immediately north of the campus tennis courts. The level site is vacant and enclosed by cyclone fencing. The parcel has previously been used for vehicle parking, and has a surface of deteriorating asphalt pavement and packed gravel, except along the edges, which are vegetated with mown ruderal grasses and weeds. Street trees line the site frontage on Fifth Street.

The College of Alameda campus extends to the east and south of the project site, while the area to the west is occupied by residential development. Immediately to the west is a complex of multi-family apartment buildings, with single-family homes abutting the northern, southern, and western sides of this development. Ruby Bridges Elementary School is located about 670 feet southwest of the project site. Development to the north of the site includes Alameda Landing, a large regional shopping center on the north side of Willie Stargell Avenue, anchored by Safeway and Target stores. The area north of Willie Stargell Avenue and west of Fifth Street is predominantly developed with single-family residences.



**Figure 1**

**Project Location**

Source: Douglas Herring & Associates

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                      | <input type="checkbox"/> GHG Emissions                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning             | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise   | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing            | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                      |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |   |

## DETERMINATION:

On the basis of the initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed name

\_\_\_\_\_  
For

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

### I. AESTHETICS — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There are no scenic vistas available from the project site or anywhere in the vicinity of the site. The site and the surrounding areas are flat, and the only sight lines are provided along the streets in the area. These constrained views consist of urban development lining the paved streets. Although these views do not provide any scenic vistas, future development of the project site with residential uses would have no effect on these views. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact** on a scenic vista.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There are no eligible or State-designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, there are no scenic resources present on the project site. Therefore, the project would have **no adverse impact** on scenic resources within a State scenic highway.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urban area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The existing visual quality of the project site is defined by the packed-gravel surface that covers the majority of the site. There are no appealing aesthetic features on the property. Future residential development on the site would be subject to the City's design review process. In order to

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), List of Eligible and Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, Accessed May 31, 2020 at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>.

obtain design review approval, the proposed development would need to demonstrate that the proposed design is appropriate for the site, is compatible with adjacent or neighboring buildings or surroundings, and promotes harmonious transitions in scale and character in areas between different designated land uses. It would also need to demonstrate that the design of the structure(s) and exterior materials and landscaping are visually compatible with the surrounding development, and design elements have been incorporated to ensure the compatibility of the structure with the character and uses of adjacent development. Because future residential uses on the site could not be approved without the City making these findings, the project would have a ***less-than-significant impact*** on the visual character of the site and its surroundings.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) <i>Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Future residential development on the site would introduce a new source of nighttime lighting to the site in the form of outdoor building security lighting, parking lot light standards (if applicable), and interior building lighting. The lighting would be subject to the design review process discussed in the preceding subsection, and would also need to comply with the Alameda Dark Skies Ordinance, promulgated at Municipal Code Section 30-5.16(c), which requires outdoor lighting to prevent excess light and glare on public roadways and private properties. Compliance with these existing regulations would ensure that the project would have a ***less-than-significant impact*** related to the creation of nighttime lighting and glare.

**II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES** — *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment project and the Forestry Legacy Assessment project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The project site is designated "Urban and Built-Up Land" on the most current map of important farmland in Alameda County prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) by the Department of Conservation (DOC), a department of the California Resources Agency.<sup>2</sup> As implied by the designation, Urban and Built-Up Land is not one of the categories of important farmland mapped by the FMMP. Therefore, implementation of the project would have **no impact** on valuable farmland.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not under a Williamson Act contract.

<sup>2</sup> California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "Alameda County Important Farmland 2016" (map), August 2018.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation: Neither the project site nor any of the surrounding lands are zoned as forest land. The proposed project would therefore have no impact on forest or timber land.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) <i>Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation: Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) defines forest land as land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. There is no forest land on the project site as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) <i>Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation: As discussed above, the project site does not contain farmland or forest land, and implementation of the proposed project would therefore have no potential to convert such lands to other uses.

**III. AIR QUALITY** — Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The air quality plan applicable to the San Francisco Bay Area is the *2017 Clean Air Plan* (CAP) adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) in April 2017.<sup>3</sup> The CAP focuses on two closely-related goals: protecting public health and protecting the climate. Consistent with the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets adopted by the State of California, the CAP lays the groundwork for a long-term effort to reduce Bay Area GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

The 2017 Plan defines an integrated, multi-pollutant control strategy to reduce emissions of particulate matter, toxic air contaminants (TACs), ozone precursors, and greenhouse gases. The proposed control strategy is designed to complement efforts to improve air quality and protect the climate that are being implemented by partner agencies at the State, regional, and local levels. The control strategy encompasses 85 individual control measures that describe specific actions to reduce emissions of air and climate pollutants. The control measures are categorized based upon the economic sector framework used by the Air Resources Board for the AB 32 Scoping Plan Update. The sectors include:

- Stationary (Industrial) Sources
- Transportation
- Energy
- Buildings
- Agriculture
- Natural and Working Lands
- Waste Management
- Water
- Super-GHG Pollutants

When a public agency contemplates approving a project where an air quality plan consistency determination is required, BAAQMD recommends that the agency analyze the project with respect to the following questions: (1) Does the project support the primary goals of the *2017 Clean Air Plan*; (2) Does the project include applicable control measures from the *2017 Clean Air Plan*; and (3) Does the project disrupt or hinder implementation of any *2017 Clean Air Plan* control measures? If the first two questions are concluded in the affirmative and the third question concluded in the negative, the BAAQMD considers the project consistent with air quality plans prepared for the Bay Area.

Any project that would not support the *2017 Clean Air Plan* goals would not be considered consistent with the *2017 Clean Air Plan*. The recommended measure for determining project support of these

<sup>3</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Final 2017 Clean Air Plan*, adopted April 19, 2017.

goals is consistency with BAAQMD CEQA thresholds of significance. As presented in the subsequent impact discussions in this section, the proposed project would not exceed the BAAQMD significance thresholds; consequently, the proposed project would support the primary goals of the *2017 Clean Air Plan* and would not hinder implementation of any of the *2017 Clean Air Plan* control measures. Therefore, the proposed project with implementation of mitigation measures would have a ***less-than-significant impact with mitigation*** associated with, conflicting with, or obstructing implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation: Air quality standards for the San Francisco Bay Area are set by BAAQMD; they are based on the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), as well as the more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

BAAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* establish thresholds of significance for construction emissions of 54 pounds per day (lb./day) for reactive organic gases (ROG), fine particulate matter equal to or less than 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), and 82 lb./day for respirable particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>). The same thresholds apply to operational emissions. The construction particulate matter (PM) thresholds apply to exhaust emissions only, not ground disturbance; emissions from grading and other site disturbance, for which there is no adopted threshold of significance, are addressed through best management practices.

BAAQMD has developed both construction-related and operational screening criteria that provide lead agencies a conservative indication of whether a proposed project could potentially result in an exceedance of any of the thresholds of significance listed above. Because they were developed with very conservative assumptions, a project that falls below the screening criteria can be assumed to have no potential to exceed the adopted air quality thresholds of significance. For such projects, BAAQMD has determined that a quantified analysis of the project's potential emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors is not necessary. The construction and operational screening criteria are discussed separately below.

As noted in BAAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, air pollution is, by its very nature, largely a cumulative impact. No single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. The BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* recommend that cumulative air quality effects from criteria air pollutants be addressed by comparison to the project-level daily and annual emission thresholds. These significance thresholds were developed to identify a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant regional air quality impact. According to the Air Quality Guidelines, if a project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable, then the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant. The Air Quality Guidelines state that a project's emissions would be cumulatively considerable if they would exceed the significance thresholds identified above. Conversely, if a project is determined to have less-than-significant project-level emissions, then it would also have a less-than-significant cumulative air quality impact.

## **Construction Impacts**

Construction operations for any sizeable project have the potential to result in short-term but significant adverse air quality impacts. The BAAQMD recommends implementation of its Basic Construction Mitigation Measures by all projects subject to environmental review under CEQA.

The BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* contain screening criteria for construction of a variety of land use development projects. Projects that fall below these thresholds are considered by BAAQMD to have less-than-significant construction-phase air pollutant emissions, provided the following additional conditions are met:

- All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures would be included in the project design and implemented during construction; and
- Construction-related activities would not include any of the following:
  - a. Demolition activities inconsistent with District Regulation 11, Rule 2: Asbestos Demolition, Renovation and Manufacturing;
  - b. Simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously);
  - c. Simultaneous construction of more than one land use type (e.g., project would develop residential and commercial uses on the same site) (not applicable to high density infill development);
  - d. Extensive site preparation (i.e., greater than default assumptions used by the Urban Land Use Emissions Model [URBEMIS] for grading, cut/fill, or earth movement); or
  - e. Extensive material transport (e.g., greater than 10,000 cubic yards of soil import/export) requiring a considerable amount of haul truck activity.

No building demolition would be required for a future proposal to develop residential housing on the project site, and it is assumed construction of such a project would not include any of the other exclusionary activities listed above (which would need to be confirmed at the time a specific development proposal is submitted to the City for review). The BAAQMD construction screening threshold for multi-family residential apartments is 240 dwelling units for both low-rise and mid-rise apartment buildings. Although development of a high-rise building is not anticipated, the threshold for that type of development is higher.

With no more than 25 residential units allowed under the proposed zoning (with an affordable housing density bonus), the size of future residential development on the site would be far below the threshold at which BAAQMD recommends quantified modeling of air emissions. As previously noted, the screening criteria are quite conservative. Therefore, there is no potential for construction of future residences to violate air quality standards. Nonetheless, in accordance with BAAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, absent implementation of BAAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, the project's effects of construction-generated criteria pollutants are presumed to have a **potentially significant impact** on air quality. Implementation of the controls listed in Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which incorporates the Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, would reduce the project's construction-related air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1:** The property owner/applicant of a future residential use shall require the construction contractor to reduce the severity of project construction period dust and equipment exhaust impacts by complying with the following control measures:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

### ***Operational Impacts***

As noted above, BAAQMD's operational thresholds of significance are the same as the construction thresholds. However, the screening criteria for project operations differ. The operational thresholds are 451 dwelling units for low-rise apartments and 494 units for mid-rise buildings. Again, the 25 dwelling units that would be allowed by the proposed rezoning, with density bonus, would be significantly below BAAQMD's operational screening thresholds for the applicable land use category, and there is no potential for the project to exceed BAAQMD operational thresholds of significance. The proposed project's operational emissions from the project would be less than significant and, therefore, the project's emissions would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project would have a ***less-than-significant cumulative impact*** on air quality.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** A future residential development on the project site that would be allowed by the proposed zoning district would not emit substantial concentrations of pollutants that could adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors, i.e., residents in homes located west of the site. While construction of a future residential use would require the operation of heavy-duty equipment that would constitute a new emission source of toxic air contaminants (TACs) including diesel particulate matter (DPM) and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), this would be a very short-term use, and the majority of the emissions would be diluted and carried aloft by circulating air currents. There would be no potential for these short-term, diluted emissions to adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, potential health impacts from air pollutants associated with the proposed project would be ***less than significant***.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) <i>Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Though offensive odors from stationary and mobile sources rarely cause any physical harm, they still remain unpleasant and can lead to public distress, generating citizen complaints to local governments. The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the sensitivity of receptors.

The BAAQMD's significance criteria for odors are subjective and are based on the number of odor complaints generated by a project. Generally, the BAAQMD considers any project with the potential to frequently expose members of the public to objectionable odors to cause a significant impact. With respect to the proposed project, diesel-fueled construction equipment exhaust would generate some odors during future residential development of the site. However, these emissions typically dissipate quickly and would be unlikely to affect a substantial number of people. A future residential development on the site would not involve operational activities that generate odors. Therefore, odor impacts associated with the proposed project would be ***less than significant***.

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The majority of the project site has a flat surface of deteriorating asphalt pavement and packed gravel. The borders of the site are vegetated with ruderal grasses and weeds. There is no natural habitat on the site, and no potential for it to harbor special-status species. The proposed project would have **no impact** on special-status species.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat present on the project site. The project would have **no impact** on sensitive habitats.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There are no wetlands present on the project site. The project would have **no impact** on wetlands.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) <i>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The project site does not provide any habitat that would support migratory wildlife, and there are no migratory wildlife species utilizing the site as a movement corridor or nursery site. The project would have **no impact** on migratory wildlife.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) <i>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There are no trees or other biological resources on the project site. There is therefore no potential for the project to conflict with policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) <i>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** A habitat conservation plan (HCP) is a document that meets federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements and enables local agencies to approve projects within endangered species' habitats, in exchange for the incorporation of HCP-prescribed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for adverse effects on natural communities and endangered species. There is no adopted HCP or other conservation plan applicable to the project site, and there is no valuable natural habitat on the site that could be adversely affected by the project. The project would not conflict with an adopted HCP or other habitat conservation plan.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** In order to be considered a significant historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, a building must be at least 50 years old. In addition, Section 15064.5 defines an historical resource as, "... a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources," properties included in a local register of historical resources, or properties deemed significant pursuant to criteria set forth in *Public Resources Code* Section 5024.1(g).

Other than the deteriorating asphalt pavement on the site and the cyclone fence enclosing it, there are no buildings or other man-made structures present on the site. However, there is a possibility that historical resources such as a buried building foundation or cultural artifacts could lie within the subsurface of the site. Were significant historical resources to be present, future development of the site could damage or destroy the resource(s), which would be a **potentially significant, adverse impact** on historical resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1, set forth in the following subsection, would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The San Francisco Bay area was occupied by Native Americans as far back as 3,000 to 4,000 years ago. Some evidence from the investigation of prehistoric sites around the Bay suggests that human occupation in the region is of greater antiquity, perhaps as early as 8000 B.C.<sup>4</sup> Recorded archaeological sites in the region indicate that at the time of initial Euroamerican incursion into the project area (circa 1770), the region was occupied by Native Americans who spoke Chochenyo. These people were a subset of the Penutian-speaking Ohlone (referred to as "Costanoans" by the Spanish) residing in northern California at the time the Spanish arrived in the region. The Ohlone territory encompassed much of the San Francisco Bay area and extended eastward to the Central Valley and southward through Monterey Bay. Previously undiscovered Native American resources are often encountered on the Bay margins and in proximity to historic water sources, among other places. Archaeological records confirm that Native Americans previously occupied the present-day City of

<sup>4</sup> City of Alameda, *Alameda Marina Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*, SCH#2016102064, Section 4.4: Cultural Resources, December 2017.

Alameda. Historic topographic maps show that the project site was historically located in marshland at the margins of San Francisco Bay, increasing the possibility that the site could have been occupied by Native Americans at one time.

If Native Americans ever occupied the project site, cultural artifacts could lie buried within the site. If such cultural resources were present, future development of the site with a residential use could damage or destroy the resource(s), which would be a **potentially significant, adverse impact** on archaeological resources. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level:

**Mitigation Measure CR-1:** At such time that a proposal to develop the project site is submitted to the City, the City shall commission, or shall require the applicant to commission, an archival search of archaeological records maintained by the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) in the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University to determine if archaeological resources are known to be present in the project area. If the results from the NWIC include any recommendations for additional investigation because the NWIC determined that there is a moderate or high probability for cultural resources to be present at the site, all recommendations shall be implemented by a qualified professional archaeologist and the results shall be presented in a professional-quality report, to be submitted to the Alameda Planning Division and the NWIC. Any additional investigation or mitigation recommended by the archaeologist, such as monitoring during ground-disturbing project construction activities, shall be implemented. With the exception of potential construction monitoring, this mitigation measure shall be implemented prior to issuance of a grading permit for the project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Similar to the potential to encounter cultural artifacts described in the preceding subsection, there is a possibility that human remains associated with the possible prehistoric occupation of the site by Native Americans could lie buried in the subsurface of the project site. Such remains are considered sacred by Native Americans tribal groups, and their disturbance or destruction during future site grading or other project construction activities would be a **potentially significant impact**. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level:

**Mitigation Measure CR-2:** In the event that any human remains are encountered during future site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and a qualified archaeologist shall notify the Office of the Alameda County Coroner and advise that office as to whether the remains are likely to be prehistoric or historic period in date. If determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner's Office will notify the Native American

Heritage Commission of the find, which, in turn, will then appoint a “Most Likely Descendant” (MLD). The MLD in consultation with the archaeological consultant and the City, will advise and help formulate an appropriate plan for treatment of the remains, which might include recordation, removal, and scientific study of the remains and any associated artifacts. After completion of analysis and preparation of the report of findings, the remains and associated grave goods shall be returned to the MLD for reburial.

**VI. ENERGY** — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** While rezoning of the subject property would have no effect on energy resources, future construction of a residential development on the site would require consumption of petroleum fuels (primarily diesel) by construction workers travelling to and from the site, by haul trucks importing and exporting construction materials and supplies to the site, and by heavy construction equipment onsite. Once the proposed project is completed and occupied, gasoline and diesel fuel would continue to be consumed by residents, visitors, delivery and repair vehicles, and service providers traveling to and from the site. Electricity and natural gas would be consumed for lighting, space and water heating, and landscape maintenance (i.e., electricity to control irrigation equipment), as well as the operation of household appliances and any amenities that might be included in the development, such as laundry facilities, a pool and/or spa, a fitness center, elevators, or electric vehicle charging.

With a maximum of 25 residential units that could be developed on the site, the potential energy consumption during construction and operation of a future residential use would be insignificant relative to existing energy consumption in Alameda. Furthermore, during construction of a proposed residential project, the building contractor would be required by Mitigation Measure AQ-1 (see Section III-b) to limit idling time of equipment and vehicles to 5 minutes or less and maintain construction equipment and vehicles in optimal working condition. These requirements would benefit air quality and would also prevent wasteful or inefficient consumption of fuel during project construction. The building contractor would also be required to comply with the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code (codified in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)) Section 5.408 Construction Waste Reduction, Disposal and Recycling, which requires the recycling or salvaging for reuse of a minimum of 65 percent of the non-hazardous construction and demolition waste. Compliance with the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code would reduce consumption of energy associated with transport, processing, and disposal of solid waste at landfills.

Once a future residential development is completed and occupied, the City won't have direct control over how residents consume energy, but inefficient use of energy would be minimized through the required compliance with the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code codified in Title 24 and with general building energy efficiency standards, also part of Title 24, which require energy-efficient

building envelope requirements, such as ceiling and rafter roof insulation, walls, floors, windows, and doors.

Part 6 of Title 24 also sets energy/water efficiency standards for HVAC, water heating, indoor lighting for conditioned spaces, indoor lighting for parking garages, outdoor lighting, electric power distribution, pool and spa systems, and solar ready buildings. There are also federal regulations pertaining to appliance efficiency, and in many cases, the California standards are the same as the federal standards. It should be noted that water efficiency contributes to energy efficiency by reducing energy requirements for treating and pumping domestic water.

Compliance with these required regulations would ensure that construction and operation of a future residential project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, the project would have a **less-than-significant impact** on energy resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Senate Bill 1389 requires the California Energy Commission to prepare a biennial integrated energy policy report that assesses major energy trends and issues facing the State's electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel sectors and provides policy recommendations to conserve resources; protect the environment; ensure reliable, secure, and diverse energy supplies; enhance the State's economy; and protect public health and safety. The 2018 *Integrated Energy Policy Report* update is the most recent update.<sup>5</sup> The State's energy system includes energy extraction, transport, conversion (such as combusting natural gas in power plants to generate electricity or producing gasoline and diesel from crude oil in refineries), and consumption for services (such as electricity for lighting, natural gas use in homes and buildings for space and water heating, pumping water to communities and crops, and gasoline and diesel to fuel cars and trucks), as well as electricity from out-of-State plants serving California.

California's electricity generation capacity is composed of multiple fuel sources, including coal, hydroelectric, natural gas, nuclear, oil, petroleum coke, waste heat, biomass, geothermal, solar photovoltaic, solar thermal, and wind. In 2018, the State had an installed generation capacity from these multiple sources of 194,727 gigawatt hours (GWh).<sup>6</sup> The composition of California's in-State generation capacity has shifted since the 2002 passage of Senate Bill 1078, which required that 20 percent of electric production come from renewable resources by 2017. With the passage of SB X1-2 in 2011, this was increased to 33 percent renewables by 2020; it was raised again to 50 percent renewables by December 31, 2030 by SB 350, passed in 2015.

Because energy consumption is directly tied to the emissions of GHGs, and in fact, is the source of 80 percent of GHG emissions in the State,<sup>7</sup> the City of Alameda's Climate Action and Resiliency Plan

<sup>5</sup>California Energy Commission, *2018 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update Volume II*. <https://www2.energy.ca.gov/2018publications/CEC-100-2018-001/CEC-100-2018-001-V2-CMF.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> California Energy Commission, *California Energy Almanac*, Electric Generation Capacity & Energy, In-State Electric Generation by Fuel Type. [http://www.energy.ca.gov/almanac/electricity\\_data/electric\\_generation\\_capacity.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/almanac/electricity_data/electric_generation_capacity.html).

<sup>7</sup> California Energy Commission, *2016 IEPR Update: Integrated Energy Policy Report*, Publication No. CEC-100-2016-003-CMF, Chapter 1: Environmental Performance of the Electricity Generation System, 2016.

(CARP), intended to reduce emissions of GHGs, can be viewed as a local plan for energy efficiency, and in fact it contains GHG reduction measures specifically pertaining to building and energy efficiency as well as measures to conserve water. (As noted above, water conservation has a beneficial effect on energy consumption.) As discussed in more detail in Section VIII-b, below, the proposed project would not conflict with the City's CARP, and therefore would not conflict with a local plan for energy efficiency.

Because the CEC's *Integrated Energy Policy Report* is intended to reduce GHG emissions by transitioning the State's energy portfolio to more renewable energy sources, it can also be viewed as a plan for renewable energy and energy efficiency on the Statewide level. As discussed in Section VI-a, above, future residential development on the project site would be required to comply with a variety of building and appliance energy efficiency standards, which would maximize its energy efficiency. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant impact** and would not conflict with a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

## VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</i>				
i) <i>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** No seismically active fault crosses the project site or in proximity to the site, and the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo fault zone. The nearest active faults are the Hayward fault, located approximately 5.5 miles east of the site, and the San Andreas Fault, located about 13.5 miles southwest of the site.<sup>8</sup> Another major fault in the region is the Calaveras fault, located about 16.5 miles east of the site. With no active faults in the vicinity, there is no potential for fault rupture at the project site.

<sup>8</sup> Association of Bay Area Governments, "Bay Area Faults," [map], 2003.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) <i>Strong seismic ground shaking?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Similar to most locations throughout the San Francisco Bay Area, the project site is potentially subject to strong seismic ground shaking during an earthquake on one of the major active earthquake faults that transect the region. The project is in an area mapped as having a Very Strong seismic shaking severity potential, equivalent to a Modified Mercalli Intensity of 7, corresponding to moderate structural damage.<sup>9</sup> The major active faults with the potential to affect the project include the Hayward, Calaveras, and San Andreas faults, discussed in the preceding subsection.

In 2015, the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WGCEP), in conjunction with the United States Geological Survey (USGS), published an updated report evaluating the probabilities of significant earthquakes occurring in the Bay Area over the next three decades. The WGCEP estimated that there is a 72-percent probability that at least one magnitude (M) 6.7 or greater earthquake will occur within the San Francisco Bay region by 2043. This probability is an aggregate value that considered seven principal Bay Area fault systems, including the Hayward, Calaveras, and San Andreas faults, as well as unknown faults.<sup>10</sup>

Given the magnitude of seismic ground shaking and related peak ground acceleration that could be experienced at the site, there is potential for a strong seismic event in the region to result in catastrophic structural failure of a future residential development on the site, with potential to severely injure or kill building occupants. However, in accordance with recent CEQA case law (e.g., *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (Aug.12, 2016) 2 Cal.App.Fifth 1057), CEQA generally no longer considers an impact of the environment on a project to be a significant impact. Accordingly, this would be a ***less-than-significant impact***.

Nonetheless, required compliance with other adopted regulations would maximize the ability of a future residential project to withstand strong seismic shaking and protect building occupants. Pursuant to Chapter XIII, Article I, Section 13-2.1 of the Alameda Municipal Code, the City of Alameda has adopted the current version of the California Building Code as its building code, and all new construction within the City is required to comply with its provisions.

The California Building Code requires that a site-specific geotechnical investigation report be prepared by a geotechnical engineer or similar licensed professional for proposed developments of one or more buildings greater than 4,000 square feet to evaluate geologic and seismic hazards and provide recommendations for site preparation and foundation design. Buildings less than or equal to 4,000 square feet also are required to prepare a geologic engineering report, except for one-story, wood-frame and light-steel-frame buildings that are located outside of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Faults Zones. The purpose of the geotechnical investigation is to identify seismic and geologic conditions that require project mitigation, such as ground shaking, liquefaction, differential settlement, and expansive soils. Based on the conditions of the site, the building code requires specific design parameters to ensure construction of buildings that will resist collapse during an earthquake. These

<sup>9</sup> Association of Bay Area Governments, MTC/ABAG Hazard Viewer Map [interactive map], Probabilistic Earthquake Shaking Hazard, accessed June 1, 2020 at: <https://mtc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=4a6f3f1259df42eab29b35dfcd086fc8>.

<sup>10</sup> Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WGCEP), Earthquake Outlook for the San Francisco Bay Region 2014-2043, Fact Sheet 2016-3020, revised August 2016.

design parameters do not protect buildings from all earthquake shaking hazards, but are designed to reduce hazards to a manageable level.

Once a specific proposal to develop the project site with multi-family residential housing is submitted to the City of Alameda, the Building Division will ensure that the proposed design incorporates the recommendations in the required geotechnical report, and ensure that it complies with the 2019 California Building Standards Code, which includes detailed structural design requirements intended to provide adequate structural integrity to withstand the maximum credible earthquake and the associated ground motion acceleration. Compliance with the applicable building codes will maximize the structural stability of the future development and minimize the potential for damage and injury during a strong seismic event.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) <i>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation: Liquefaction occurs when clean, loose, saturated, uniformly graded, fine-grained soils are exposed to strong seismic ground shaking. The soils temporarily lose shear strength and cohesion, thereby causing the soil to flow as a liquid. This can result in a loss of ground stability that can cause building foundations to fail. Because of the higher intergranular pressure of the soil at greater depths, the potential for liquefaction is generally limited to the upper 40 feet of the soil.

The project site is within an area mapped by the California Geological Survey as having liquefaction potential.<sup>11</sup> Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 2697(a), a geotechnical report defining and delineating any seismic hazard is required before a city or county can approve a project located in a seismic hazard zone.

Seismically-induced soil liquefaction can cause other ground failure, including lateral spreading, sand boils, and areal and differential settlement. Lateral spreading, where soil spreads laterally on top of the liquefied soil layer, can happen on relatively flat sites with slopes of less than 2 percent; it generally occurs when the liquefied layer is in relatively close proximity to an open, free slope face such as the bank of a creek channel. Lateral spreading can lead to surficial ground tension cracking (i.e., lurch cracking) and settlement. Since there are no significant free slope faces on or near the project site, there is likely no potential for significant lateral spreading to occur at the site.

The site-specific seismic hazards at the site will be evaluated by the geotechnical report that will be required for future residential development of the site. Despite the assumed potential for liquefaction and possibly other forms of seismic-related ground failure at the project site, for the reasons set forth in Section VII(a)(ii), this would be a ***less-than-significant impact***. However, the required compliance with the California Building Code as well as the recommendations in the required geotechnical investigation report would ensure that the site preparation and building design requirements would minimize threats from seismic-related ground failure and the potential for structural failure and associated threat to human health and safety.

<sup>11</sup> California Geological Survey, Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation, Oakland West Quadrangle [map], February 14, 2003.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>iv) Landslides?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** A landslide is a slope failure created by down-slope slippage of a mass of earth or rock that typically occurs as a planar or rotational feature along single or multiple surfaces. Landslides can range from slow-moving, deep-seated slumps to rapid, shallow debris flows. The hazard is greatest on steep slopes with gradients of 15 percent or more, but can occur on shallower slopes with unstable soils, particularly when saturated.

The project site is essentially level, as are all of the parcels surrounding the site. There are no steep slopes located in close proximity to the site. Consequently, the potential for landslides is non-existent. There would be **no impact** due to landslides.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Any construction project that exposes surface soils creates a potential for erosion from wind and stormwater runoff. The potential for erosion increases on large, steep, or windy sites; it also increases significantly during rainstorms. Although the proposed project would occur on a level site, construction could occur during the rainy season, which increases the potential for erosion at the site. In addition, approximately 0.8 acres of land would be disturbed, increasing the potential for exposure of soils to the erosional effects of wind and rain. Therefore, there would be potential for substantial erosion during project construction, which would be considered a **potentially significant impact** on the environment. The impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the Erosion Control Plan required by Mitigation Measure WQ-1 and additional erosion controls required by Mitigation Measure WQ-2 (see Section X).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** As discussed in Sections VII-a-ii and VII-a-iii, above, there is no potential for landslide at the site and there is very low potential for lateral spreading, but there is potential for liquefaction. As previously noted, the project would be required to meet engineering and structural requirements and comply with all applicable building codes and seismic requirements, which would ensure that a future

residential development on the site would not be exposed to unstable ground that could result in structural failure. This would therefore be a ***less-than-significant impact***.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) <i>Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Expansive soils can undergo significant volume change with changes in moisture content. They shrink and harden when dried and expand and soften when wetted. The risks associated with expansive soils generally occur within approximately 5 feet of the ground surface, where substantial changes in soil volume can damage building foundations and pavements. The potential for expansive soils on the site would be evaluated as part of the geotechnical investigation that would be required for future residential development of the site. As warranted, site preparation and/or structural design recommendations would be provided to eliminate the risk of expansive soils adversely affecting the structural stability of the foundations, building(s), and pavements. This would be a ***less-than-significant impact***.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) <i>Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** A future residential development on the site would utilize the existing sanitary sewer system that serves the project area; septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) <i>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains of vertebrate or invertebrate organisms from prehistoric environments found in geologic strata. They are valued for the information they yield about the history of the earth and its past ecological settings. They are most typically embedded in sedimentary rock foundations, and may be encountered in surface rock outcroppings or in the subsurface during site grading. The project site is underlain by artificial fill, so there are likely no

paleontological resources in the subsurface of the site. However, until a site-specific geotechnical investigation is completed, there is currently insufficient information about the underlying soils to definitively rule out the potential for paleontological resources to be present. If any unique paleontological resources were encountered during future project construction, they could be damaged, destroyed, or lost during subsurface disturbance of the site. This would be a ***potentially significant impact***. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level:

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** If any paleontological resources—such as fossilized bone, teeth, shell, tracks, trails, casts, molds, or impressions—are encountered during site grading or other construction activities, all ground disturbance within 100 feet of the find shall be halted until the services of a qualified paleontologist can be retained to identify and evaluate the scientific value of the resource(s) and, if necessary, recommend mitigation measures to document and prevent any significant adverse effects on the resource(s). Significant paleontological resources shall be salvaged and deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution, such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP).

#### **VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Greenhouse gases (GHGs) refer to gases that trap heat in the atmosphere and contribute to global warming. The primary GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>), sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and water vapor (H<sub>2</sub>O). The majority of GHG emissions in the Bay Area come from transportation (39.7 percent), followed by industrial/commercial sources (35.7 percent) and electricity generation (14.0 percent). Construction equipment and other off-road equipment contribute 1.5 percent of the total GHG emissions.<sup>12</sup>

As discussed in more detail in Section III-b, the BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* contain operational screening criteria for a variety of land use development projects. In addition to the screening thresholds for criteria air pollutants discussed in Section III-b, there are also screening criteria for GHGs. For multi-family residential development, the GHG screening threshold is 78 dwelling units for low-rise apartment buildings and 87 units for mid-rise buildings. BAAQMD has determined that multi-family residential projects smaller than these thresholds have no potential to exceed the adopted thresholds of significance for GHGs, and a quantified analysis of the project's

<sup>12</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Bay Area Emissions Inventory, Summary Report: Greenhouse Gases, Base Year 2011*, Table F: 2011 Bay Area GHG Emissions by Sector, updated January 2015.

potential emissions of GHGs is not necessary. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant impact** from its emissions of GHGs.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The City of Alameda adopted its *Climate Action and Resiliency Plan (CARP)* in September 2019.<sup>13</sup> The CARP identifies how the City will exceed the State-recommended GHG emissions reduction target of 15 percent below 2008 levels by the year 2020 (equivalent to 1990 emissions); Alameda's goal is to reduce emissions by 50 percent below 2005 levels by 2030. The CARP identifies GHG reduction actions to address building energy use, transportation-related emissions, sequestration of carbon, and waste reduction.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which is the principal State law adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, includes a quantitative goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Statewide plans and regulations such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles and the low carbon fuel standard are being implemented at the statewide level; compliance at the specific plan or project level is not addressed because no project individually could have a major impact (either positively or negatively) on the global concentration of GHG. In September of 2016, AB 32 was extended to achieve reductions in GHG of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The new plan, outlined in Senate Bill (SB) 32, involves increasing renewable energy use, putting more electric cars on the road, improving energy efficiency, and curbing emissions from key industries.

The proposed project, including future development of the site with a residential use, would result in a significant impact if it would be in conflict with the City's CARP and/or State regulations such as AB 32 and SB 32. If it is consistent with the CARP, it can be presumed to be consistent with the statewide goals for GHG emissions reduction. The proposed project would not conflict with the goals or GHG reduction actions set forth in the Alameda CARP. One of the goals of the CARP is to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and the associated GHG emissions by encouraging a transportation mode shift to alternative modes to vehicle travel. The project site is close to numerous AC Transit bus lines, including a trans-bay line that serves the jobs market in San Francisco, which would encourage future residents on the site to utilize public transit, consistent with the CARP. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant impact** related to a conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

<sup>13</sup>City of Alameda, *Alameda Climate Action and Resiliency Plan (CARP)*, September 2019.

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The proposed project would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. While construction of future residential development on the site could entail transport and use of hazardous materials for equipment operation and maintenance, such as motor oil, transmission fluid, or solvents, such use would not be in quantities large enough to pose an environmental hazard, nor would it constitute routine, ongoing use. Such use is typical of most construction projects and does not represent a significant hazard. Once construction is complete and occupied, residents would likely store and use small containerized quantities of household cleaning products, paints, automotive products, and other similar products for cleaning and maintaining their homes and vehicles. This type of usage is typical of most residential development, and the multi-family units would likely entail the storage and use of fewer products than is generally the case for single-family detached homes. This type of common residential usage would not constitute a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The project would have a **less-than-significant impact** from the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** As discussed in Section IX-a above, the proposed project would not introduce hazardous materials beyond small-containerized products typically used in residential settings for cleaning and maintenance purposes. As discussed in Section IX-d, below, no soil or groundwater contamination is known to be present on or in proximity to the site. However, were such contamination present, it could adversely affect the health of workers and the public during future construction on the site. Contaminated soil could also pose a health risk to future residents on the site, either through direct exposure (e.g., while digging in a garden) or from the migration of soil vapor gas into the assumed future building on the site. Consequently, it is conservatively assumed that currently unknown contaminants in the subsurface of the site could be released during future construction, creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment. This would be a **potentially significant impact**. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level:

**Mitigation Measure HM-1:** Prior to approval of any future development on the project site, the applicant shall retain the services of a Registered Environmental

Assessor (REA) to conduct and document a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) in accordance with standards established by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard ASTM E1527-13. If the Phase I ESA determines that there is some potential for contamination at the site and recommends performance of a Phase II ESA with subsurface testing of soil and/or groundwater, the Phase II ESA shall be completed prior to issuance of a grading permit. Any further recommendations presented in the Phase II ESA report, such as performing remediation of contaminated soil or groundwater determined to be present, shall also be implemented prior to issuance of a grading permit, and a No Further Action letter from the regulatory agency overseeing the cleanup (likely to be California Department of Toxic Substances Control, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, or Alameda County Environmental Health Department) shall be provided to the City of Alameda prior to issuance of a grading permit.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Although there is a school located within one-quarter mile of the project site—Ruby Bridges Elementary School, located about 670 feet to the southwest—any future residential development on the site would not emit hazardous emissions, handle hazardous materials, or generate hazardous waste. There would be **no impact** on schools related to hazardous materials as a result of project implementation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) <i>Be located 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, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 actually consists of several lists, including:

- A list of hazardous waste sites compiled by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC);

- A list of contaminated water wells compiled by the California Department of Health Services (DHS) (subsequently reorganized into the California Department of Health Care Services and the California Department of Public Health);
- A list of leaking underground storage tank sites and solid waste disposal facilities from which there is a migration of hazardous waste, compiled by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB); and
- A list of solid waste disposal facilities from which there is a migration of hazardous waste, compiled by the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA). These lists are consolidated by the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle).

Each of these lists must be updated at least annually, and must be submitted to the Secretary for Environmental Protection, the head of the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). DTSC maintains the EnviroStor database for purposes of complying with Section 65962.5, while the SWRCB maintains the GeoTracker database. These databases were searched to identify any hazardous materials sites on the project site or within a 1,000-foot radius around the site. The search of the GeoTracker database revealed no results, while the EnviroStor search produced a single result at the very edge of the search radius. That site was the Shinsei Gardens at 410 Stargell Avenue, approximately 1,000 feet northwest of the project site. It is listed as a Voluntary Cleanup site that was certified by DTSC on October 5, 2017. Although the certification includes some land use restrictions for that site to prevent the intrusion of soil vapor gas into building interiors, and requires annual inspection and reporting, there is no potential for the Shinsei Gardens site to pose an environmental hazard to the project site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) <i>For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There is no airport within 2 miles of the project site. The closest airport is Oakland International Airport, located about 4.5 miles to the southeast of the project site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) <i>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Neither the proposed rezoning nor an assumed future residential development on the site would have the potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City of Alameda's *Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan*, the City's adopted emergency response plan and emergency evacuation plan.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Government Code Section 51178 directs the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) to identify areas of high fire hazard within Local Responsibility Areas (LRAs) that are not under the direct jurisdiction of CAL FIRE, where local fire-fighting agencies have primary responsibility for fire response. CAL FIRE's mapping of Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZs) is based on data and models of potential fuels over a 30- to 50-year time horizon and their expected fire behavior and burn probabilities. All of the City of Alameda is within an LRA and is designated as a non-VHFHSZ.<sup>14</sup> The project site is located in an urbanized area and there are no wildlands in close proximity to the site. Therefore, there is no potential for wildfire at the project site.

#### **X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — *Would the project:***

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:**

#### ***Construction Impacts***

Construction activities associated with future residential development of the site could potentially affect water quality as a result of erosion of sediment. Once construction sites become disturbed by clearing, grading, excavation, and other site preparation activities, site soils become particularly susceptible to erosion from wind and rain water. Wind-blown soils adversely affect air quality, as discussed in more detail in Section III-b, while soil entrained by flowing stormwater becomes transported off site, flowing into downstream receiving waters, such as storm drains and drainage ditches. Because the City's stormwater drainage system ultimately discharges to San Francisco Bay, this water body is susceptible to increased sedimentation from uncontrolled erosion from construction sites. In addition, leaks from construction equipment; accidental spills of fuel, oil, or hazardous liquids used for equipment maintenance; and accidental spills of construction materials are all potential sources of pollutants that could degrade water quality during construction.

Stormwater runoff from the site is ultimately discharged, without treatment, to San Francisco Bay, which is on the list of impaired water bodies compiled by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water

<sup>14</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), Alameda County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA, As Recommended by CAL FIRE [map], September 8, 2008.

Quality Control Board (RWQCB) pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act. Because the State is required to develop action plans and establish Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) to improve water quality within these water bodies, uncontrolled discharge of pollutants into them is considered particularly detrimental.

Generally, new development that entails “land disturbance” of 1 acre or more requires the project sponsor to obtain coverage under Construction General Permit (CGP) Order 2009-0009-DWQ, administered by the RWQCB. Order 2009-0009-DWQ requires project sponsors to implement construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) at the project site and comply with numeric action levels (NALs) in order to achieve minimum federal water quality standards. The CGP requires control of non-stormwater discharges as well as stormwater discharges. Measures to control non-stormwater discharges such as spills, leakage, and dumping must be addressed through structural as well as non-structural BMPs. With a site area of 0.82-acre, the project would not be required to obtain coverage under the CGP. Because the project site is below the threshold requiring CGP coverage, construction of a future residential development would have a ***less-than-significant impact*** on water quality.

### ***Operational Impacts***

The primary source of water pollutants from residential development is from automotive vehicles traveling on site roadways. Moving vehicles deposit oil and grease, fuel residues, heavy metals (e.g. lead, copper, cadmium, and zinc), tire particles, and other pollutants. They emit polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) from their exhaust, resulting from incomplete combustion of gasoline, which settles to the ground. Parked vehicles can also deposit oil, metals, and other pollutants that can be washed into the storm drain system by rain water.

All of the pollutants described above collect on roofs, pavements, and other impervious surfaces, where they can be washed by stormwater into downstream surface waters, thereby degrading water quality. Pesticides that may be used on landscaping or around buildings can potentially contribute to the depletion of dissolved oxygen and/or toxic concentrations of dissolved ammonia in downstream receiving waters, creating acute toxicity for aquatic wildlife. Fertilizers can similarly degrade water quality.

Operational stormwater discharges from new development are regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), administered by the RWQCB under authority of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. In accordance with the NPDES, the RWQCB regulates stormwater discharges via municipal stormwater permits issued to the cities, counties, water districts, and flood control districts under its jurisdiction in the San Francisco Bay Area. In the City of Alameda, development projects must comply with NPDES Permit No. CAS612008, issued to the Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program (ACCWP)<sup>15</sup> and other Bay Area jurisdictions by the RWQCB (NPDES Order No. R2-2015-0049). The revised Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit (MRP) was adopted on November 19, 2015 and became effective on January 1, 2016. This permit replaced the previous permit issued on October 14, 2009, which was formally rescinded by the RWQCB. The current MRP consolidates the multiple countywide permits previously issued to member agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area under a single MRP regulating stormwater discharges from municipalities and local agencies in Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties and the cities of Fairfield, Suisun City, and Vallejo.

Although the MRP imposes a variety of responsibilities for monitoring and protecting stormwater quality on member agencies, it also includes requirements for individual development projects. Specifically, Provision C.3 of the MRP requires any private or public development project that would

<sup>15</sup> Although the named Permittee in the MRP is Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program, this organization is also referenced on its website as Clean Water Program Alameda County as well as Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program.

create or modify 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surfaces to take measures to improve water quality of stormwater discharges from the project site (i.e., stormwater runoff), including providing treatment of 100 percent of the stormwater runoff from the site. The size threshold is reduced to 5,000 square feet for certain special land use categories, which include auto service facilities, retail gasoline outlets, restaurants, and uncovered parking lots. Where a redevelopment project would alter 50 percent or more of the impervious surfaces of a previously existing project that was not subject to Provision C.3 requirements, the entire project must be designed and operated in compliance with Provision C.3. The Provision C.3 requirements also pertain to construction or widening of roads, trails, and sidewalks.

Projects subject to Provision C.3 must include low-impact development (LID) measures to capture and perform onsite treatment of all stormwater from the site prior to its discharge, including rainwater falling on building rooftops. (Treatment may also occur offsite at an approved joint stormwater treatment facility.) LID treatment is defined as the removal of pollutants from stormwater using infiltration, evapotranspiration, rainwater harvesting and use, and biotreatment. LID techniques reduce water quality impacts by preserving and recreating natural landscape features, minimizing imperviousness, maximizing opportunities for infiltration and evapotranspiration, and using stormwater as a resource.

Project applicants are required to implement appropriate source control and site design measures and to design and implement stormwater treatment measures in order to reduce the discharge of stormwater pollutants to the *maximum extent practicable* (MEP), a standard established by the 1987 amendments to the federal Clean Water Act. LID treatment measures include harvesting and reuse, infiltration, evapotranspiration, and biotreatment.

Provision C.3 LID requirements include source controls and site design and stormwater treatment requirements. Examples of source control requirements that could be relevant to the proposed project include:

- Landscaping that minimizes irrigation and runoff, promotes surface infiltration, minimizes the use of pesticides and fertilizers, and incorporates other appropriate sustainable landscaping practices and programs such as Bay-Friendly Landscaping;
- Efficient irrigation systems;
- Properly designed trash storage areas; and
- Storm drain system stenciling or signage.

The MRP states that permittees (i.e., the cities and counties) should encourage projects that do not meet the Provision C.3 size thresholds to still implement these source control measures to the extent feasible.

Examples of site design and stormwater treatment requirements that could be relevant to the proposed project include:

- Minimization of impervious surfaces;
- Construction of sidewalks, walkways, patios, and/or parking lots with pervious pavements;
- Inclusion of self-treating areas and self-retaining areas;
- Rainwater harvesting and reuse;
- Minimization of stormwater runoff by directing runoff from roofs, sidewalks, walkways, driveways, and/or uncovered parking lots onto vegetated areas; and

- Treatment of 100 percent of the site's stormwater runoff with onsite LID treatment measures (or with LID treatment measures at a joint stormwater treatment facility) through harvesting and re-use, infiltration, evapotranspiration, or biotreatment.

Given the size of the project site, a future proposal to develop multi-family housing units on the site would entail the creation of well over 10,000 square feet of new impervious surfaces, exceeding the Provision C.3 threshold. Therefore, prior to issuance of a grading permit for a future residential development, the project applicant would be required by the City to obtain coverage under the current MRP. Obtaining this coverage would require approval of a C.3 Stormwater Control Plan that specifies treatment measures and source control and site design features to be incorporated into project design and construction to reduce the pollutant load in stormwater discharges and manage runoff flows. Compliance with these requirements would prevent the substantial contribution of pollutants to downstream surface waters, including San Francisco Bay. Operation of the proposed project would therefore have a ***less-than-significant impact*** on water quality.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The project site is underlain by the East Bay Plain Subbasin that is part of the Santa Clara Valley Basin groundwater aquifer that underlies the cities lining the east side of San Francisco Bay, extending from the City of Richmond in the north to the City of Santa Clara and surrounding South Bay cities.<sup>16</sup> The East Bay Plain covers about 77 square miles from Richmond to Hayward. The predominant water-bearing materials are unconsolidated alluvial deposits, in places extending as deep as 1,000 feet. The basin is recharged largely from the numerous streams that originate in the East Bay hills and flow across the urban areas to the Bay. Although it is not a primary water resource for the area, there are several hundred wells that supply domestic, municipal and agricultural uses. Production amounts are indicated by the California Department of Water Resource to be on the order of about 2,500 acre-feet per year (AF/Y)<sup>17</sup> for municipal supply and about 1,000 AF/Y for agriculture.<sup>18</sup>

The domestic water supply for any future residential development on the site that would be allowed by the proposed rezoning would be provided by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), which derives about 90 percent of its water supply from the Mokelumne River, supplemented by other surface water supplies.<sup>19</sup> EBMUD does not rely on groundwater for water supply, but is developing the Bayside

<sup>16</sup>County of Alameda Department of Environmental Health, *Local Agency Management Program for Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems, Alameda County, California*, Figure 2.2: Major Groundwater Basins, Alameda County LAMP, April 25, 2016.

<sup>17</sup>An acre-foot is the amount of water necessary to cover 1 acre of land to a depth of 1 foot, and is equivalent to 325,851.43 gallons, or 43,560 cubic feet.

<sup>18</sup>County of Alameda Department of Environmental Health, *Local Agency Management Program for Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems, Alameda County, California*, Section 2, Groundwater Basins, April 25, 2016.

<sup>19</sup> East Bay Municipal Utility District, *Water Supply Management Program 2040 Plan*, Section 3.2.2: EBMUD System Infrastructure, April 2012.

Groundwater Project to allow it to bank surface water in the groundwater basin during wet years and extract the stored water to augment supplies during drought years.<sup>20</sup>

Future residential development on the site would rely on EBMUD's surface water supplies. While the development of residential housing on the site could increase the amount of impervious surfaces on the site, the majority of the site is currently covered in deteriorating asphalt pavement, so existing groundwater recharge is limited. Depending on future project plans and the amount of landscaping and open space that would be provided, the amount of impervious surfaces on the site could be reduced in comparison to existing conditions. Any increase in impervious surfaces would be modest, and would not materially change the amount of groundwater recharge currently occurring. Therefore, the project would have a **less-than-significant impact** on groundwater supplies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</i>				
i) <i>Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Construction-related impacts relating to erosion or siltation both on and off-site are discussed in Section X-a. The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river, but it could incrementally increase the amount of impervious surfaces on the site, which would result in changes to existing surface drainage patterns. Absent appropriate controls, the additional impervious surface area would result in an increased rate and volume of stormwater discharge from the site, which could increase erosion and siltation in downstream receiving waters. However, the required preparation and implementation of Stormwater Control Plan discussed in Section X-a, above, would ensure that the project would not cause substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site. This would be a **less-than-significant impact**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) <i>Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** As previously discussed, future residential development would either decrease the amount of impervious surfaces on the site, or result in a minor incremental increase that would not have the potential to substantially increase the volume or rate of stormwater discharge from the site.

<sup>20</sup> East Bay Municipal Utility District, *Urban Water Management Plan 2015*, Section 4.3.3: Supply Assessment, July 2016.

In addition, on-site stormwater treatment facilities that would be required in compliance with the MRP (see Section X-a, above) would serve to detain stormwater discharge from the site such that the rate of peak discharge during storm events would be reduced in comparison to existing conditions. Therefore, there is no potential for storm runoff from the site to increase flooding on or off the site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>iii) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Stormwater runoff from the project site flows into the City's stormwater collection system located under public streets. Because the proposed on-site stormwater treatment facilities would serve to retard the discharge of stormwater runoff from the site, such that the amount and rate of stormwater discharged from the site would not increase in comparison to existing conditions, the project therefore would not have the potential to exceed the capacity of the existing storm drainage facilities. The on-site treatment of stormwater would ensure that water subsequently discharged from the site would not carry substantial amounts of pollutants. The project would therefore have a **less-than-significant impact** on the stormwater drainage system.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The site is in an area designated as Zone X, Area of Minimal Flood Hazard.<sup>21</sup> Zone X areas are generally outside the inundation zone for the 0.2-percent chance flood (i.e., the 500-year flood). However, the City has mapped the area as being potentially subject to temporary flooding as a result of a 24-inch rise in sea level due to climate warming in combination with a 100-year storm event.<sup>22</sup>

The project site is located within a potential tsunami runup area, as mapped by the California Emergency Management Agency.<sup>23</sup> The potential for inundation by tsunami of the site due to seiche is unknown, but it would be unlikely to exceed the potential for inundation.

<sup>21</sup> Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Alameda County, California and Incorporated Areas, Map Number 06001C0066H, December 21, 2018.

<sup>22</sup> City of Alameda, Alameda General Plan, Safety and Noise Element, Figure 8-3: Flood Hazards, January 1, 2017.

<sup>23</sup> California Emergency Management Agency, California Geological Survey, and University of Southern California, Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, State of California–County of Alameda, Oakland West Quadrangle, July 31, 2009.

While there is some potential for inundation of the site by flooding, tsunami, or seiche, these impacts would be reduced through implementation of adopted General Plan Safety and Noise Element policies, including the following:

**Policy SN-15:** Develop sea level rise adaptive strategies for different areas of the City for public discussion and evaluation, including but not limited to: avoidance/planned retreat, enhanced levees, setback levees to accommodate habitat transition zones, buffer zones, beaches, expanded tidal prisms for enhanced natural scouring of channel sediments, raising and flood-proofing structures, and/or provisions for additional floodwater pumping stations, and inland detention basins to reduce peak discharges.

**Policy SN-16:** Protect and upgrade public infrastructure, including but not limited to streets, wastewater systems and pump stations, stormwater systems and pump stations, and electric systems and facilities, to ensure capacity and resilience during storm events, high tides, and sea level rise, and to decrease the chance of flooding of nearby streets, utilities, and private property.

**Policy SN-17:** Reduce the risk of tsunami inundation through public tsunami education, with special emphasis in low-lying shoreline properties, including the maritime communities and marinas.

**Policy SN-19:** Require new development adjacent to the shoreline, lagoons and low elevations to plan for 50 years of sea level rise. Ensure that the design of future developments incorporate flood protection measures to protect improvements from a 100-year storm event and anticipated sea level rise.

**Policy SN-22:** Require the use of “Green Infrastructure”, landscaping, pervious surfaces, green roofs, and on-site stormwater retention facilities to reduce surface runoff and storm drain flooding during storm events.

With implementation of these General Plan policies, the risk of inundation of the site would be minimized, along with the potential for pollutants to be released from the project site into flood waters. This would be a ***less-than-significant impact***.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) <i>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** As discussed in Section X-a, above, future residential development on the site would be required to comply with the NPDES regulations pertaining to new development sites, which would prevent the discharge of water pollutants from the site. By complying with these regulations, there would be no potential for the project to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin* (Basin Plan), which is the master water quality control planning document adopted by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) for the Bay Area. For reasons discussed in Section X-b, the project would not conflict with the applicable groundwater management plan.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING** — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Physically divide an established community?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Approval of the proposed rezoning would have no physical effects. Future residential development of the project site that would be allowed by the proposed zoning district would occur entirely within the confines of the site. No new roads would be constructed and no existing roads or pedestrian paths would be removed or blocked off, and no physical barriers would be constructed that could divide the existing community. The project would not divide an established community or interfere in any way with access to an established community.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The General Plan land use designation of the site is Medium-Density Residential, which is primarily intended for one- and two-family residential units, but also allows multi-family housing. The anticipated future use of the site for residential housing would thus be an allowable use in the Medium-Density Residential designation. Additionally, the project would support the following policies from the Land Use Element of the General Plan:

**Policy 2.4.a:** Maintain and enhance the residential environment of Alameda's neighborhoods.

**Policy 2.4.c:** Where a suitable residential environment can be created, give priority to housing on land to be developed or redeveloped in order to meet the quantified objectives of the Housing Element.

**Policy 2.4.e:** Expand housing opportunities for households in all income groups.

The proposed project would rezone the property from Mixed Use (M-X) to R-4 Neighborhood Residential District. The R-4 district allows residential development with a maximum density of one unit per 2,000 square feet. This would allow development of the 35,556-square-foot site with up to 17 dwelling units, or up to 25 units with the applicable affordable housing density bonus. For purposes of this environmental review, it is assumed that a future proposal to develop the site would include up to 25 multi-family residential units on the site. Absent detailed project plans, a thorough zoning consistency analysis is not feasible at this time, but it is assumed a future development proposal would conform to the applicable zoning regulations or include a request for one or more variances, as applicable.

Based on currently available information, the proposed project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The project site and all lands in the vicinity of the site are classified as Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) category MRZ-1 by the California Department of Conservation's Division of Mines and Geology (DMG).<sup>24</sup> The MRZ-1 designation is assigned to areas where adequate information is available to make a determination that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged by DMG that there is little likelihood that they are present. It can therefore be assumed that mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State are absent from the site. In addition, the site is located in a developed urbanized area, where extraction of minerals from the site would be impractical and highly disruptive to surrounding established land uses. This is reinforced by a statement in the DMG report published with the MRZ maps for the Bay Area that mineral lands located within areas that have already been urbanized are not considered viable for extraction, and are deemed incompatible.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, the project would have **no impact** on the availability of mineral resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** No locally significant mineral resources are designated in the City's General Plan. As noted above, the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the availability of significant mineral resources.

<sup>24</sup> California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Generalized Mineral Land Classification Map of the South San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region, Newark Quadrangle [map] (Plate 1 of 29), 1996.

<sup>25</sup> California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, *Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the South San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region*, Concepts Used in Identifying Available Aggregate Resources (page 7), 1996.

**XIII. NOISE** — *Would the project result in:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** According to the Future Noise Contour Map presented in the Safety and Noise Element of the City's General Plan, the project site is not located within or near one of the elevated noise contours, where noise levels from vehicle and air traffic range from 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA) community noise equivalent level (CNEL) to 79 dBA CNEL.<sup>26, 27</sup> Noise levels are generally considered low when ambient levels are below 45 dBA, moderate in the 45-60 dBA range, and high above 60 dBA.

Construction of a future residential development on the project site would generate substantial noise on the site on a temporary and short-term basis. The highest noise levels would be generated by the operation of heavy-duty construction equipment during site preparation and grading. While this type of noise can exceed 85 dBA at the property line and can be perceived as annoying to nearby receptors, most Bay Area cities do not treat temporary construction noise as a significant impact pursuant to CEQA if construction activities are limited to stipulated hours. Pursuant to Section 4-10.7 of the Alameda Municipal Code, noise-generating construction activities must be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction is prohibited on Sundays and holidays. Construction of a future residential project would be required to occur only during these hours and, therefore, the project would have a ***less-than-significant impact*** related to temporary construction noise.

With respect to permanent operational noise, future residential development on the site would generate a negligible amount of noise, primarily by passenger vehicles of the residents and their visitors, delivery trucks, and maintenance/service vehicles arriving to and departing from the site. Periodic maintenance of landscaping could generate short-term elevated noise levels, such as during operation of a lawn mower or leaf blower. These noise sources are common to all residential development, and are not considered noise disturbances subject to regulation.

Alameda General Plan Policy SN-57 in the Safety and Noise Element states that for purposes of CEQA, a project would have a significant impact if it would cause an increase in the  $L_{dn}$  noise level of 4 dBA or more, if the resulting noise level would exceed that described as normally acceptable for the

<sup>26</sup>A decibel (dB) is a unit of sound energy intensity caused by rapid fluctuation of air pressure as sound waves travel outward from a source. An A-weighted decibel (dBA) is a decibel corrected for the variation in frequency response to the typical human ear at commonly encountered noise levels.

<sup>27</sup>CNEL is the average A-weighted noise level during a 24-hour day, obtained by addition of 5 decibels in the evening from 7:00 to 10:00 p.m., and an addition of a 10-decibel penalty in the night between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

affected land use.<sup>28</sup> The City's land use compatibility guidelines indicate that multi-family residential development is normally acceptable where the ambient L<sub>dn</sub> or CNEL is up to 65 dBA.<sup>29</sup>

Vehicle traffic would be the primary source of noise generated by the assumed future use of the site. It requires a doubling of traffic volumes to result in a just-perceivable increase of 3 dBA in ambient noise. Since there is no potential for project-generated traffic to double the existing traffic volumes in the area, there is no potential for the project to cause a perceivable increase in the existing ambient noise level. Therefore, the proposed project would have a ***less-than-significant operational noise impact***.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** While future construction on the project site would generate vibration, it is not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Furthermore, there are no structurally vulnerable buildings in close proximity to the site that could potentially be damaged by excessive groundborne vibration. Therefore, the proposed project would have a ***less-than-significant impact*** from groundborne vibration.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There is no airport within 2 miles of the project site. The closest airport is Oakland International Airport, located about 4.5 miles to the southeast of the project site. There would be ***no impact*** due to exposure of future project residents to excessive airport noise.

<sup>28</sup> The L<sub>dn</sub> sound level is the average day-night 24-hour average sound level, and is roughly equivalent to the CNEL.

<sup>29</sup> City of Alameda, Alameda General Plan, Safety and Noise Element, Table 8-1: California Land Use Compatibility Guidelines, January 1, 2017.

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING** — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The proposed rezoning and assumed future residential development of the site would lead to an incremental increase in the population of Alameda, though some project residents would likely already be residents of the City who would relocate to the future residences. Based on the 2010 U.S. Census, Alameda has an average household size of 2.35 persons.<sup>30</sup> If all future occupants of the assumed 25 dwelling units were new residents to the City, there would be an increase in the City's population of under 59 people. With a 2010 population of 72,259 residents,<sup>31</sup> this would represent a 0.082-percent increase in the City's population which, by any measure, would not constitute substantial unplanned growth. Furthermore, the City's General Plan assumes and plans for continued growth in the City's population. In addition, the existing M-X zoning of the site already allows residential development with a density of up to one dwelling unit per 2,000 square feet of lot area, which would also allow development of the site with up to 25 dwelling units with the allowable affordable housing density bonus. Thus, residential development and the associated population growth has already been factored into the City's land use planning. Therefore, implementation of the project would have a **no impact** on population growth.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There is no housing on the project site, so housing would be displaced as a result of the project. There are no existing businesses on the site that would be required to relocate.

<sup>30</sup>United States Census Bureau, Average Household Size, 2000 Decennial Census, Table PO17, accessed June 6, 2020 at: [https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=Table\\_DP-1\\_Alameda\\_City\\_CA&g=1600000US0600562&tid=DECENNIALSF12000.P017&layer=VT\\_2018\\_160\\_00\\_PY\\_D1&vintage=2000&cid=P015001](https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=Table_DP-1_Alameda_City_CA&g=1600000US0600562&tid=DECENNIALSF12000.P017&layer=VT_2018_160_00_PY_D1&vintage=2000&cid=P015001).

<sup>31</sup> United States Census Bureau, Total Population, 2000 Decennial Census, Table PO01, accessed June 6, 2020 at: [https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=Table\\_DP-1\\_Alameda\\_City\\_CA&g=1600000US0600562&tid=DECENNIALSF12000.P001&layer=VT\\_2018\\_160\\_00\\_PY\\_D1&vintage=2000&cid=P015001](https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=Table_DP-1_Alameda_City_CA&g=1600000US0600562&tid=DECENNIALSF12000.P001&layer=VT_2018_160_00_PY_D1&vintage=2000&cid=P015001).

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES** - *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Fire protection?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Fire protection services in Alameda are provided by the Alameda Fire Department (AFD), which also provides emergency medical response. The AFD operates out of four fire stations located throughout the City, with a staff of 117 personnel, with a minimum of 25 people on duty daily. Alameda Fire Station No. 2 is located about one-half mile to the southeast of the project site, at 635 Pacific Avenue. Emergency response time to the site would be well within the goal established in the Safety and Noise Element of the General Plan, which is to provide first response within 5 minutes and 20 seconds, 90 percent of the time.

While future development of up to 25 residential dwelling units on the project site could result in an incremental increase in calls for fire protection services, any increase would be a tiny fraction of the more than 7,500 annual calls for service. Any additional calls for fire protection service could readily be accommodated by the AFD's existing facilities and staffing. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not require construction of new or expanded fire stations, and there would be **no impact** related to such construction.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Police protection?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Police protection services in Alameda are provided by the Alameda Police Department (APD), which operates out of headquarters located at the 1555 Oak Street. The APD currently has a staff of 88 sworn police officers and 33 non-sworn full-time personnel. The City of Alameda is divided into five sectors, with one to four officers assigned to each sector at any given time. The project site is located within Sector 5.

In 2019, the APD handled 2,778 calls for Part I crimes (i.e., homicide, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny/theft, vehicle theft, and arson).<sup>32</sup> There were a total of 5,054 calls for police service in 2019.

Similar to the preceding discussion on fire protection services, future residential development on the project site could result in an incremental increase in calls for police protection services, but any

<sup>32</sup> Alameda Police Department, Annual Crimes Statistics, accessed June 7, 2020 at: <https://www.alamedaca.gov/Departments/Police-Department/Annual-Crime-Stats>.

increase would be a tiny fraction of the more than 5,000 annual calls for service to the APD. Any additional calls for police protection service could readily be accommodated by the APD's existing facilities and staffing. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not require construction of new or expanded police stations, and there would be **no impact** related to such construction.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Public school services in Alameda are provided by the Alameda Unified School District (AUSD), which has nine elementary schools, four middle schools, and four high schools. School-age children living in future residences on the site would attend Ruby Bridges Elementary School (351 Jack London Avenue), Wood Middle School (210 Central Avenue), and Encinal Junior/Senior High School (420 Grand Street).<sup>33</sup>

Pursuant to Senate Bill 50 (1998), with payment of applicable school impact fees, the State has determined that proposed development projects would have a less-than-significant impact on schools.<sup>34</sup> The project would be required to pay school impact fee for residential development in effect at the time future residences on the site are proposed, which would ensure that the project would have a **less-than-significant impact** on schools.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There are over 20 parks and recreation facilities in Alameda. In the project vicinity, there is Neptune Park, at 2301 Webster Street (0.3-mile east of the project site); Bayport Park, at 301 Jack London Avenue (0.25-mile west of the project site); Woodstock Park, at 351 Cypress Street (0.4-mile southwest of the project site); and the Main Street Soccer Field at Main Street and Appenzato Parkway (0.6-mile southwest of the project site).

Future residential development on the project site would cause a small incremental increase in the City's population, and therefore could result in additional use of parks in Alameda. The minor increase in demand that could be generated by 17 dwelling units, or up to 25 units with density bonus, would not exceed the capacity of existing parks or require construction of new parks. Furthermore, a future residential project would be required to pay a Development Impact Fee, based on the number of proposed dwelling units, pursuant to Section 27-3 of the Alameda Municipal Code. The Development Impact Fee is intended to defray the cost of providing and maintaining parks, as well as other public improvements, services, and amenities.

<sup>33</sup>Alameda Unified School District, School Finder, Accessed June 7, 2020 at: <http://apps.schoolsitelocator.com/?districtcode=66066>.

<sup>34</sup>Senate Bill (SB 50), Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, Statutes 1998, Chapter 407.

Because the proposed project is expected to generate a minor increase in demand for parks, and construction of new or expanded park facilities would not be required to meet this demand, the project would have a ***less-than-significant impact*** on parks.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) <i>Other public facilities?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The proposed project would cause a small incremental increase in the City's population, and therefore could result in demand for other public facilities, such as libraries. The additional demand for libraries and other services that would potentially be created by 25 new dwelling units would not cause a need for construction of new or expanded public facilities, so the proposed project would have a ***less-than-significant impact*** on other public facilities.

## **XVI. RECREATION —**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The additional use of neighborhood and/or regional parks or other recreational facilities that would potentially be created by up to 25 future residences would not have the potential to cause substantial physical deterioration of park or recreation facilities. In addition, the City requires new residential development to pay a Development Impact Fee, as discussed in Section XV-d, which would be used to help the City to maintain and expand the availability of park and recreational facilities. The minor incremental increase in demand for parks and other recreational facilities would not cause a substantial physical deterioration of the facilities. The project would have a ***less-than-significant impact*** on recreation facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** There are currently no plans to develop the project site, but future residential development that would be facilitated by the proposed rezoning could potentially include recreational facilities, such as a fitness gym. Construction of these facilities would cause short-term environmental effects that have been addressed elsewhere in this Initial Study, such as the discussions of air quality and water quality/hydrology. While construction of the recreation facilities could result in a **significant, adverse impact** on the environment, with implementation of mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

#### **XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The two primary plans addressing the circulation system in Alameda are the *Transportation Choices Plan* and the Transportation Element of the General Plan. The *Transportation Choices Plan* (TCP) is intended to provide a framework for implementing future transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) projects and programs in the City. The TCP was prepared in coordination with numerous local and regional transportation planning documents, including the Alameda County Transportation Commission's *Countywide Transit Plan* (2016), *City of Alameda Transit Plan* (2001), *AC Transit Service Expansion Plan* (2016), and Water Emergency Transportation Agency's *System Expansion Policy, Short-Range Transit Plan* (2016), among many others. The TCP also aligns with *Plan Bay Area 2040* (2017), the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area.

The two governing goals of the TCP are to: (1) decrease drive-alone trips at estuary crossings, especially in the peak periods, and (2) increase the share of walking, bicycling, bus, and carpooling trips within Alameda. The Plan sets forth priority strategies and implementation projects and programs for achieving these goals. The proposed project would contribute toward meeting the second goal and would also support the following priority strategies:

**Priority Strategy #1:** Expand transit, bicycling and walking to/from Oakland and BART.

**Priority Strategy #2:** Expand transit and carpools to/from San Francisco.

The anticipated future residential development on the site would support these priority strategies because the new residences would be located approximately one-quarter mile from a major transit stop on Webster Street that provides access to six AC Transit bus lines, including two transbay lines providing service to/from San Francisco, four lines providing service to/from Oakland, and three lines providing service to/from BART; the bus lines are listed in the following subsection. The proposed project would not conflict with any of the TCP's priority strategies, implementation projects, or implementation programs.

The City of Alameda's General Plan Transportation Element (adopted in 2009) also provides targeted objectives and policies that seek to enhance the use of alternative modes of transportation, assist the development of an intermodal transportation system, and reduce the overall drive-alone mode share in Alameda. The proposed project would not conflict with any of the policies promulgated in the Transportation Element.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subsection (b)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation: Pursuant to SB 743, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) adopted revisions to the *CEQA Guidelines* on December 28, 2018 stating that adverse effects on Level of Service will no longer be considered to be a significant environmental impact under CEQA. The revised Guidelines have replaced LOS with vehicle-miles-travelled (VMT) as the most appropriate measure of transportation impact.<sup>35</sup> The *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* published by OPR in December 2018 provided recommendations regarding VMT evaluation methodology, significance thresholds, and screening thresholds for land use projects. The OPR guidelines and Section 15064.3(b) of the revised *CEQA Guidelines* state that transit-oriented development projects located within ½-mile of an existing major transit stop would have a less-than-significant impact on VMT. The project site is located approximately one-quarter mile west of a major transit stop located on Webster Street at Willie Stargell Avenue. This stop provides access to six AC Transit bus lines, including two transbay lines (O and W) and an all-nighter line (851). Four of the lines provides access to downtown Oakland (20, 51A, 314, and 851) and another provides access to the Rockridge and Fruitvale BART stations in the East Bay (51A). Lines 20 and 851 also provide access to the Fruitvale BART station. The project site is located within ½-mile of an existing major transit stop, and the project would therefore have a **less-than-significant impact on VMT** per OPR guidelines.

<sup>35</sup> California Public Resources Code, Section 21099(b)(2) and *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.3(a).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Future development of the project site would occur entirely within the confines of the site. No new roads, intersections, or other features with the potential to create traffic hazards would be constructed. There would be **no impact** from the creation of traffic safety hazards.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) <i>Result in inadequate emergency access?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The surrounding streets adjoining the project site—Fifth Street, Willie Stargell Avenue, and Ralph Appezato Memorial Parkway—would continue to provide emergency access to the site. A future residential development would have a driveway entrance on Fifth Street that would provide emergency access to the site and Fire Department review and approval of the site plan would ensure that the future development would not create any constraints to adequate emergency access to the site. There would be **no impact** on emergency access.

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES** — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i>				
<i>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** In 2004 the California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 18, which requires local governments to contact and consult with California Native American tribes prior to adoption or amendment of a general plan, specific plan, or designation of open space. This requirement was expanded to include development projects with the passage in 2014 of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which established a consultation process with all California Native American tribes included on a list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). For a specific development project, the consultation must be with a tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.

AB 52 established a new class of cultural resources, Tribal Cultural Resources. A Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) is a site feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object that is of cultural value to a Native American tribe and is either on or eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or a local historic register, or the lead agency chooses, at its discretion, to treat the resource as a TCR.

For any development project application deemed complete by a lead agency after July 1, 2015, the lead agency must provide written notification within 14 days to all tribes that have requested placement on the agency's notification list. The notification must provide the project location, a brief description of the project, the lead agency contact information, and notice that the tribe has 30 days to request consultation. If a tribe requests consultation, it must begin within 30 days.

To date, no Native American tribal groups who may be traditionally and culturally affiliated with the City of Alameda have requested placement on the City's notification list. Although there is no development on the project site with the potential to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources, such resources could potentially lie buried in the subsurface of the site, as discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources.

In general, potentially significant impacts to prehistoric archaeological resources may be considered potentially significant impacts to TCRs. As discussed further in Section V, undiscovered cultural resources may lie buried within the project site, and implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 would be required prior to future residential development of the site. While implementation of Mitigation

Measure CR-1 would ensure that potentially significant impacts to TCRs would be less than significant, Mitigation Measure TCR-1, below, would ensure compliance with AB 52, and would further reduce potential impacts to TCRs.

Were any TCRs present in the subsurface of the project site, any disturbance to such resources during future construction could result in a **significant, adverse impact** on tribal cultural resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1, set forth in Section V, and the following mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level:

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1:** At such time that a proposal to develop the project site is submitted to the City, the City shall provide written notification about the project—within 14 days of deeming the development application complete—to all tribes that have requested placement on the City’s notification list. The notification must provide the project location, a brief description of the project, the lead agency contact information, and notice that the tribe has 30 days to request consultation. If a tribe requests consultation, the City shall commence consultation within 30 days of receiving the request, and shall execute the consultation in accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 51 prior to issuing a grading permit for the proposed development.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>A resource determined by the Lead Agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the Lead Agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 establishes the California Register of Historical Resources and defines the criteria for inclusion on the California Register. As discussed in Section V-a, no historic resources are known or suspected to be present at the project site. However, their potential presence cannot be completely ruled out. Were such resources to be present, disturbance of the subsurface during construction could damage or destroy the resource(s), which would be a **potentially significant impact** on historic resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 (see Section V) would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** — *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** A future residential development on the project site would connect to the existing water and wastewater utilities that serve the project area. The tiny increment of increased demand for water and wastewater treatment services would not have the potential to exceed the capacity of the local water and wastewater treatment plants. Adequate capacity in the local conveyance pipes would be confirmed prior to approval of a specific development project. Stormwater runoff from the site would continue to be discharged into the City's stormwater drainage system, which consists of roadway curb inlets that collect and channel surface water from rainfall and other sources into a series of pipelines beneath City roadways that ultimately discharge into San Francisco Bay. As discussed in more detail in Section X, the project would not have the potential to exceed the capacity of the existing storm drainage facilities and, therefore, construction of new facilities would not be required. There is also existing infrastructure in the area to provide electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications services to the project site, and construction of new facilities would not be required. Companies providing these services upgrade their facilities when needed to accommodate increased demand. The proposed project would have a **less-than-significant impact** on water, wastewater, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Construction of future residential development allowed by the proposed rezoning would temporarily consume water for suppression of dust during site grading activities. Water would also be used during construction for production of concrete, washing equipment, and for other miscellaneous purposes. Following project construction, domestic water would be consumed by residents and for irrigation of landscaping. Water would be supplied by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), which conducts regular planning, as required by State law, to ensure it has adequate water supplies to meet demand within its service area both during normal rainfall years and during multiple drought years. EBMUD's demand projections are based on projected population and job growth rates produced by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), which draws on the general plans of the cities and counties in the Bay Area. Because the existing General Plan land use designation of the

site allows development of a school, water demand from the site has been part of EBMUD's water supply planning for many years. Therefore, the project's impact on water supply would be ***less than significant***.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation: See Section XIX-b, above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) <i>Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation: Solid waste generated in the City of Alameda is transported to the Davis Street Resource Recovery Complex located in San Leandro, where it is sorted and recyclable materials are recovered. Residual solid waste is disposed at the Altamont Landfill, which has an estimated permitted capacity of 62 million cubic yards, a daily permitted capacity of 11,500 tons per day, and an estimated remaining capacity of 47.2 million cubic yards as of 2012.<sup>36</sup> The incremental increase in solid waste generation that would be created by development of a future residential development on the project site would not have the potential to exceed the available disposal capacity of Altamont Landfill.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) <i>Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation: Future residential development of the site would be required to comply with all laws and regulations pertaining to solid waste. This would include the diversion of at least 50 percent of the construction and demolition (C&D) debris generated during site development from landfill disposal, as

<sup>36</sup> City of Alameda, *Encinal Terminals Master Plan Draft Focused Supplemental Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse Number 2016042076, Section H: Utilities and Service Systems, February 2017.

required by Section 21-24.3 of the Alameda Municipal Code. Therefore, the project would have a **less-than-significant impact** due to conflicts with solid waste management statutes and regulations.

**XX. WILDFIRE** — *If located in or near a State Responsibility Area or lands classified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** As discussed in more detail in Section IX-f, the project would not block or impede access to emergency evacuation routes, and would not interfere with implementation of the City's *Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan* or emergency response procedures adopted by any local service providers.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire of the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** As discussed in more detail in Section IX-g, the project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ), as mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). The site is not adjacent to or near wildlands or slopes, and is located in an urbanized area substantially developed with pavements and buildings. As concluded in Section IX-g, there is no potential for wildfire at the project site. The project would have **no impact** due to increased risk of wildfire.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The project site is fully served by existing roads, water supply, and fire-fighting services. No new infrastructure construction would be required to provide fire-fighting services to the project, so there would be no associated construction impacts to the environment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) <i>Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** The project site is located in an area characterized by flat topography, with no slopes on or in the vicinity of the site. There is therefore no potential secondary effects from a wildfire, such as post-fire slope instability. Furthermore, there is no risk of wildfire at or near the project site. The project would have **no impact** related to the exposure of people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

## XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE —

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) <i>Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Operational air quality impacts would be less than significant and mitigation measures have been identified in this Initial Study to ensure that construction-related air quality impacts remain less than significant. There is no special habitat present on the project site, and the project would have no impact on biological resources. There is a possibility for prehistoric or historic cultural resources to be buried under the site, and subsurface disturbance of the site during future construction could damage or destroy any buried cultural resources that may be present. Similarly, if paleontological resources are present, they could also be damaged or destroyed during construction activities. However, mitigation measures have been identified to ensure that these potential impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) <i>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** No significant cumulative impacts were identified for the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) <i>Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation:** Mitigation has been identified to reduce potential impacts from the generation of dust during project construction, which could potentially have adverse effects on human receptors. No other potentially significant impacts on human beings were identified. Mitigation has also been included that requires performance of an Environmental Site Assessment prior to future development of the site to ensure that there is no soil or groundwater contamination on the site that could adversely affect human health or the environment. Were any contamination to be found, remediation of the site to safe levels would be required prior to issuing a grading permit.

No other environmental effects of the project were identified that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

## MITIGATION MEASURES

### Air Quality

#### **Mitigation Measure AQ-1:**

The property owner/applicant of a future residential use shall require the construction contractor to reduce the severity of project construction period dust and equipment exhaust impacts by complying with the following control measures:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

### Cultural Resources

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-1:**

At such time that a proposal to develop the project site is submitted to the City, the City shall commission, or shall require the applicant to commission, an archival search of archaeological records maintained by the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) in the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University

to determine if archaeological resources are known to be present in the project area. If the results from the NWIC include any recommendations for additional investigation because the NWIC determined that there is a moderate or high probability for cultural resources to be present at the site, all recommendations shall be implemented by a qualified professional archaeologist and the results shall be presented in a professional-quality report, to be submitted to the Alameda Planning Division and the NWIC. Any additional investigation or mitigation recommended by the archaeologist, such as monitoring during ground-disturbing project construction activities, shall be implemented. With the exception of potential construction monitoring, this mitigation measure shall be implemented prior to issuance of a grading permit for the project.

**Mitigation Measure CR-2:**

In the event that any human remains are encountered during future site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and a qualified archaeologist shall notify the Office of the Alameda County Coroner and advise that office as to whether the remains are likely to be prehistoric or historic period in date. If determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner's Office will notify the Native American Heritage Commission of the find, which, in turn, will then appoint a "Most Likely Descendant" (MLD). The MLD in consultation with the archaeological consultant and the City, will advise and help formulate an appropriate plan for treatment of the remains, which might include recordation, removal, and scientific study of the remains and any associated artifacts. After completion of analysis and preparation of the report of findings, the remains and associated grave goods shall be returned to the MLD for reburial.

Geology and Soils

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:**

If any paleontological resources—such as fossilized bone, teeth, shell, tracks, trails, casts, molds, or impressions—are encountered during site grading or other construction activities, all ground disturbance within 100 feet of the find shall be halted until the services of a qualified paleontologist can be retained to identify and evaluate the scientific value of the resource(s) and, if necessary, recommend mitigation measures to document and prevent any significant adverse effects on the resource(s). Significant paleontological resources shall be salvaged and deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution, such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP).

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

**Mitigation Measure HM-1:**

Prior to approval of any future development on the project site, the applicant shall retain the services of a Registered Environmental Assessor (REA) to conduct and document a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) in accordance with standards established by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard ASTM E1527-13. If the Phase I ESA determines that there is some

potential for contamination at the site and recommends performance of a Phase II ESA with subsurface testing of soil and/or groundwater, the Phase II ESA shall be completed prior to issuance of a grading permit. Any further recommendations presented in the Phase II ESA report, such as performing remediation of contaminated soil or groundwater determined to be present, shall also be implemented prior to issuance of a grading permit, and a No Further Action letter from the regulatory agency overseeing the cleanup (likely to be California Department of Toxic Substances Control, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, or Alameda County Environmental Health Department) shall be provided to the City of Alameda prior to issuance of a grading permit.

#### Tribal Cultural Resources

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1:** At such time that a proposal to develop the project site is submitted to the City, the City shall provide written notification about the project—within 14 days of deeming the development application complete—to all tribes that have requested placement on the City’s notification list. The notification must provide the project location, a brief description of the project, the lead agency contact information, and notice that the tribe has 30 days to request consultation. If a tribe requests consultation, the City shall commence consultation within 30 days of receiving the request, and shall execute the consultation in accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 51 prior to issuing a grading permit for the proposed development.

(This page intentionally left blank.)