



CITY OF SAN LEANDRO
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
Planning Division

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM

Project title: Cornerstone at San Leandro Crossings Project, PLN2008-00030, Westlake Development Partners, LLC and BRIDGE Urban Infill Land Development (BUILD, LLC)

Lead agency name, address & phone number: Kathleen Livermore, Planning Manager
City of San Leandro, 835 E. 14th Street, San Leandro, CA 94577
(510) 577-3350

Project location: The proposed project encompasses two project areas totaling approximately 4.22 acres that are situated in the downtown area of the City of San Leandro in Alameda County (see Figure 1). The site is identified as “Cornerstone at San Leandro Crossings” or the BUILD, LLC Project, which encompasses two separate parcels identified as “Sites 1 and 2” Site 1 is located at the northeast corner of San Leandro Boulevard and West Juana Avenue (APN #075-0039-007-05) and Site 2 is a portion of 1333 Martinez Street, located near the intersection of Parrott Street and San Leandro Boulevard (Ptn. of APN # 075-0047-007-00 and 075-0047-002-00).

Project sponsor’s Name and address: M. Gary Wong, President, Westlake Development Partners, LLC
520 El Camino Real, 9th Floor, San Mateo, CA 94402-1722

General Plan: Site 1: RH Residential High Density Site 2: OF Office
Zoning: Site 1: DA-4(S) Site 2: DA-5(S) / PS (S)

Description of site and proposed project: Cornerstone at San Leandro Crossings is a transit-oriented development (TOD) project located in an area adjacent to the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. This project will be one of the first development efforts to implement the City’s Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy previously analyzed in the TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in September of 2007. The project encompasses three separate parcels, identified herein as “ Site 1” and “ Site 2”. Site 1 is a relatively flat site that has been previously graded and disturbed and is presently used as commuter parking for the San Leandro BART Station (APN#075-0039-007-05). This site is proposed for 200 luxury, multi-family condominiums consisting of four stories of studios, one- and two-bedroom units over a ground floor and basement containing a 290-space parking garage (Ptn. of APN #075-0047-007-00 and 075-0047-002-00). Site 2 is proposed for a 329 to 345-stall BART parking structure that will replace all of the BART parking (329 spaces) currently provided on Site 1, plus up to 16 additional stalls. The parking garage will cover a part of Martinez Street which will be vacated. Land will then be set aside for the addition of more BART parking to accommodate future development in later phases pursuant to Vesting Tentative Map 8010. As part of this project, a portion of Martinez Street (between Parrott and Thornton Streets) will be removed and incorporated into the BART parking garage, in addition to proposed street, sidewalk, landscaping and utility improvements.

Surrounding land uses and setting: North: Commercial Office
South: Industrial
East: San Leandro BART Station
West: Light Industrial

Other public agencies Involved: San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings
Of Significance | | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. 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 significant effect(s) 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 attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, to analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- 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 all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

Kathleen Livermore, Planning Manager
Printed name

Date

City of San Leandro

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

1. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?			X		1, 2, 9
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X	2, 3, 4
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X	2, 3, 4

EXPLANATION:

- a) The approximately 4.22-acre project site is located in downtown San Leandro and encompasses two parcels and a portion of a third parcel. The sites (Cornerstone at San Leandro Crossings) are generally identified as “Site 1” and “Site 2”. Site 1 is located at the northeast corner of San Leandro Boulevard and West Juana Avenue and totals 2.26 acres (APN#075-0039-007-05). Site 1 has been previously graded and disturbed and is presently used as a surface parking lot serving the San Leandro BART Station (See Figure 2). This site is surrounded by St. Leander’s School to the north, single-family residential and commercial uses to the south, condominiums (Pacific Plaza) to the east and the San Leandro BART Station to the west. The property has been developed as a parking lot since approximately 1971 when the property was purchased by the current property owner. Prior to that, the property was developed with residential and commercial buildings. Site 2 is comprised of a portion of 1333 Martinez Street south of West Estudillo Avenue on the north, Thornton Street on the south, Alvarado Street on the west and Martinez Street on the east and totals 1.96 acres (APN # 075-0047-002-00 and a ptn of 075-0047-007-00). This project site has been previously graded and disturbed and is presently a vacant lot surrounded by a commercial office building further to the north, industrial uses to the south, light industrial to the west and San Leandro Boulevard and the San Leandro BART Station to the east (See Figure 3). This property was previously the site of the Del Monte facility which was demolished in 1989. The proposed uses would complement rather than divide the established community by providing in-fill development on underutilized urban lots and would implement land uses approved by the downtown San Leandro Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy, previously analyzed in the TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in September of 2007. Therefore, the proposed project would not create significant impacts nor disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the community established by existing uses.
- b) The City of San Leandro General Plan contains various policies pertaining to land use, housing, circulation and transportation, open space, recreation and noise, which could be applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project does not involve the creation of a new General Plan land use designation and zoning district, but rather implements land uses set forth in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy and analyzed in the TOD Strategy EIR (September 2007). The TOD Strategy was developed to comply with and implement the overall vision of the General Plan as it relates to the downtown San Leandro area. The TOD Strategy is a comprehensive plan for the smart growth of the downtown area and supports residential growth with higher density housing, such as the proposed project. As part of the TOD Strategy, a detailed land assessment was completed for downtown, and thirty-nine opportunity sites were identified, including the project site (Site 1 and Site 2). Development of the project site will help to implement the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy. As a result, the proposed project will not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation and will therefore not have a potentially significant effect.
- c) There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in effect within the project area. The project sites have been previously graded and disturbed, containing vegetation that is primarily ornamental (Site 1) and ruderal in nature (Site 2) and are surrounded by existing development. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with any habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans and will therefore have no impact.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or major infrastructure)?		X			1, 2, 4, 9
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---	--	--	------------

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

b. Displace substantial number of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	1, 2, 4, 9
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	1, 2, 4, 9

EXPLANATION:

a) Site 1 includes the proposed development of a 200-unit luxury condominium project, with 290 parking spaces on a site that is presently used as a surface parking lot for the San Leandro BART Station. Intensification of the use of this site would lead directly to population growth in the downtown San Leandro area. Site 2 will consist of the development of a 329 to 345-space BART parking garage. Impacts related to population and housing were evaluated in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR. The proposed project will not create substantial population growth and result over and above what was analyzed in the TOD EIR, which was certified in September of 2007. The proposed project, as a development project occurring under the TOD Strategy, would be required to follow the General Plan Policies and the Mitigation Measures Master List set forth in the TOD Strategy EIR. Implementation of mitigation measures, as identified below, would result in less than significant impacts for population and housing.

Mitigation Measure #1: The applicant shall implement infill development on vacant or underused sites within residential areas in compliance with General Plan Policy 3.04.

Mitigation Measure #2: As provided in Section 6-3014 (b) of the San Leandro Zoning Code, a developer may provide off-site construction, land dedication, credit transfers, in-lieu fees or a combination of these alternatives to satisfy the inclusionary housing requirements, which are being pursued in this case.

This application is for infill development of vacant and underutilized sites. There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR (2007).

b-c) The proposed project would include development on parcels that are currently either vacant or used as a surface parking lot and have been previously graded and disturbed. No housing units are currently located on either site. The construction of replacement housing would not be necessary since no housing units or residents will be displaced with project implementation.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

3. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
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?				X	5, 6, 7
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X			5, 6, 7
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X			5, 6, 7
iv) Landslides?				X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		5, 6, 7
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:		X			5, 6, 7

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

d. Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks of life or property?		X			5, 6, 7
e. Have soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X		5, 6, 7
f. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on- or off-site?			X		4, 5, 8
g. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach, sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?				X	4, 5, 8

EXPLANATION:

a) i. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act requires the delineation of zones along sufficiently active and well defined faults by the California Department of Conservation, Geological Survey (CGS). The project site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and no known active or potentially active faults exist on the sites. The nearest active fault to the project sites are the Hayward fault, approximately 2.9 miles to the northeast; the Calaveras, approximately 17 miles to the northeast; and the San Andreas, approximately 26 miles to the southwest. Therefore, no fault rupture hazards are anticipated with project implementation.

ii, iii. In 2002, the U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) predicted a 62 percent probability of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake occurring in the San Francisco Bay Area by the year 2032. During a major earthquake on a segment of one of the nearby faults, strong shaking is expected to occur at the project sites. The project sites are also within a designated liquefaction hazard zone. Strong shaking during an earthquake can result in ground failure such as that associated with soil liquefaction, lateral spreading and cyclic densification. Test borings and cone penetration tests were performed by Rockridge Geotechnical in August, 2008, and these results were used to evaluate the potential for seismic hazards to occur. Based on preliminary field investigations, potentially significant impacts could occur with geologic hazards associated with strong shaking on a nearby fault and the presence of compressible clay zones below the sites. Therefore, mitigation of potential liquefaction hazards is required with project implementation.

Mitigation Measure #3: The City of San Leandro has incorporated the 2006 International Building Code into its municipal building code (Title 7, Chapter 7-5). The project applicant would be required to comply with all applicable State and City regulations to address potential geologic hazards associated with the proposed project, including ground shaking and liquefaction. Geotechnical and seismic design criteria must conform to engineering recommendations in accordance with the seismic requirements of the 2007 California Building Code (Title 24) and any amendments adopted in the San Leandro Municipal Code. Additionally, because the project site is in a liquefaction Seismic Hazard Zone, the project applicant will be required to comply with the guidelines set forth by California Geological Survey Special Publication 117.

iv. The TOD Strategy Area is nearly flat and there are no hilly areas immediately adjacent to the project sites. Site 1 is rectangular in shape and currently consists of an at-grade asphalt parking lot. Site 1 elevations range between 44 and 47 feet, and the site is underlain by clay that extends to depths ranging from 25 to 50 feet below the existing ground surface (bgs). Site 2 consists of vacant, undeveloped land with site elevations ranging between 45 and 48 feet, and the site is blanketed by 22 to 28 feet of clay with varying sand content, with interbedded alluvial soils beneath the upper clay layer extending to a maximum depth of 100 feet bgs. Neither site is associated with significant slopes, and there are no adjacent hillsides. Therefore, the proposed project would not create potential impacts associated with landslides, mudflows or other mass soil movements.

The proposed project would consist of grading and trenching activities that could create effects on water quality as a result of erosion. Because the project site exceeds one acre in size, the project applicant would be required to apply for coverage under the State General Construction Permit in order to comply with federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Geology/Soils (Continued)

System (NPDES) requirements, in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board (see Section VIII, Hydrology and Water Quality).

The applicant would be required to develop and implement a Storm Water Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to reduce potential erosion and subsequent sedimentation of storm water runoff. The SWPPP would include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control erosion associated with grading, trenching and other ground surface disturbance. Additionally, all construction activities will be required to comply with Chapter 18 of the San Leandro Municipal Code regulating excavation activities and the construction of foundations and retaining walls, as well as the San Leandro Grading Ordinance regulating grading activities, drainage and erosion control. Therefore, compliance with the NPDES permit process and the California Building Code requirements would minimize potential impacts from erosion during and after project construction and would ensure that potential geology and soils impacts are less than significant.

c- e) Borings, cone penetration tests and laboratory testing conducted by Rockridge Geotechnical (December 22, 2008) revealed potentially liquefiable soil at a depth of between 42 and 50 feet on Site 1, with estimates that ground-surface settlement associated with liquefaction after a major seismic event is less than ¼ inch over a horizontal distance of 30 feet. Site 2 demonstrated potentially liquefiable soil layers at depths ranging from 23 to 96 feet bgs indicating that settlement resulting from post-liquefaction reconsolidation could be up to 1 –1 ¼ inches, and differential settlement may be up to ½ inch over a horizontal distance of 30 feet. An acceptable degree of soil stability would be achieved for expansive, liquefaction-prone and compressible soils by incorporating soil treatment programs such as replacement, grouting, compaction and drainage control during the excavation and construction phases of the project in order to address site-specific soil conditions. No septic tanks or leach field systems are proposed as part of the project, but rather wastewater disposal would be handled through the sanitary sewer system.

Mitigation Measure #4: Where wet and/or subgrade soils are encountered during subgrade preparation or other grading activities, the weak soil shall be removed and replaced with select fill in compliance with the compaction and other requirements set forth in the Final Geotechnical Report (Rockridge Geotechnical, January 21, 2009). Ground modification techniques, such as permeation grouting, columnar jet grouting, deep soil mixing, stone columns, gravel or other drains shall be implemented, and deep foundations shall be put in place to mitigate potential liquefaction-induced settlement impacts.

f-g) Development and intensification of the project site could result in wind or water erosion of soils on- or off-site, as underutilized and vacant parcels are replaced with high-density residential development and a BART parking structure. To ensure that impacts are less than significant, the project applicant will be required to adhere to Best Management Practices. All construction activities will be required to comply with Chapter 18 of the San Leandro Municipal Code regulating excavation activities and the construction of foundations and retaining walls, as well as the San Leandro Grading Ordinance regulating grading activities, drainage and erosion control. Therefore, compliance with the NPDES permit process and the California Building Code requirements would minimize potential impacts from erosion during and after project construction and would ensure that potential geology and soils impacts are less than significant. The proposed development will not result in significant amounts of deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake, as there are no bodies of water on or near the project site.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

4. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:					
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X		4, 5, 8

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?)		X			4, 5, 8
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		X			4, 5, 8
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		X			4, 5, 8
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		X			4, 5, 8
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		X			
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) or other flood hazard delineation map?				X	4, 5, 8
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X	4, 5, 8
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	X				4, 5, 8
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X	4, 5, 8
k. Exposure of people property to water-related hazards such as tidal waves?				X	4, 5, 8
<p>EXPLANATION:</p> <p>a-b)The project site is currently either underutilized (Site 1) or vacant (Site 2). Site 1 runoff releases into two on-site storm drain inlets that collect storm water and deliver it to the City storm drain system. Site 2 releases overland onto Martinez Street and Alvarado Street. Ultimately, both sites discharge into the San Pablo Bay subbasin and the San Leandro Watershed. The applicable water quality objectives and standards for this watershed are listed in the San Francisco Bay Basin Water Quality Control Plan Basin (Basin Plan) prepared by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) in compliance with the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Section 303(d) of the CWA requires that the states make a list of waters that are not attaining standards after the technology-based limits are put into place.</p>					

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Hydrology/Water Quality (Continued)

For waters on this list, the states are to develop total maximum daily loads or TMDLs. TMDLs are established at the level necessary to implement the applicable water quality standards. The proposed project would be subject to existing TMDLs that are considered protective of water quality. The proposed project would not violate water quality standards with compliance to applicable regulations and waste discharge requirements, therefore impacts would be less than significant.

The City of San Leandro Municipal Code regulates the discharge of stormwater and the potential for pollutant transport to water resources through Title 3: Health and Safety, Chapter 3-15 Storm Water Management and Discharge Control. Chapter 3-15 requires the best management practices (BMPs) for new development and redevelopment and compliance with BMPs where BMP guidelines or requirements have been adopted by any federal, state, regional and/or City agency (Section 3-15-Buildings and Subdivisions, Chapter 1-12 Grading, Excavations and Fills. If a grading permit is required, project applicants must prepare and implement an erosion and sediment control plan (ESCP) including interim and permanent erosion and sediment control measures, and a pollutant control plan (PCP). A grading permit cannot be issued until the project applicant has filed the required documentation with the State Water Resources Quality Board and has prepared a Storm Water Pollutant Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which has been reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The City Engineer or their representative must conduct inspections prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy to ensure that requirements are complied with.

A Stormwater Control Plan was prepared for the proposed project by Lea & Braze Engineering (September, 2008) that identified opportunities and constraints for stormwater control. To reduce imperviousness, a number of recommendations are included to promote ground water recharge. The majority of water supplies serving the City of San Leandro are obtained from the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD). The proposed project would not include development of any groundwater supply wells and would rely on EBMUD water supplies. About 90 percent of EBMUD water supplies are surface water resources from the Mokelumne River system with the rest from runoff from local watersheds to terminal reservoirs, such as Lake Chabot (EBMUD 2005).

Mitigation Measure #5: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant must prepare and implement an erosion and sediment control plan (ESCP) including interim and permanent erosion and sediment control measures, as well as a pollutant control plan (PCP).

Mitigation Measure #6: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall file the required documentation with the State Water Resources Quality Board and prepare a Storm Water Pollutant Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The City Engineer must conduct inspections prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy, to ensure that requirements are complied with.

The project site is currently underutilized (Site 1) and has historically been covered by impervious surfaces, including an at-grade, asphalt parking lot. Site 2 is currently vacant and undeveloped, but is the former site of the Del Monte Processing Plant. The proposed project would replace a previously graded and paved site with a 200-unit multi-family residential development. It would also intensify development by replacing a vacant lot with a 329 to 345-space BART parking garage. Consequently, development of the proposed project will result in a net increase in impervious surfaces and, therefore, a potentially significant impact on groundwater recharge. With implementation of the proposed project, the intensity of development would be increased relative to existing conditions, resulting in a potential reduction in groundwater recharge potential.

The majority of water supplies serving the City of San Leandro are obtained from the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD). The TOD Strategy Area drains to the San Pablo Bay subbasin and the San Leandro watershed. Water features in San Leandro include creeks, flood control channels, and portions of the San Francisco Bay. EBMUD collaborates with the Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (ACFCWCD), Alameda County Water District (ACWD), the City of Hayward and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to coordinate initial regional groundwater management activities, such as sharing monitoring data from each basin and monitoring performance of projects.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Hydrology / Water Quality (Continued)

c-f) Construction activities associated with the proposed project would generally alter existing drainage patterns in a manner that could result in erosion or siltation as surfaces are exposed to wind and rain during the construction-phase of the project. After project implementation, on-site drainage patterns will be altered, as underutilized (Site 1) and vacant (Site 2) property as impervious surfaces are increased with project implementation. However, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in a substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns that could cause substantial erosion or siltation. The City’s on-going participation in the Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program and requirement that a SWPPP be implemented would minimize erosion and siltation on-and off-site.

Mitigation Measure #7: The applicant will comply with applicable waste discharge requirements and municipal code requirements including preparation of a SWPPP for construction activities and compliance with the Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program (ACCWP). These permit programs are designed to prevent violation of water quality standards through mitigation and control of pollutant transport in stormwater runoff and infiltrating waters. The City of San Leandro Municipal Code ensures that permit conditions are met.

Mitigation Measure #8: The applicant will submit, along with their building permit application, a Stormwater Facility Operation and Maintenance Plan that includes a detailed maintenance schedule and maintenance requirements to ensure compliance with Best Management Practices, as well as the other requirements set forth in the Stormwater Control Plan prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering (September 25, 2008).

g-i) The project site is not located within a FEMA defined 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, there would be no impacts of or to the 100-year floodplain.

The project site is located within the dam failure inundation zone for both the Lake Chabot and New Upper San Leandro Reservoir dams. The proposed project includes development of 200 multi-family residential units and a 329 to 345-space BART parking garage within this dam failure inundation zone. This would expose more people to risks associated with dam failure inundation, which is a potentially significant impact.

The EBMUD East Bay terminal reservoirs, such as Lake Chabot and the New Upper San Leandro Reservoir, function as secondary water sources that store runoff from local watersheds for system use. Lake Chabot, an earthen dam, is about 130 years old and holds more than 3 billion gallons of water. The Upper San Leandro Reservoir was built in 1977 and holds more than 13 billion gallons. Requirements for earthquake and flood safety for the East Bay dams are imposed by the State of California Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD), which routinely inspects dams statewide. DSOD requires that embankments under its jurisdiction are safe to withstand the maximum credible earthquake without an uncontrolled release of reservoir water. In 2003, DSOD requested that EBMUD perform a stability evaluation of the Chabot dam. Studies are still in progress (EBMUD 2005). However, studies conducted by EBMUD have identified the time it would take for water to reach certain regions (Beaver, 2005).

Mitigation Measure #9: To reduce imperviousness, the applicant shall minimize use of concrete walks and hardscape areas. Planters and landscape areas shall be maximized and bioswales, paver blocks, decomposed granite and other alternate e pavement materials will be utilized to promote groundwater recharge.

Mitigation Measure #10: The applicant shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement stating the parties responsible for and upkeep of the bioswales required with project implementation.

Mitigation Measure #11: Applicant shall be required to demonstrate adequacy of the existing storm drain system to handle existing run-off from the drainage basin and project, upgrade the storm drain system to handle existing run-off from the drainage basin and project, or meter run-off from the site so that it leaves the site at current rate.

If the Upper San Leandro Reservoir were breached, much of its contents would surge into Lake Chabot, overflowing it and flooding highly populated areas downstream in a matter of minutes. At 40 mph, it would take just 13.1 minutes to get from Chabot to Estudillo Avenue near Bancroft Avenue. About five minutes later, the water there would peak at a height of 22 feet. Further west, at the intersection of Davis and Alvarado streets, the water would peak at 15 feet. The City of San

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Hydrology / Water Quality (Continued)

Leandro has developed a Hazards Master Plan to coordinate efforts for mitigating emergency conditions. Regardless, the proposed project would expose additional people to potential risk of dam failure inundation, unless sufficient flood proofing and safety mitigation is implemented.

Mitigation Measure #12: The applicant shall comply with the applicable City of San Leandro Engineering and Building standards as part of the Site Plan Review process to ensure that new construction is designed to minimize the potential for damage from flooding.

The properties are not identified as being located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplain. Therefore, there would be no impacts of or to the 100-year floodplain.

j) Tsunamis are large sea waves generated by submarine earthquakes or similar large-scale, short-duration phenomena, such as volcanic eruptions, that can cause considerable damage to low-lying coastal areas. Because the project is located approximately 47 feet above mean sea level, not along an exterior coast, and over one mile inland from San Francisco East Bay, it would not be subject to tsunami inundation. Therefore, no impact would result, and no further analysis is required.

k) Seiches are waves caused by large-scale, short-duration oscillation of confined bodies of water (such as reservoirs and lakes) during earthquakes that may damage low-lying adjacent areas, although not as severely as a tsunami. The closest enclosed body of water that could result in earthquake-induced seiche is Lake Chabot, over 2.5 miles upstream of the project sites. Furthermore, there have never been any documented impacts from seiches at Lake Chabot. Therefore, the project sites are not subject to seiche risk. There would be no impact, and no further analysis is required.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

5. 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:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X			3, 4, 9, 16
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X			3, 4, 9, 16
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		X			3, 4, 9, 16
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X			3, 4, 9, 16
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X		3, 4, 9, 16

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

EXPLANATION:

a-e) The proposed project will intensify existing land uses at the project sites and permit residential and associated uses that do not currently exist in the project vicinity. The traffic related to the new residents (Site 1) and vehicular traffic generated by the BART parking structure (Site 2) could result in additional regional air emissions. This increase in emissions could contribute to local traffic congestion that may result in “hotspots” of localized air pollutants such as carbon monoxide. Air quality is heavily influenced by climate and topography. During the Summer months, the Pacific high pressure system typically causes a subsidence of warm air that creates frequent Summer atmospheric temperature inversions. Pollutants are subsequently trapped by these inversions near the ground in small volumes of air and help contribute to smog.

Mitigation Measure #13: The applicant shall implement measures set forth in the Traffic Impact Analysis Technical Memorandum (as revised February 17, 2009) to improve arterial traffic, including contributing towards mitigation costs through transportation development impact fees or fair-share contributions regarding signalization of San Leandro Blvd. and Parrott Street and the I-880 / Marina Blvd. interchange to offset potential traffic/circulation impacts that could lead to a deterioration of air quality.

In addition, the demolition and construction activities involved in the development of the proposed project during the construction phase of the project would emit particulate matter and construction equipment exhausts. Also, during the construction-phase of the project, construction activities could create odors that may disturb any sensitive receptors near the project area. Because of potential airborne dust and particulate matter that may be generated during construction and grading activities, the proposed project may hinder efforts to attain state and federal air quality standards for ozone and small particulate matter, for which the Bay Area is in nonattainment during the construction-phase of the project. Any of these effects would be considered potentially-significant impacts.

Mitigation measures appropriate to the proposed project are as follows:

Mitigation Measure #14: The applicant shall cooperate with the appropriate regional, state and federal agencies to implement the regional Clean Air Plan and enforce air quality standards in compliance with General Plan Policy 31.01.

Mitigation Measure #15: The applicant shall provide residents with on-site bicycle storage lockers to promote alternative, environmentally-friendly methods of transportation such as bicycling to help improve air quality by reducing the necessity of driving and by providing better provisions for bicyclists and pedestrians, in compliance with General Plan Policy 31.02.

Mitigation Measure #16: The applicant shall utilize construction and grading practices that minimize airborne dust and particulate matter.

Air-quality related concerns were examined in both the San Leandro General Plan EIR (2001) and the Downtown San Leandro Transit-Oriented Development Strategy EIR (2007). Specific policies, actions and mitigation measures were developed as part of the San Leandro General Plan and Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy to reduce air quality impacts. The San Leandro General Plan, through its Transportation Element promotes the development of properties adjacent to BART stations and along heavily used public transit corridors to maximize transit use. The transportation element addresses the need to work with BART and AC Transit (and to a lesser extent, Caltrans) to enhance transit services for San Leandro residents. Policies and actions include improving AC Transit feeder-bus service to the two BART stations, using smaller buses to allow for broader service coverage, expanding shuttle service to the city’s employment districts and shopping areas, coordinating AC Transit and BART schedules, and developing a traffic-signal pre-empt program for buses.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Air Quality Impacts (Continued)

Planned improvements related to traffic safety include lighted crosswalks, countdown signal heads at crossings, and longer crossing times for pedestrians on wide streets. The TOD Strategy also addressed the need for adequate sidewalk widths to ensure pedestrian safety related to speeding and comfort as development intensifies along East 14th Street. Capital improvement projects in the TOD Strategy focused on improving connectivity between the station and adjacent neighborhoods and renovating the BART station, such as pedestrian and bicycle linkages. In BART's August 2002 San Leandro BART Station Access Plan, a key goal is to ensure that access planning for the BART station guides other capital investments for the station, including connecting the station to the downtown with strategic streetscape improvements and creating a new design for a commuter parking garage that frees the land for development, which is the purpose of the proposed project. Therefore, project implementation will provide a catalyst to implementing several of key components of the San Leandro BART Station Access Plan.

Mitigation Measure #17: The applicant shall implement landscaping and tree planting to absorb carbon monoxide and other pollutants.

The proposed project implements policies and actions that will promote the use of public transportation when traveling to and from work and when shopping for goods and services. The Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy will implement development that is designed to encourage walking and bicycling, including the conversion of auto lanes into bicycle lanes. Additionally, higher density development under the TOD Strategy in close proximity to transit and improved bicycle and pedestrian amenities will support the local clean air plan by reducing vehicle miles travelled and dependency on the single-occupancy vehicle as a primary mode of travel. The proposed project implements the TOD Strategy by providing an in-fill development project in close proximity to the Downtown San Leandro BART Station and AC Transit bus routes which will encourage the use of alternative means of transportation. Therefore, there are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X	2, 4, 9
b. 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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			X		2, 4, 9
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X	2, 4, 9
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X	2, 4, 9

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X	2, 4, 9
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X	2, 4, 9

EXPLANATION:

a-b)The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) for the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) San Leandro, Hayward, Oakland East, Oakland West, Las Trampas Ridge and Newark 7.5-minute quadrangles identifies 82 special-status plant and animal species, and four sensitive natural communities in the database. This includes species listed as rare, threatened, endangered, or proposed for listing as such, under the California and Federal Endangered Species Acts, species of special concern to California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and plants on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) list 1 or 2 (considered rare or endangered within California and elsewhere). The extensive species lists generated by the CNDDDB and CNPS queries are the result of populations of sensitive species associated with freshwater wetlands and undisturbed native grasslands found within the region (primarily east of the project sites); and species associated with the brackish and freshwater habitats of San Francisco Bay (approximately two miles west of the project sites).

Site 1 is a previously graded and disturbed property located at the northeast corner of San Leandro Blvd and West Juana Avenue and is currently a square shaped asphalt parking lot with no permanent building structures. The site does contain mature, ornamental landscaping around the site perimeter. A Tree Report prepared by Hortscience (October, 2008) identified all trees on the subject property over six inches in diameter. Forty-seven trees were surveyed on the site, representing five species, including Holly Oak (23), Sweet Gum (18), Camphor (4) and Tree of Heaven (1) and Honey Locust (1). Twenty two (22) of the Holly Oaks along San Leandro Boulevard and four (4) of the interior trees will be impacted by the proposed project. The tree report recommended the removal of up to thirty (3) trees. The site plan will allow for preservation of up to seventeen trees, including seven of the Sweet Gums along W. Juana Avenue, nine of the Sweet Gums along Carpentier Street and one Tree of Heaven.

Mitigation Measure #18: The applicant shall follow the tree preservation guidelines set forth in the October, 2008 Hortscience Tree Report, including having the consulting arborist review all project plans with regard to tree impacts and implementation of necessary protection measures and avoiding grading, construction, demolition or other work within designated, on-site Tree Protection Zones.

An examination of the limited number of trees and shrubs on site during the field investigation did not reveal the presence of any nests of birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However, any project activities that would result in the removal of existing woody vegetation could potentially impact nesting birds (i.e., the loss of young birds or the abandonment of an active nest), which would be a violation of Fish and Game Code Section 3503 and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and would be a potentially significant impact. The mitigation measure below would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure #19: The applicant shall conduct pre-construction surveys for the presence of nesting birds within each of the project sites. The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction breeding-season survey (approximately February 1 through August 31) to determine if any birds are nesting on or directly adjacent to the project area. The survey shall be conducted during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. If no nesting birds are found, then no further action would be required. If nesting birds are found within the trees on or directly adjacent to the project area, the project applicant shall avoid all birds nest sites located in the project area during the breeding season (approximately February 1 through August 31), or until it is determined by a qualified biologist that all young have fully fledged (left the nest). If the construction cannot be delayed, avoidance shall include the establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest site. The size of the buffer zone will be determined in consultation with the CDFG. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing, and shall remain in place until it is determined by a qualified biologist that all young have fully fledged (left the nest).

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Biology Impacts (Continued)

c-d) No “wetlands or other waters of the United States” are present within, or adjacent to the project boundaries, as the surrounding area is almost entirely developed. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on any wetland protected by state or federal regulations. As the surrounding area is almost entirely developed, it does not serve as a migratory corridor for native species; nor does it provide nesting sites for wildlife species. Therefore, no further analysis is necessary.

e-f) Implementation of the project will not result in conflicts with any local tree protection ordinances and will likely result in a net increase in tree cover, as the properties are developed and landscaped. The project sites and surrounding areas are completely developed, and do not lie within or adjacent to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Accordingly, there would be no impact to these resource areas.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

7. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. 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?				X	18
b. 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?				X	18

EXPLANATION:

a-b) The State legislation protecting mineral resource zones is the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975. Part of the purpose of the act is to classify mineral resources in the State and to transmit the information to local governments which regulate land use in each region of the State. Local governments are responsible for designating lands that contain regionally-significant mineral resources in local general plans to assure resource conservation in areas of intensive competing land uses. The law has resulted in the preparation of Mineral Land Classification Maps delineating Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ) 1 through 4 for aggregate resources (sand, gravel and stone).

The project area is classified by the California Geological Survey as MRZ-1, a Mineral Resource Zone for which there is adequate information to indicate there are no aggregate mineral resources present. Consequently, there would be no impact to mineral resources with project implementation, and no mitigation measures are required.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X	10, 11, 12,13
b. 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?			X		10, 11, 12,13

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X		10, 11, 12,13
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		X			10, 11, 12,13
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	10, 11, 12,13
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	10, 11, 12,13
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	10, 11, 12,13
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X	10, 11, 12,13
<p>EXPLANATION:</p> <p>a-d) A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment has been prepared for the proposed project to identify the potential for onsite or nearby soil or groundwater contamination (Stantec, 2008). Based on a preliminary review of available aerial photographs and topographic maps, Site 1 has been a BART parking lot since at least 1982 and there are no permanent building structures located on the property. Prior to that, commercial buildings and residential dwellings were present on the property, as viewed from available aerial photographs and topographic maps. Site 1 is surrounded by San Leandro Boulevard and the San Leandro BART Station to the west, Carpentier Street and residential land uses to the east, West Juana Avenue and residential and commercial buildings to the south and West Joaquin Avenue and Saint Leander’s Church and School to the north. No pits, ponds, lagoons or waterways were observed on the adjacent properties. Site 2 has been vacant since the Del Monte facility was demolished in 1989. Observations of the adjoining properties provided indications of past usage and activities.</p> <p>A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment was also prepared (Iris Environmental, January, 2009). The Phase II ESA results assessed the environmental quality of soil gas, soil and groundwater beneath Site 1. Sampling of soil gas, soil and groundwater at Site 1 was completed in a grid-like fashion across the site to identify potential environmental restrictions that may be encountered in the future and were analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Tetrachloroethylene (PCE), benzene and 1, 3-butadine were the only VOCs in soil gas detected at concentrations greater than their most conservative California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs).</p> <p>Two soil samples were collected from each sample location at various depths utilizing USEPA methods. Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) were detected in two samples from two distinct sample locations. Various metals were detected in all of the tested soil samples, although they were not elevated above what is expected in local, native soils. The only metal detected at concentrations above agency screening levels was arsenic. Asbestos was not detected in any soil samples.</p>					

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Hazards & Hazardous Materials (Continued)

One or more VOCs were detected in all of the groundwater samples collected. Chlorinated solvents, including PCE or trichloroethylene (TCE) and associated breakdown products were detected in all samples, with the highest concentrations in the eastern and southern portion of the site. None of the chemicals detected in soil gas, soil or groundwater present restrictions to using the site for residential development, with adherence to applicable remediation methods and mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measure #20: The applicant shall utilize appropriate remediation efforts identified in the Phase I and Phase II Environmental Assessments, including removal of impacted soils and recompaction.

In a document produced subsequent to the Phase I prepared by Stantec, Iris Environmental prepared a Phase II Sampling proposal. The Iris Environmental report stated the following:

Stantec did not identify any recognized environmental conditions (RECs) in connection with either property but did identify long site use histories involving chemical usage. The 1333 Martinez site was used as a cannery for decades and the BART Parking Lot has had commercial uses for long periods of time. Furthermore, the two subject sites are located in an industrial portion of San Leandro where off-site chemical releases have resulted in local groundwater contamination. Three sites illustrating off-site contamination concerns include:

- The former Caterpillar facility at 800 Davis Street
- Richards Automotive and Gas at 1495 Hayes Street, and
- Liquid Gold Oil Corporation at 1696 Martinez Street.

The Phase II subsurface investigation proposed in the Iris Environmental document is scoped to address the potential of on-site chemical releases and the potential for the subject sites to have been contaminated from chemical migration from neighboring sites.

The Cornerstone at San Leandro Crossings site has the potential presence of chemicals of potential concern (COPC) beneath the Sties which could present unacceptable risks to construction workers and future residents of the site. Iris Environmental has developed a soil sample plan and a menu of mitigation measures to be utilized as necessary. The “San Leandro Crossings Potential Mitigation Measures for Proposed Development Projects, November 12, 2008” is attached for reference purposes.

The mitigation measures include Subsurface Investigations, Pre-Development Mitigation Measures, Risk Management Measures for Construction Phases, Pre-Construction Planning and Notification, Site-Specific Health and Safety Worker Requirements, Construction Impact Mitigation Measures, Site Control, Equipment Decontamination, Personal Protective Equipment, Dust Control, Vertical and Horizontal Preferential Pathways, Storm Water Pollution Controls, Excavation De-Watering, Additional Soil Management Protocols During Construction Activities, Procedures of Unknown Areas of Contamination, and Imported Fill.

Mitigation Measure #21: Subsurface Investigations

Subsurface investigations are planned for both the San Leandro Crossings East and San Leandro Crossings West Sites prior to development. The sampling and analysis programs will be specific to each Site based on the prior uses of that Site. Additionally, a groundwater sampling and analysis program will be implemented for chemical constituents that could have migrated onto the sites from off-site upgradient sources, if identified during due diligence. Detection limits for the analytical program will be sufficiently low to allow assessment of risks to human health under construction worker and residential exposure scenarios.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Hazards & Hazardous Materials (Continued)

If the subsurface investigation programs yield data suggesting that there could be unacceptable risks to future construction workers or residents, a California state environmental regulatory agency will be consulted to provide its opinion on the findings of the subsurface investigations and the assessment of risk. This opinion would be sought prior to initiating construction on either site. The environmental testing programs have not been completed on either of the Sites. However, there are no chemical source areas known to exist on either Site. The mitigation measures presented below are proposed as means to mitigate potential chemical exposures and associated unacceptable risks to human health should COPCs be found at the Sites at levels of concern in soil, soil gas or groundwater.

Mitigation Measure #22 Pre Development Mitigation Measures

If the subsurface investigation programs yield data suggesting that there could be unacceptable risks to future construction workers or residents and a California state environmental regulatory agency determines that an active remedial response is warranted, the following mitigation measures listed below include methods that may be employed to mitigate unacceptable risks to human health of construction works and future residents.

- Remove the impacted soil and dispose of off-Site;
- Install a cap to prevent contact with the contamination;
- Install a physical barrier for vapors such as a vapor barrier or passive venting system, to prevent the accumulation of vapors in indoor environment;
- Stockpile soil and aerate on-Site, or in a staging area as may be appropriate, in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations;
- Conduct in situ bioremediation measures; or
- Implement liquid or vapor extraction measures.

The appropriateness of one of the above management measures over another will depend on many factors, such as the type of constituent detected, the size of the identified impacted area, and the estimated cost of implementing the remedy.

Results of the sampling activities and the proposed course of action, e.g., no action necessary, soil excavation and off-Site disposal, on-Site treatment and soil reuse, shall be reported to a State environmental regulatory agency and the contractor shall obtain concurrence before implementing the remedial measures.

Remedial action plans would be approved in advance by a state environmental regulatory agency. Any cleanup or remediation would be required to meet applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations and requirements.

Mitigation Measure #23 Risk Management Measures for Construction Phases

The following are risk management procedures to be followed by future contractors during Site preparation and construction activities. General soil management protocols are presented; as well as, protocols for managing fill soils that may be brought to the Sites during filling operations.

- **Pre-Construction Planning and Notification:** Prior to the start of construction activities involving below-ground work, information regarding known areas of contamination shall be provided to the contractor by the Site owner.
- **Site-Specific Health and Safety Worker Requirements:** Each contractor will be responsible for the health and safety of their own workers, including, but not limited to, preparation of their own health and safety plan (HSP) and injury and illness prevention plan (IIPP). The purpose of these documents is to provide general guidance to the work hazards that may be encountered during each phase of construction activities.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Hazards & Hazardous Materials (Continued)

Contractors are also required to determine the requirements for worker training, based on the level of expected contact to soil, soil vapor, and groundwater associated with the contractor’s activities and locations. The HSP shall contain provisions for limiting and monitoring chemical exposure to construction workers, chemical and non-chemical hazards, emergency procedures, and standard safety protocols. Depending upon known conditions at the time of site development, employees conducting earthwork activities at the Site may be required to complete a 40-hour HAZWOPER training course (29 CFR 1910.120 (e)), including respirator and personal protective equipment training.

- **Construction Impact Mitigation Measures:** During construction, measures shall be taken by contractors to minimize dust generation, storm water runoff and tracking of soil off the Sites. In addition, measures will be taken to reduce the potential for the creation of preferential pathways (vertical or horizontal) for COPCs detected at the Sites during the planned subsurface investigations of soil, soil gas and/or groundwater beneath the Sites. Construction impact mitigation measures are described below.
- **Site Control:** Site control procedures shall be implemented to control the flow of personnel, vehicles and materials in and out of the Sites while working in known contaminated areas. (Currently, there are no known contaminated areas at either of the Sites.) The control measures described below will help control the spread of COPCs from the Sites. The perimeter of the Sites shall be fenced. Access and egress shall be controlled at the appropriate locations. Signs will be posted instructing visitors to sign in at the project support areas at all Site entrances.
- **Equipment Decontamination:** Contractors whose vehicles and construction equipment contact soil that is suspected of being contaminated shall be required to clean the equipment upon leaving the contaminated area. A decontamination area will be established near the construction exit of each area. Soil will be removed from the equipment and vehicles before leaving the contaminated area. Cleaning methods used may include dry methods, such as brushing, scraping, or vacuuming. If dry methods are not effective, wet methods, such as steam cleaning or pressure-washing, should be used. The contractor will contain, manage, and collect samples of the rinse water for analytical testing by a state certified laboratory prior to appropriate disposal. Decontamination procedures shall be developed and implemented by the construction contractor to minimize the possibility that equipment releases contaminated soil onto public roadways or to on-Site areas containing “clean” cover materials or new paving.
- **Personal Protective Equipment:** Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and clothing shall be used to isolate workers from COPCs and physical hazards. The minimum level of protection for workers coming into direct contact with contaminated materials will be Level D:
 - Coveralls or similar clothing,
 - Reflective safety vests,
 - Work gloves, as necessary,
 - Steel-toed boots,
 - Safety glasses, as necessary,
 - Hard hat, and
 - Hearing protection, as necessary.
- **Dust Control:** Construction operations will be conducted to minimize the creation and dispersion of dust, including the following measures:
 - Application of water while grading, excavating, and loading, as needed;
 - Limiting vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour on unpaved portions of the Sites;
 - Minimizing drop heights while loading/unloading soil; and,
 - Soil that is suspected of being contaminated will be covered by an impermeable layer.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Hazards & Hazardous Materials (Continued)

- Additional dust control measures may be identified and implemented by contractors, as necessary, especially if dry and windy conditions persist during periods of earthwork.
- Compliance with all Bay Area Air Quality Management District rules and regulations.
- **Vertical and Horizontal Preferential Pathways:** If development plans include the construction of deep foundations, the foundation of the buildings shall incorporate measures to help reduce the potential for the downward migration of contaminated groundwater. These measures shall be identified in the site-specific geotechnical investigation reports. Appropriate measures shall be implemented to reduce vapor migration through trench backfill and utility conduits. Such measures may include placement of low-permeability backfill “plugs” at intervals on-site and where utilities extend off current parcel boundaries.
- **Storm Water Pollution Controls:** A storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will be required to be prepared for the site. Storm water pollution controls shall be based on best management practices (BMPs), such as those described in “Guidelines for Construction Projects” and “Erosion and Sediment Control Field Manual” published by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- **Excavation De-Watering:** Although not anticipated, if excavation de-watering is required, the water will be sampled and analyzed prior to pumping to evaluate discharge alternatives. The developer’s environmental consultant shall collect a sample of the water for laboratory analyses for COPCs; other analyses may be required, based on the intended use of the water.

Additional Soil Management Protocols During Construction Activities: Soil with residual COPCs may be present on-site. Subsurface investigations planned for the Sites will determine the presence or absence of COPCs in soils. Once soils are tested, a Site specific soil management plan (SMP) will be prepared. At the present time, there are no known chemical source areas or areas of soil contamination on either Site. The protocols to be followed in the event that unknown areas of contamination are identified during development are described in this section.

- **Procedures for Discovery of Unknown Areas of Contamination:** Site development activities may result in the identification of previously unknown areas or types of contamination. Unknown conditions which may trigger contingency monitoring procedures during site development include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - Oily, shiny, or chemical saturated soils;
 - Soil with a significant chemical or hydrocarbon-like odor; or
 - Significantly discolored soils.

Upon the discovery of one of the conditions identified above, the contractor will conduct the contingency monitoring. Contingency monitoring, if conducted, will consist of the following steps: If unknown areas of potential discolored soils are encountered, additional analyses should be conducted for the suspected constituents to assess the actual composition of the suspected contamination. A State environmental regulatory agency should be contacted for assistance in determining if additional sampling and potential mitigation is necessary. If the encountered materials are suspected to contain volatile organic chemicals, the following contingency monitoring procedures may be followed:

Conduct contingency monitoring by taking organic vapor readings using an organic vapor meter (OVM) or an organic vapor analyzer (OVA) to screen for the presence of fuel, oil, or solvents. If the OVM/OVA indicates that an unknown area of fuel, oil, or solvents has been detected, then a State environmental regulatory agency should be notified to determine if additional sampling is appropriate prior to continuing construction in that area. OVM or equivalent screening methods will be conducted by experienced personnel only.

If an unknown area of soil contamination has been identified, and the State environmental regulatory agency requests additional characterization, the following steps will be taken: Soil samples will be collected from the identified area and analyzed for the likely COPC, depending on the suspected type of contamination. The

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Hazards & Hazardous Materials (Continued)

sampling strategy will be discussed with a State environmental regulatory agency prior to the initiation of the sampling activities. Analytical results collected from the suspected source will be compared to the health-based screening levels and results discussed with a State environmental regulatory agency. If the levels are below the relevant health-based screening levels and the State environmental regulatory agency concurs, no additional action may be necessary.

- If the soil contains COPCs at levels that exceed the relevant health-based screening levels, or if the State regulatory agency concludes that an unacceptable risk to construction worker or future residents may be present, then management measures, such as the following, will be undertaken:
 - Remove the impacted soil and dispose of off-Site;
 - Install a cap to prevent contact with the contamination;
 - Install a physical barrier for vapors such as a vapor barrier or passive venting system, to prevent the accumulation of vapors in indoor environment;
 - Stockpile soil and aerate on-Site, or in a staging area as may be appropriate, in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations;
 - Conduct in situ bioremediation measures; or
 - Implement liquid or vapor extraction measures.

The appropriateness of one of the above management measures over another will depend on many factors, such as the type of constituent detected, the size of the identified impacted area, and the estimated cost of implementing the remedy. Results of the sampling activities and the proposed course of action, e.g., no action necessary, soil excavation and off-Site disposal, on-Site treatment and soil reuse, shall be reported to a State environmental regulatory agency and the contractor shall obtain concurrence before implementing the remedial measures. Construction activities in the specific area where the unknown conditions were identified will resume following the completion of the additional sampling activities and the implementation of any required responses.

Any cleanup or remediation shall be required to meet applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations and requirements.

- **Imported Fill:** To minimize the potential introduction of contaminated fill onto the Sites, all imported fill shall have adequate documentation so it can be verified that the fill source is appropriate for the Site’s intended use. Documentation shall include detailed information on previous land use of the fill source, any Phase I Environmental Site Assessments performed and the findings, and the results of any analytical testing performed. If no documentation is available or the documentation is inadequate or if no analytical testing has been performed, samples of the potential fill material shall be collected and analyzed. The analyses selected shall be based on the fill source and knowledge of the previous land use as determined by the developer’s environmental consultant. The sample frequency for potential fill material shall be in accordance with that outlined in the Department of Toxic Substances Control technical document titled, “Information Advisory on Clean Imported Fill Material”. The developer’s environmental consultant shall approve the use of imported fill.

- e-f) There are no airports or airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. Oakland International Airport is approximately 2 miles northwest of the project site and Hayward Executive Airport is approximately 4 miles to the southeast.
- g) The project would not alter existing emergency response procedures, nor impose a substantial demand on emergency response personnel. Accordingly, the proposed project would not impair implementation or interfere with emergency response in the project vicinity and therefore have no impact.
- h) The project site is in an urbanized setting, remote from wildlands. Therefore, safety hazards from wildland fires would have no impact on the proposed project. There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

9. NOISE. Would the project result in:					
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinances, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X			4, 13, 14, 15
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration of groundborne noise levels?		X			4, 13, 14, 15
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X			4, 13, 14, 15
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X			4, 13, 14, 15
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X		4, 13, 14, 15
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X		4, 13, 14, 15

EXPLANATION:

a-d) Existing ambient noise in the vicinity of the project site is predominantly due to proximity to the San Leandro BART Station and tracks, vehicular traffic along San Leandro Boulevard, and noise from on-going railroad (SPRR) operations. A noise study conducted for the proposed project assessed the exterior noise environment of the subject properties. After project build out, the noise environment will be dominated by BART operations along the easterly portion of Site 2, by SPRR operations along the westerly portion of Site 2 and by a combination of both to the north and south of the project area. Aircraft-related noise is low and infrequent, with only occasional civil aircraft operations being audible for brief periods. Existing sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed project include students at St. Leander’s Church and School to the north of Site 1 on W. Estudillo Avenue. The proposed project could introduce new sensitive receptors into the project site because of the residential nature of the development proposed for Site 1.

As described below in Section XV, Transportation/Traffic, implementation of the proposed project would result in a direct and indirect increase in residents and visitors to the project site over current conditions. The increased activity levels at the project site, in addition to traffic and operation of the proposed project, have the potential to increase noise levels in the vicinity of the project. This potential increase could impact both existing sensitive receptors, as well as new potential residents within the project area. However, the Noise Study conducted by Wilson Ihrig & Associates, Inc. (July 15, 2008) predicted no significant net increases in future noise levels at either of the project sites, with incorporation of appropriate noise attenuation features into the project design.

Mitigation Measure #24: Common outdoor use areas and courtyards on Site 1 that will contain residential land uses that are exposed to noise sources exterior to the project shall be provided with noise mitigating design features, such as architectural sound barriers and other noise mitigation set forth in the Wilson Ihrig & Associates, Inc. Noise Study (July 15, 2008) in accordance with CCR Title 24. Public or private balconies are exempt from this requirement pursuant to the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR (September, 2007).

f) Neither Site 1 or 2 is located within the vicinity of a public airport or private airstrip. Oakland International Airport is located approximately 2.1 miles northwest of the project site. The project site (Sites 1 and 2) are slightly outside the airport’s general referral area and well outside the designated noise zone. The effects of any airport-related noise could be considered a potentially significant impact on new residents due to the residential nature of the proposed project. There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

10. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the project:					
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X			4, 9, 16, 17
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X			4, 9, 16, 17
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, Including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X		4, 9, 16, 17
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		4, 9, 16, 17
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?		X			4, 9, 16, 17
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X		4, 9, 16, 17
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or Programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X		4, 9, 16, 17
h. Trigger CMA Review? (GPA involving more than 100 p.m. peak hour trips generated over existing GP)			X		4, 9, 16, 17

EXPLANATION:

a-e) Implementation of the proposed project would result in a direct and indirect increase in residents and vehicular traffic to the project site over current conditions, as an at-grade asphalt parking lot is replaced with multi-family residential housing (Site 1) and a vacant lot is replaced with a 329 to 345-space BART parking garage (Site 2). Trip generation calculations adhere to the trip rate assumptions made for the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy, as set forth in the TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007. Trip generation is the amount of traffic expected to be created from the proposed development and expected to travel the streets of San Leandro. Morning and afternoon peak hour trip generation was calculated using trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation, 7th Edition*. Based on the methodology used in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR, trip generation rates for the proposed project were calculated. Accordingly, traffic impact analyses were prepared to examine the transportation impacts of the proposed project on the existing and planned road network, pedestrian and bicycle activity, transit services, parking and operational safety (Kimley-Horn and Associates, November, 2008 and February 2009). Those analyses determined that traffic generated by the project would exacerbate the already unacceptable levels of service at the intersection of San Leandro Boulevard and Parrott Street during the AM and PM peak periods. Because the San Leandro Boulevard/Parrott Street intersection operates at LOS “F” under the existing conditions, it is considered an existing deficiency. This is considered a potentially significant impact associated with project implementation.

The traffic analysis includes the relocation and one-to-one replacement of the existing 329 parking spaces on the BART surface parking lot (Site 1) plus up to 16 additional spaces from the Cornerstone site to the proposed new BART parking garage located at the intersection of Martinez Street /Parrott Street (Site 2). The vehicles that currently park at the surface parking lot were rerouted to the new parking garage based on driveway traffic counts conducted on October 1, 2008, and the anticipated origin and destination of the existing BART parking lot users. The project trips were assigned to the existing street network based on the trip distribution. The existing roadway geometry and traffic control were assumed in the traffic analysis. The Existing plus Project peak hour turning movements were also evaluated. The results of the traffic analysis demonstrated that all of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service with the exception

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Transportation/Circulation Impacts (Continued)

of the intersection of San Leandro Boulevard / Parrott Street, which operates at LOS F for the AM and PM peak hours. Consistent with existing conditions, this intersection satisfies peak hour signal warrants. As a result, the number of project-related trips would be expected to increase demand on the local and regional transportation network and could adversely impact emergency access as a result. The additional traffic could add to congestion at local intersections and could exceed established levels of service, especially at the intersection of San Leandro Boulevard and Parrott Street, as well as the I-880/Marina Interchange.

Mitigation Measure #25: In order for the intersection of San Leandro Boulevard and Parrott Street to operate at an acceptable level of service, the intersection should be signalized. The project shall contribute towards mitigation costs through transportation development impact fees or pay its fair share based on the proportion of project traffic added to the intersection.

Mitigation Measure #26: In order for the deficient I-880/Marina Blvd. interchange to operate at an acceptable level of service, the project shall contribute towards mitigation costs through transportation development impact fees or pay its fair share based on the proportion of project traffic added to the interchange.

- f) Parking requirements, as described in the TOD Strategy, are to be provided at a maximum of 1.0 spaces per dwelling unit for residential parking due to proximity to BART and AC Transit facilities. Parking demand for residential land uses is comprised of two components: 1) the residents; and 2) guests or visitors including deliveries. Peak parking demand for residential land uses is late at night when everyone is home. It is assumed that parking associated with the residential component of the proposed project (Site 1) will be reserved and not available to the general public or visitors. With project implementation, a total of between 329 to 345 parking spaces will be provided on Site 2 to replace all of the BART parking (329 spaces) that are currently being provided at Site 1 – at the northeast corner of West Juana Avenue and San Leandro Boulevard. The TOD Strategy provides strategies and implementation measures to address parking that are designed to decrease parking demand, manage parking demand and usage, mitigate spillover parking impacts and strategically locate parking to serve demand.

Mitigation Measure #27: The proposed project shall implement TOD Strategy F7 by maximizing on-street parking opportunities on the internal circulation network west of the BART Station (Site 2). This shall include the use of angled parking on appropriate streets.

Mitigation Measure #28: The proposed project shall implement TOD Strategy F14 by adopting a maximum parking ratio of 1.0 exclusive spaces per dwelling unit plus a maximum parking ratio of 0.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit for flex parking.

Mitigation Measure #29: The proposed project shall implement TOD Strategy 15 by accommodating visitors through the shared parking supply (on and off-street) or in the unbundled flex parking supply that is permitted on site.

The proposed project is in compliance with these mitigation measures.

- h) The proposed project would involve the in-fill development of an underutilized (Site 1) and vacant site (Site 2). The proposed project implements the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy evaluated in the TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in September 2007 and that encourages and supports alternative means of transportation. The proposed project does not involve a General Plan Amendment and therefore, does not trigger CMA review.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

11. 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 public services:

a. Fire protection?		X			1, 4, 9, 13
b. Police protection?		X			1, 4, 9, 13
c. Schools?		X			1, 4, 9, 13, 19
d. Parks?		X			1, 4, 9, 13
e. Other public facilities?		X			1, 4, 9, 13

EXPLANATION:

a-e) Implementation of the proposed project would result in a direct and indirect increase in residents and visitors to the project site over current conditions. This intensification of land uses may necessitate the acquisition of new or additional equipment and hiring of additional personnel in order to adequately maintain acceptable standards of fire and police protection. In addition, the increase in population may impact school facilities in order to accommodate a total of 10 new students that will be generated by the proposed project. Student generation rates were assessed in a report prepared by Schoolhouse Services (December, 2008). That report provided an assessment of the enrollment impact of the proposed project on the San Leandro Unified School. Enrollment impacts were calculated by multiplying the number of units in the project by the appropriate student generation rate. In this case, a student generation rate of 0.05 students per unit was used. A 200-unit building with a 0.05 student generation rate would generate a total of 10 students (Schoolhouse Services, December 2008).

In January 2008, the San Leandro Unified School District (SLUSD) issued a report titled, “2008 Developer Fee Justification Study.” Pursuant to California Education Code Section 17620, the school district is allowed to assess fees on new residential construction to fund the construction of new school facilities. The school district hired a consultant (SchoolWorks) to review demographic trends in the School District and to develop a justification for the fee the school district charges developers for new development. The study found that there currently exists a reasonable relationship between new residential development and the need for additional school facilities in the San Leandro Unified School District. To the extent that this relationship exists, as demonstrated in the report, the school district is authorized to levy developer fees, as authorized by Education Code Section 17620. In their approval of the new developer fees, the school district made the following findings:

“ a) the purpose of the fees adopted and confirmed in this resolution is to fund the construction or reconstruction of school facilities; b) these fees will be used to fund the construction or reconstruction of school facilities needed to reduce overcrowding which exists in the District and impairs the normal functioning of educational programs; c) the overcrowding to be reduced by use of these fees exists because the enrollment project to result from continuing residential, commercial , or industrial construction exceeds the capacity of the District to provide adequate housing; d) the amount of fees to be paid pursuant to this resolution bears a reasonable relationship and is limited to the needs of the community for elementary or high school facilities and is reasonably related and limited to the need for schools caused by residential, commercial or industrial construction, and e) the amount of fees to be paid pursuant to this Resolution does not exceed the estimated reasonable costs of providing for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities necessitated by the construction projects from which the fees are to be collected. And be it further resolved, that the board adopts and levies the following fees upon any construction within the boundaries of the District for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities: A) \$2.97 per square foot of all assessable residential space as defined by Government Code Section 65995(b)(1).”

The school district is limited by State law to a maximum fee of \$2.97 per square foot of residential development. The fees collected may be used for purchase or lease of interim school facilities, for purchase of lease land for school facilities, for construction modernization and reconstruction of school facilities, and for design, permit fees and school furniture. California State Assembly Bill 2926-School Facilities Act of 1986. In 1986, AB2927 was enacted by the State of California authorizing entities to levy statutory fees on new residential and commercial development in order to pay for school facilities. AB 2926, entitled the “School Facilities Act of 1986”, was expanded and revised in 1987 through passage of AB1600, which added section 660000 et seq. of the Government Code. Under this statute, payment of statutory fees by developers would serve as total CEQA mitigation to satisfy the impact of development on school facilities.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Public Services Impacts (Continued)

California Senate Bill 50 (SB 50). The passage of SB 50 in 1998 defined the Needs Analysis process in Government Code Sections 65995.5 to 65998, thus providing the requirements that a school district must articulate when identifying expansion programs. Under the provisions of SB 50, school districts may collect fees to offset the costs associated with increasing school capacity as a result of developments. The fees- referred to as Level One fees-are assessed based upon the proposed square footage of residential, commercial/industrial, and/or parking structure uses. Level Two fees require the developer to provide one-half of the costs of accommodating students in new schools, while the state would provide the other half. Level Three fees require the development to pay the full cost of accommodating the students in new schools and would be implemented at the time the funds available from Proposition 1A (approved by the voters in 1998) are expended. School districts must demonstrate to the state their long-term facilities needs and costs based on long-term population growth in order to qualify for this source of funding. However, voter approval of Proposition 55 on March 2 2004, precludes the imposition of the Level Three fees for the foreseeable future. Therefore, once qualified, districts may impose only Level Two fees as calculated according to SB 50.

As evaluated in the TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in September 2007, new development occurring under the TOD Strategy would be required to follow the Policies and Mitigation Measures Master List of the Development and Implementation Guidelines chapter within the TOD Strategy document that incorporates various General Plan Policies and Mitigation Measures.

Mitigation Measure #30: The minimum levels of service standards for police and fire response times shall be maintained in accordance with General Plan Policy 45.01.

Mitigation Measure #31: The applicant shall incorporate lighting, landscaping and other design features that reduce the potential for crime and facilitate rapid response to emergency calls in accordance with General Plan Policy 45.06.

Mitigation Measure #32: The applicant shall pay all developer fees required by the San Leandro Unified School District at the time of building permits.

12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:					
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?		X			3, 4, 8
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X			3, 4, 8
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X			3, 4, 8
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?		X			3, 4, 8
e. 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?		X			3, 4, 8

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X		3, 4, 8
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		3, 4, 8
h.. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to discharge of storm waters?			X		3, 4, 8

EXPLANATION:

a-h) Because the proposed project would result in greater residential population and vehicular traffic at the project site, it is expected that demand for public utilities would increase. Depending on the existing and planned capacities to be available, the proposed project could necessitate the alteration or construction of water, wastewater, or solid waste facilities resulting in a potentially significant impact. As identified in the Downtown TOD Strategy EIR (September 2007), implementation of the project could result in adverse impacts on water supply.

Mitigation Measure #33: The applicant shall promote the efficient use of existing water supplies through a variety of water conservation measures, including the use of recycled water for landscaping in accordance with General Plan Policy 27.02.

Mitigation Measure #34: The applicant shall conserve water through the use of such measures as low-flow plumbing fixtures and water-saving appliances in accordance with General Plan Policy 27.04.

Mitigation Measure #35: The applicant shall be required to pay its fair share of the cost of improving the water, sewer, drainage and other infrastructure systems needed to serve the development through use fees or other appropriate forms of mitigation in accordance with General Plan Policy 52.02.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR (2007).

13. RECREATION.

a. 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?		X			3, 4, 9
b. 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?				X	3, 4, 9

EXPLANATION:

a-h) Because the proposed project could result in greater residential population at the project site, it is expected that demand for parks and recreational facilities could increase. Depending on the existing use and condition of local parks and related recreational facilities, the proposed project could necessitate the expansion or construction of park-related resources which could result in a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure #36: The applicant shall pay an impact fee and/or dedicate parkland to offset the increase in park needs resulting from the proposed project. Where on-site parkland is dedicated, it should be improved, maintained, and accessible to the general public in accordance with General Plan Policy 22.02.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR (2007).

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

14. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X		2, 3, 4, 9
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X	2, 3, 4, 9
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		X			2, 3, 4, 9
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X			2, 3, 4, 9
e. Create significant shadow effects on adjacent buildings?			X		2, 3, 4, 9

EXPLANATION:

Sites 1 and 2 are located in a relatively flat area of downtown San Leandro. The visual setting is characterized by one- to four-story residential, one- to two- story commercial office and light industrial buildings, as well as the BART Station and overhead tracks. Site 1 has been previously graded and disturbed and is presently an at-grade asphalt parking lot. Site 2 is a vacant lot surrounded by a commercial office building to the north, industrial uses to the south, light industrial to the west and the San Leandro BART Station and associated parking lots to the east. There is limited, natural landscaping in the project vicinity. Site 1 is visually screened by the presence of mature landscaping around the property perimeter. A small cluster of mature trees occur along the easterly and westerly edges of Site 2 along Alvarado Streets and Martinez Streets.

There is limited ornamental landscaping in the form of mature trees surrounding adjacent buildings and in adjacent parking lots. Site 1 is visible from San Leandro Boulevard on the west, as well as from the surrounding roadways and from the existing multi-family residential development to the east (Pacific Plaza Condominiums).

Views from the west-facing condominiums will be affected, as views west towards the existing at-grade BART parking lot are replaced with a new, four-story multi-family development project which will change the visual landscape. However, existing views are limited to primarily existing development, therefore, the proposed project will not alter views from existing residences towards any significant scenic resources or vistas, therefore visual impacts will not be significant. Site 2 is visible from San Leandro Boulevard on the east, as well as from surrounding roadways and adjacent development. Distant views to and from the project site are limited due the flat topography and the presence of existing development. However, the East Bay Hills are visible from some areas of the project site beyond the BART Station. The project site would be visible to BART riders as they passed the project site from the BART trains leaving and entering the San Leandro BART Station.

There are no designated scenic vistas or scenic resources on or adjacent to the project area. Accordingly, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic resources nor damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

b-c)The proposed project could change the visual character and quality of the project site, which is currently underutilized (Site 1) and vacant (Site 2). The project site is currently surrounded by a mixture of low and medium rise residential buildings and low-rise light industrial and commercial buildings. Development of the project site would introduce more intensive uses, thereby introducing visual elements and features that will change the existing visual landscape.

Mitigation Measure #37: The applicant shall be required to go through the City of San Leandro Site Plan Review process to ensure that the design for the proposed project is compatible with and consistent with the various architectural styles and character of downtown San Leandro, in accordance with General Plan Policy 42.04.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Aesthetics Impacts (Continued)

d-e) Existing lighting at the project site is limited to existing light standards in the parking lot in Site 1 and is non-existent on Site 2, which is currently vacant. Surrounding light sources are characterized by low-intensity security and safety lighting along walkways, within the adjacent BART parking lots, and at building entrances. The proposed project will include lighting plans to address nighttime and security lighting characteristics of a residential development and a BART Parking Structure. However, the new buildings may involve lighting designs or construction materials that could increase potential light and glare impacts for neighboring uses and motorists.

Mitigation Measure #38: The Applicant shall be required to apply street lighting standards and other exterior lighting standards that are designed to reduce glare on adjacent properties. New lighting shall be designed to reduce adverse impacts by using techniques such as automatic shut off controls and glare shields and by appropriately orienting and positioning fixtures at a height consistent with the intended use, in accordance with General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure D4.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

15. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in section 15064.5?				X	2, 3, 4,9
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5?			X		2, 3, 4,9
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		2, 3, 4,9
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X		2, 3, 4,9

EXPLANATION:

Historic and archaeological resources were evaluated in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR (September 2007) and in the San Leandro General Plan EIR (November 2001). Additionally, a Phase I (Stantec, October 2008) and Phase II (IRIS Environmental, January 2009) Environmental Assessment were prepared for the proposed project. A review of aerial photographs and historical maps indicate that the Site 1 has been developed as a BART parking lot since at least 1982. Prior to that, the property contained a combination of residential and commercial structures. Since the site has been graded and developed with an at-grade asphalt parking lot, there are no historic structures on the project site and no impacts to buildings or resources that could have historic status. Site 2 is currently vacant and has been a vacant lot since the former Del Monte facility was demolished in 1989. The Del Monte facility was first identified on the property in the 1968 Sanborn Map. Aerial photographs dating back to 1939 show various cannery processing facilities to be located on the site.

a) There are no historic structures present on Site 1. There is the presence of residual foundation structures along the southwestern boundary of Site 2 that were left behind from the previous use. However, since the State Office of Historic Preservation typically considers structures to be potentially historic if they are at least 45 years old (built in 1950 or earlier) the remaining foundation structure is not considered to be eligible for historic status. Therefore, there are no historic structures on the project site and no impacts to buildings or resources that could have historic status.

b,d) Based on an evaluation of the environmental setting and features associated with known sites, Native American cultural resources in this part of Alameda County are found in many areas adjacent to water resources like the bayshore or intermittent and perennial watercourses. The proposed project area is on a broad alluvial plain that is marginal to the bayshore. For this reason it is unlikely that unrecorded Native American cultural resources exist in the project area.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

Cultural Resource Impacts (Continued)

Although the project site does not contain recorded Native American or historic-period archeological resources, there remains a low possibility of encountering Native American and cultural archaeological or human remains during site disturbance. Construction activities could result in ground disturbance that would cause a substantially adverse change in the significance of an unknown archeological resource.

Mitigation Measure #39: The applicant shall cease any grading or construction activities and shall consult with appropriate representatives of the Native American Heritage Commission if human remains are discovered, in accordance with State Law and Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 15064.5 (e) of the State CEQA Guidelines and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

16. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. 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?				X	3, 4
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	3, 4
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X	3, 4

EXPLANATION:

- a) The project sites are currently either underutilized or vacant and are surrounded by a mixture of residential, commercial and light industrial uses, as well as the San Leandro BART Station and associated parking. The project site is not on or adjacent to any farmland. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert or have the potential to convert existing farmland to a nonagricultural use, and the proposed project would result in no impact on important farmlands.
- b, c) The project site is not currently protected under the Williamson Act or zoned for agricultural uses. The three parcels to be impacted by the proposed project are zoned for a variety of commercial (DA-4 and DA-5) and Public (PS) uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts to agricultural resources.

There are no new impacts beyond what was analyzed in the Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy EIR that was certified in 2007.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a. Does the project have the potential to 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, 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?				X	2, 3, 4, 9
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---	------------

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
--------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	---------

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means the incremental effects of a project that are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X			3, 4, 9, 15
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X			3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11,12

EXPLANATION:

- a) As discussed under Section IV, Biological Resources, a Tree Report prepared by Hortscience (October, 2008) identified all trees on the subject property over six inches in diameter. Forty-seven trees were surveyed on the site, representing five species, including Holly Oak (23), Sweet Gum (18), Camphor (4) and Tree of Heaven (1) and Honey Locust (1). Twenty two (22) of the Holly Oaks along San Leandro Boulevard and four (4) of the interior trees will be impacted by the proposed project. The tree report recommended the removal of up to thirty (30) trees. The site plan will allow for preservation of up to seventeen trees, including seven of the Sweet Gums along W. Juana Avenue, nine of the Sweet Gums along Carpentier Street and one Tree of Heaven. The project would not likely affect any sensitive species or habitat on Site 1 or 2. However, mature trees on both sites may provide habitat for nesting birds typically found in urban settings. It is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, per the California Fish and Game Code (Section 3503). Removal of trees currently on either site during nesting season could affect these birds. The applicant shall conduct pre-construction surveys for the presence of nesting birds within each of the project sites. The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction breeding-season survey (approximately February 1 through August 31) to determine if any birds are nesting on or directly adjacent to the project area. The survey shall be conducted during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. If no nesting birds are found, then no further action would be required. The project will not affect historical and architectural resources, and the potential for discovering pre-historic cultural resources is low.
- b) Impacts that are individually limited but can be cumulatively considerable include impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biology, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology / water quality, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation/circulation, recreation, and utilities and service systems. Mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. c) As discussed in Section 3, Geology and Soils, and in Section 8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Phase I and Phase II Environmental Assessments were conducted for the proposed project that identified remediation methods and mitigation measures to avoid substantial, adverse impacts to human beings resulting from seismic induced ground failure, including liquefaction, as well as potentially significant hazards to the public or the environment. Section 5, Air Quality, notes that the proposed project could introduce regional and localized air emissions through construction and long-term operational activities. Section 10, Transportation / Circulation notes that traffic generated by the project would exacerbate the already unacceptable levels of service at the intersection of San Leandro Boulevard and Parrott Street. Given these impacts, the project may have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly that require mitigation to reduce them to a level of less than significant.

Inclusion of mitigation measures will reduce all significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Attachments

Figure 1. Location Map

Figure 2. Photograph of Site 1 (With Multi-Family Residential Beyond)

Figure 3. Photograph of Site 2 (Ptn of 1333 Martinez Street)

Sources

1. Westlake Development Partners, LLC, Project Description, February 2, 2009.
2. Field Inspection, Planning Staff, City of San Leandro, February 4, 2009.
3. *City of San Leandro General Plan*, Adopted May 2002.
4. Design, Community and Environment, *Downtown San Leandro Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy EIR*, Prepared for City of San Leandro, June 5, 2007.
5. *Final Geotechnical Investigation San Leandro Crossings Development*, Rockridge Geotechnical, January 21, 2009.
6. *State of California Seismic Hazard Zones, San Leandro Quadrangle*, February 14, 2003.
7. California Geological Survey, *Special Publication 117: Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California*, Adopted March 13, 1997 by the State Mining and Geology Board in Accordance with the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act of 1990.
8. *Stormwater Control Plan for San Leandro Crossings*, Prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc. September 25, 2008.
9. *San Leandro General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report*, Prepared by Barry Miller, AICP, November 2001.
10. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for 1333 Martinez Street*, Prepared by Stantec Consulting Corporation, August 12, 2008.
11. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for Northeast Corner of San Leandro Boulevard*, Prepared by Stantec Consulting Corporation, October 20, 2008.
12. *Phase II Environmental Site Assessment for San Leandro Crossings Eastern Parcel*, Prepared by IRIS Environmental, January 6, 2009.