



**CITY OF SAN LEANDRO  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
Planning & Housing Services Division**

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM**

**Project title:** Bayside Business Park

**Lead agency name and address:** City of San Leandro Community Development Department, Planning & Housing Services Division, 835 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, San Leandro, CA 94577

**Contact persons and phone numbers:** Debbie Pollart, Planner III; (510) 577-3327

**Project location:** 2500 Davis Street; APN 79A-515-2-8

**Project sponsor's name and address:** McMahon Development Group, LLC; 380 Stevens Avenue, Suite 313; Solana Beach, CA 92075

**General Plan:** GI General Industrial

**Zoning:** IG Industrial General District

**Description of the proposed project:**

Tentative Map; Rezone from IG-Industrial General to IG-PD, Industrial General, Planned Development Overlay District; Planned Development, and Master Sign Program for a proposed new eco-industrial business park, located on the former Hohener property. The project site comprises approximately 21+ acres and is proposed to be subdivided into nine parcels, ranging in size from 0.98 acres to 6.58 acres. Parcels A-G will be developed with speculative industrial buildings, ranging in size from 15,600 square feet to 58,700 square feet, for a total of 311,100 square feet of development. A new FedEx Ground parcel processing facility is proposed for Parcel H, the largest of the parcels. Parcel I would be comprised of the private ingress/egress road that would serve the business park, and an existing wetlands mitigation area, located west of the proposed FedEx Ground facility.

The underlying IG zoning district allows for a variety of general industrial, manufacturing, and office uses. It should be noted that future tenants of the speculative buildings may be required to undergo separate environmental review should the specifics of their proposal fall outside of the assumptions made for the traffic report utilized for this Initial Study and/or if the proposed use requires additional discretionary review pursuant to the City's Zoning Code, such as a Conditional Use Permit.

**Surrounding land uses and setting:**

North: Industrial and City's Water Pollution Control Plant  
South: Industrial  
East: Industrial  
West: Davis Street Transfer Station and Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline

The project site is located on the south side of Davis Street, near its western terminus. Surrounding uses include scrap metal dealers, various industrial/manufacturing businesses, the Davis Street Transfer Station, and the City's Water Pollution Control Plant. The project site is currently developed with several buildings associated with the former meatpacking use, but which are currently (or soon to be) vacant and are proposed for demolition as part of this project.

**Other public agencies  
whose approval may be  
required:**

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Regional Water Quality Control Board; California Department of Fish & Game; Alameda County Flood Control

---

**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 Issue” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

---

Debbie Pollart, Planner III

---

*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?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>
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?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				<b>X</b>	<b>2, 11</b>

**EXPLANATION:** The project site is designated as General Industrial in the General Plan. This designation characterizes a wide range of manufacturing, transportation, warehousing, vehicle storage, and distribution uses. The property is zoned IG Industrial General, and the proposed FedEx Ground facility is a permitted use (with approval of Administrative Review, which is required for parcel processing facilities in excess of 30,000 square feet in size). The property is proposed to be rezoned from IG to IG-PD (Planned Development) in order to facilitate development of the project. Surrounding businesses include older industrial uses (scrap metal dealers and various manufacturing companies), the Davis Street Transfer Station and the City's Water Pollution Control Plant. Development of this site as an industrial business park would not conflict with these existing uses and is a natural progression for this part of the City, which has maintained industrial uses for several decades. There are no habitat conservation plans in place in either the General Plan or Zoning Code. Development of the project site would be in conformance with the local Airport Land Use Commission's plan (small portion of site is within over-flight zone). There is an existing, designated wetlands mitigation area included as part of the proposed project. Potential impacts of the proposed project on this area are discussed under the Biological Resources section.

**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)?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>
b. Displace substantial number of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				<b>X</b>	<b>2, 11</b>

**EXPLANATION:** The project area is already served by existing utility systems and public services. The project does include public and private improvements in the form of a new private road, sidewalk, curb and gutter (improvements along the Davis Street frontage would be public). The new private street would end in a cul-de-sac at the southern end and would only provide access to the industrial park and as a secondary point of egress for the Davis Street Transfer Station (utilized by transfer trucks only, not by the public). This development is considered a re-use of property already existing within an urban context. The intensity of development conforms to the underlying General Plan designation and zoning district. Therefore, potential impacts related to population growth are considered less than significant. A single-family residence (noted as a farm house) is located on the project site, but has been vacant for a number of years. Its use was associated with the former cattle feed lot/meatpacking operations that previously occupied the project site. Given the structure's vacant status, demolition of the structure would not warrant the construction of replacement housing, nor would its removal displace anyone.

**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:		<b>X</b>			<b>2, 6</b>
--	--	----------	--	--	-------------

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
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		2, 6
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X			2, 6
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X			2, 6
iv) Landslides?				X	2, 6
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		2, 6
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			2, 6
d. Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks of life or property?		X			2, 6
e. Have soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X	2, 11
f. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on- or off-site?			X		2
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	2, 11

**EXPLANATION:** [The information for this section was based, in part, on a geotechnical investigation prepared by Treadwell & Rollo for the project applicant. This report may be viewed in its entirety at the Planning & Housing Services Division during normal business hours.] The project area is located within the seismically-active Bay Area, with several faults located within 3-16 miles of the project site, although the area is not included in an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. Therefore, it is likely that during the lifetime of future buildings constructed on the project site, they will be subject to seismic shaking and other earthquake-induced effects. The Uniform Building Code requires new building construction to meet requirements for construction in earthquake-prone areas, which is intended to minimize any potential impacts related to seismic events. The project area is currently served by sewers for disposal of wastewater. Future development will be required to connect to the existing sewer system, therefore impacts related to soils types and septic tanks are not applicable. The geotechnical report prepared for the project site found that on-site soils consisted of up to 10' of fill, moderately compressible clay, medium stiff to very stiff native clays and medium dense to dense sands. Laboratory tests indicate the native clay is highly expansive. Groundwater depths ranged from about 6 to 12 feet below the existing ground surface. The groundwater level at the site may fluctuate a few feet due to seasonal precipitation and tidal influence. It is anticipated that specific engineering will be required for some of the proposed truck docks in order to address the shallow water table. The geotechnical report indicates that the site has a low potential for liquefaction and liquefaction-induced settlements. However, during a large earthquake some soil layers or isolated pockets may liquefy. The potential for lateral spreading at the site is surmised to be low, and settlements related to differential compaction are considered negligible. Due to the project's location on relatively flat topography and not adjacent to a creek or the Bay, potential impacts related to landslides, erosion and modification to streams or bays are not anticipated. Due to the relatively flat topography, potentially significant impacts related to erosion are not anticipated either during the construction phase or upon project buildout. Potential erosion/sedimentation impacts as they relate to the on-site wetlands are discussed in the Biological Resources section. The project site is not located adjacent to a beach, river or the Bay. Therefore, no impacts related to siltation or deposition are anticipated.

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

**EXPLANATION – continued**

The following mitigation measures are recommended in order to reduce potentially significant impacts related to on-site soils to a level of insignificance:

- **Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicants shall submit a Grading Plan accompanied by Soils Engineering and Engineering Geology Reports, in accordance with requirements of the City of San Leandro Municipal Code Title VII, Chapter 12. All recommendations included in the Treadwell & Rollo reports shall be included in the Grading Plan, to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.**
- **All recommendations found in the Treadwell & Rollo report shall become conditions of approval for the proposed project and shall be so indicated on plans submitted for building plan check, to be reviewed and approved by the Chief Building Official.**

**4. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:**

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X			2
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		2
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		2
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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?		X			2
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			2
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X		2
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	2, 11
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?			X		1, 2

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
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		2
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X		2
k. Exposure of people property to water related hazards such as tidal waves?			X		2
<p><b>EXPLANATION:</b> The project area is fairly level with development including an older residence and several outbuildings and paving existing on the northern portion of the project site, all associated with the former meatpacking operation. The central and southern portions of the site are unpaved. Historic aerial photographs indicate that the southern two-thirds of the site have been utilized in the past as cattle pens and also for agricultural production of cattle feed (most likely alfalfa and/or hay). In the late 1980s, the former property owner filled in a small portion of the central portion of the site. It was later determined that the area filled in contained jurisdictional wetlands. As compensation for the loss of habitat, an on-site wetlands mitigation area was developed in the southwestern portion of the site, which exists today. The proposal includes construction of a new private access roadway and eight industrial buildings, with average lot coverage by buildings of approximately 38 percent (plus approximately 15 percent additional coverage associated with the roadway). Therefore, it can be anticipated that implementation of the proposed project may result in potentially significant impacts related to water quality, groundwater, drainage patterns, and increased run-off. It is anticipated that some of these impacts may be lessened or off-set by the standard requirement that projects be required to comply with Best Management Practices (BMPs) during the construction phase. Preliminary hydrologic and hydraulic calculations prepared for the project indicate that storm drainage effluent will be split between the Alameda County Flood Control &amp; Water Conservation District (ACFC) facilities located in Davis Street, and the jurisdictional wetlands located in the southwest portion of the property. These wetlands are tidal impacted through a city-owned storm drainpipe system running parallel to the railroad tracks at the southern end of the site. The project site is located within the 100-year flood zone (Zone VE), identified as coastal flooding with velocity hazard (wave action). The base flood elevation established is 71 feet. Properties to the south and east currently have problems with flooding, which limits the amount of runoff that can be directed to the wetlands to the south. In addition, in order to protect the salt-sensitive vegetation of the jurisdictional wetlands, the applicant is proposing to limit the runoff rate from the portion of the site that cannot drain to ACFC facilities in Davis Street. The project site is located within approximately ½ mile of the San Francisco Bay, but given the site's location, probabilities for inundation and tidal wave action are anticipated to be remote. The following mitigation measures are recommended in order to reduce potentially significant impacts related to hydrology, flooding and water quality to a less than significant level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a site-specific and drainage area hydrology study for the site shall be prepared which, at a minimum analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed project with regards to water quality, groundwater use and degradation, affect on existing drainage patterns, the potential for increased run-off, the impacts to the development from local tidal action, and the potential for flooding upstream of the site. The hydrology studies shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval.</b></li> <li>• <b>Prior to issuance of the grading permit, an erosion control plan shall be developed for the site in order to minimize any erosion that may occur during grading, with specific attention paid to precluding impacts to the jurisdictional wetlands. Protection measures may include implementing silt fencing, hay bales and/or sand bags. The erosion control plan shall be submitted to the City Engineer, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Alameda County Flood Control District, and the Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish and Game (the latter two agencies for review of potential impacts to the jurisdictional wetlands) for review and approval.</b></li> <li>• <b>In accordance with the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, the applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) advising that the project is under consideration for construction. The applicant shall submit proof of approval from the RWQCB to the City Engineer prior to issuance of grading permits. To control storm water pollution, the applicant shall comply with the regulations and provisions contained in the City's Grading Ordinance, the City's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Permit, and the NPDES, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.</b></li> </ul>					

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

**EXPLANATION – continued**

- Until such time as all construction for the development has been completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, the applicant shall provide current Erosion & Sediment Control Plans, and amended Storm Water Pollution prevention Plans (SWPPPs) for all portions of the site where construction is ongoing. Said plans shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval on or before September 1 of each calendar year, and shall be fully implemented on or before October 15 of each calendar year.
- All on-site buildings shall be designed to be located at least 1 foot above the established base flood elevation, or at a height as determined necessary by the City Engineer. Truck loading docks shall be engineered so as to preclude groundwater and runoff from pooling (i.e., no standing water) around building foundations, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

**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		2
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X		2
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		2
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X		2
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X	2

**EXPLANATION:** Air quality impacts would result during both the construction phase and ultimate buildout and operation of the development. Construction emissions would occur temporarily, while operational emissions would continue for the life of the project. Construction impacts would include dust generated during grading operations and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions would be generated from paints and other architectural coatings utilized for construction of the proposed buildings. Post-construction, the primary source of emissions would be generated by project-related traffic. Construction-related activities are anticipated to occur over a period of 18 months, and would be expected to generate substantial amounts of dust, which would result in temporary potential health and nuisance impacts in the immediate project vicinity. Telephone conversations with BAAQMD staff indicated that building square footage for the proposed project would not trigger a need for a quantitative analysis of project-related vehicular emissions. In terms of cumulative impacts, the project involves re-use of a former meatpacking facility, located within an industrial context, which is served by nearby public transit. It is anticipated that the proposed project would contribute incrementally towards the Bay Area air quality. However, given the scale of the project and infill nature, significant cumulative impacts are not anticipated. Staff notes, as discussed in the Hazards section, some of the existing buildings may contain asbestos and/or lead, which requires special handling during demolition. The following mitigation measures are recommended in order to reduce temporary construction-related impacts to a level of insignificance:

- Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the applicant shall receive approval from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District for proposed removal of asbestos-containing and lead-contaminated materials that may exist on-site. Proof of BAAQMDs approval for removal of on-site contaminants shall be submitted to the Chief Building Official prior to issuance of demolition permits.

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

**EXPLANATION – continued**

- **Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall be required to demonstrate compliance with BAAQMD Regulation 2, Rule 1 (General Requirements) for all portable construction equipment subject to that rule. This rule requires authorities to construct and permits to operate certain types of portable equipment used for construction purposes (e.g., gasoline or diesel-powered engines used in conjunction with power generation, pumps, compressors, and cranes) unless such equipment complies with all applicable requirements of the CAPCOA Portable Equipment Registration Rule, or with all applicable requirements of the Statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program. This exemption is provided in BAAQMD Rule 1-2-105. Proof of compliance shall be submitted to the Chief Building Official.**
- **Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall perform low-NO<sub>x</sub> tune-ups on all diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower (no more than 30 days prior to start of use of that equipment). Periodic tune-ups (every 90 days) should be performed for such equipment used continuously during the construction period. This shall be accomplished to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official.**
- **The project sponsor shall require the construction contractor to implement a dust abatement program, details of which shall be submitted for review and approval of the Chief Building Official prior to issuance of grading permits. Based on BAAQMD guidance, elements of the program shall include: Water all active construction areas at least twice daily; Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials; Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas; Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets; Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more); enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.); limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour; install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible; and designate a person or persons to oversee the implementation of a comprehensive dust control program and to increase watering, if necessary.**

**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, 8
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, 8
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, 8
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

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, 11
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, 11
<p><b>EXPLANATION:</b> <i>This analysis is based, in part, on the Hohener Property Wetland Mitigation Site As-Built Plan, prepared in 1999 for the former property owner. This report can be found in its entirety, bound separately from this checklist. This plan was required when a small area of wetlands (0.14 acres), located in the central portion of the property, was inadvertently filled. The wetland mitigation design called for the on-site restoration of a minimum of 0.7 acres of pickleweed-dominated wetland habitat. This area provides a mitigation ratio of 2:1 for the loss of 0.14 acres of seasonal wetlands. An additional 0.42 acres of wetlands was included to compensate for wetland fill that occurred prior to the proposed mitigation plan. The mitigation site is located in the southwestern portion of the project site, and is immediately adjacent to an existing pickleweed-dominated marsh. The actual surface area constructed (0.74 acres) is slightly larger than the surface area required by the 1999 mitigation plan. The proposed project includes subdivision of the property into nine parcels, with eight of the parcels to be developed with industrial buildings. As proposed, the existing mitigation area, along with the new private access road would constitute the ninth parcel. Two potentially significant impacts could result with this project as follows: 1) development of the site, in particular the FedEx Ground facility to the east of the wetland mitigation area, could affect the existing wetlands by increasing sedimentation during the grading phase and increasing on-site impervious surfaces (with a resultant increase in site runoff) upon project completion; and 2) the new private roadway as proposed would result in the removal of less than 1/10 acre of wetland habitat (near the new crossing proposed for Waste Management). Hydrology analyses performed to date for the applicant indicate that the project has been designed so as to control the amount and quality of runoff that would be directed towards the wetlands mitigation area. There are no adopted conservation plans, local policies or ordinances, which address protection of plant/animal species that might be affected by development of the project site. The following mitigation measures are recommended in order to reduce potentially significant impacts related to on-site established wetlands to a level of insignificance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permits, the applicant shall consult with the Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Game (and any other agencies deemed responsible agencies) for development of sedimentation plans and runoff controls that will not adversely impact the established on-site wetlands mitigation area, either during the construction phase or upon project buildout. Proof of the agencies approval shall be submitted to the Community Development Director prior to issuance of a demolition or grading permit.</b></li> <li>• <b>Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall confer with the Army Corps of Engineers for determination of whether the small wetlands area proposed to be removed (less than 1/10 of an acre) are considered jurisdictional and whether removal of them will require replacement (and at what ratio). This shall be accomplished to the satisfaction of the Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish and Game. If a replacement plan is required, the plan shall be developed in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish Game and submitted to the Community Development Director prior to issuance of grading permits.</b></li> </ul>					
<b>7. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>					
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	2, 11
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	2, 11
<p><b>EXPLANATION:</b> There are no known mineral resources located within the boundaries of the project area, which has been previously developed and used for agricultural purposes. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources are anticipated.</p>					

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

**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		2, 9
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		2, 9
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	2, 11
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		2, 9
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		2
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	2, 11
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		2, 11
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	2, 11

**EXPLANATION:** Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (EA) were prepared for the project site in November of 2001 by Treadwell & Rollo. This property encompasses approximately 21+ acres and is improved several buildings (including farm buildings, a slaughter house, a residence, maintenance buildings, grain sheds, cattle pens, storage, boiler rooms, an incinerator, and office areas), gravel parking areas, and undeveloped land (used previously for agricultural production – feed grain for the cattle). Most of the soil samples contained low concentrations of heavy petroleum hydrocarbons such as diesel and oil, but do not represent a significant threat to groundwater quality in the site area. Two water wells are located on the northern 1/3 of the site. Storm drains exist on-site, as well as several floor drains associated with some of the existing buildings. The previous property owner (Hohener) stated that the only chemicals used during the site operations were chloring-based detergents and lubricating oils. Most of the groundwater samples contained low concentrations of heavy petroleum hydrocarbons such as diesel and oil. These concentrations likely result from site and upgradient (to the east) site releases. Several above ground tanks were observed on the property. Their uses include molasses storage, water heating, and water tanks. The potential exists for asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint to be present on the site structures, given that they were constructed prior to the early 1970's. Present-day use of potentially hazardous materials is highly regulated by several agencies, including Cal/OSHA and the Alameda County Fire Department, to name just two. Therefore, future use of the site with the proposed uses is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to those working/living in the project vicinity. The following mitigation measures are recommended in order to reduce potential impacts related to contamination of on-site soils and groundwater wells, and asbestos-containing building materials to a level of insignificance:

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

**EXPLANATION – continued**

- **Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the applicant shall have a survey completed that analyzes the extent of on-site paints, varnishes, oil, and other potentially toxic materials, and including electrical circuit breakers and transformers, as well as asbestos and lead paint. A plan for proper disposal of surveyed materials shall be submitted to the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and the City’s Environmental Services Manager for review and approval prior to issuance of demolition permits.**
- **All asbestos-containing materials shall be required to be abated by the applicant prior to demolition. Non-friable materials observed can be disposed of as non-hazardous waste. Worker protection, dust controls, packaging in a sealed dumpster or closed truck, and asbestos registration of the demolition contractor shall be required in compliance with Cal/OSHA regulation 8 CCR 1529 and the California Business Code. Friable asbestos shall be removed under full isolation abatement procedures. All thermal system insulation is classified as friable asbestos and shall be removed under Work Class I procedures in compliance with 8 CCR 1529. All asbestos removal operations shall be conducted with the oversight and approval of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.**
- **If soil from areas containing concentrations of heavy petroleum hydrocarbons is excavated during site development, it may be graded under the proposed buildings and parking lot area. A Soil Mitigation Plan shall be prepared to outline proper soil handling procedures to be implemented during construction. The plan shall be submitted prior to issuance of grading permits and reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and Environmental Services Manager.**
- **Site area groundwater shall not be used for drinking water by future on-site uses. If groundwater is pumped during site development near boring B-8 (as identified in the Treadwell & Rollo study), next to the former auto services barn, it may require treatment prior to sewer discharge to meet discharge criteria. This shall be accomplished to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and City Environmental Services Manager.**
- **The two on-site groundwater wells shall be properly abandoned prior to issuance of building permits, to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City’s Environmental Services Manager.**

The project area is not located within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Development of the project area would not interfere with an existing emergency response/evacuation plan. A very small portion of the northeaster portion of the site is located within the airport over-flight zone for nearby Oakland International Airport. However, development of the site, including maximum building height and type of development (industrial business park) would not result in a significant impact to the flight zone or the adopted Airport Land Use Plan. Given the urban context, potential impacts related to wildland fires are anticipated to be less than significant.

**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?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration of groundborne noise levels?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
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		2
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	2, 11
<p><b>EXPLANATION:</b> The project site is located near the western terminus of Davis Street, which ends at the Davis Street Transfer Station. The nearest residential areas are located approximately 1 mile to the east and south of the project site (Davis West and Mulford Gardens, respectively). The existing noise environment for the project area is characterized by heavy truck traffic (associated with the Transfer Station, and well as trucks travelling along Doolittle Drive, an established truck route, to the east), noise associated with typical industrial uses, and noise from jet airplanes and small, single-engine planes landing and taking off from nearby Oakland International Airport. The proposed use as an industrial park, with the assumption that all future uses would be located within the buildings, would not result in a significant increase over the existing ambient noise level of the project area. Short-term increases in noise may be expected during the construction phase. However, given the relatively short duration and the intermittent nature of the noise, and with inclusion of BMPs regarding construction equipment, impacts related to construction noise are anticipated to be less than significant. Potentially significant noise impacts to workers in the new buildings are not anticipated, as the new construction would be required to adhere to current Title 24 requirements for insulation of noise, and would be required to adhere to the General Plan noise levels for compatibility with the proposed use. A very small portion of the northeastern corner of the property is within the over-flight zone for nearby Oakland International Airport (North Field). Given the existing noise environment, the existing building code requirements (Title 24) for construction, and the non noise-sensitive nature of the use (as an industrial business park), impacts to future tenants associated with airplane over-flight are anticipated to be less than significant.</p>					
<b>10. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the project:</b>					
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		2, 10
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X			2, 10
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	2, 11
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		2
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X		2
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X		2
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or Programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X		2
h. Trigger CMA Review? (GPA involving more than 100 p.m. peak hour trips generated over existing general plan land use)				X	2

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

**EXPLANATION:** The project site is located near the western terminus of Davis Street, west of Doolittle Drive and approximately 1 mile west and north of the closest established residential neighborhoods (Davis West and Mulford Gardens, respectively). A traffic study was prepared for the applicant, with the assumption that no more than 20,000 square feet of the total development would be for office uses (i.e., other than ancillary office use associated with a future industrial tenant). The traffic report concluded that all study intersection are expected to operate at acceptable levels of service under Existing Conditions and in year 2006 (project buildout) with and without the proposed project. (The study assumed that the proposed Westgate Parkway would be in place, so some traffic volumes are removed from the Davis/Doolittle intersection. Westgate Parkway is a Measure B funded project, with construction expected to be completed by 2005). With traffic growth as a result of the redevelopment of West Sand Leandro by the year 2025, the intersection of Davis/Doolittle is expected to operate at LOS F during both peak hours with and without the project. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact. The project is expected to contribute no more than 8 percent traffic to any one of the study intersections under the near-term scenario. In year 2025, the project contributes less than seven percent traffic to any one of the study intersections under the future scenarios. The study indicates that having all Oyster Bay Regional Park access from Davis Street has a greater impact on the Davis/Doolittle intersection than the proposed project, although it is assumed that a majority of these trips would be on the weekends. Assuming buildout of the park as indicated in the park Master Plan, park traffic would contribute 400 to 500 a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips to this intersection as opposed to approximately 300 trips from the project in either peak. The traffic report indicates that the suggested mitigation for park access by extending Polvorosa to Neptune as described in the *Davis West Specific Plan* would work well and would allow the Davis/Doolittle intersection to operate at LOS E and better with the project. The intersection of Davis/I-880 Southbound ramp/Westgate Parkway is expected to operate unacceptably under the year 2025 with and without the project in the a.m. peak. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact. This intersection can be improved to operate with less delay if a second southbound right turn lane can be added with a single southbound land and two left turn lanes, but still remains at LOS E. The proposed subdivision of the project site has taken into account the City's requirement for off-street parking for each parcel. Therefore, unless a use other than industrial or parcel processing facility were to locate on-site, it appears that on-site parking is adequate. In addition, the business park has been developed with input from Alameda County Fire Department personnel with regards to access for emergency vehicles, and appears to be in conformance. The City has no adopted plans regarding alternative modes of transportation. The following mitigation measure are recommended in order to reduce potential transportation impacts to a level of insignificance:

- **Prior to occupancy of the first building or at such time as determined by the City Engineer, the applicant shall pay their fair share (as determined by the City Engineer) towards the eventual improvements of Davis and Doolittle, with the widening of eastbound and northbound approaches.**
- **Prior to occupancy of the first building or at such time as determined by the City Engineer, the applicant shall commit to participation in a local assessment district for the development of Eden Road, which will need to be developed sometime between 2006 and 2025 to maintain better, if not acceptable, levels of service at the Davis/Doolittle intersection. The applicant's fair share contribution shall be determined by the City Engineer.**
- **Prior to occupancy of the first building, the applicant shall be required to widen Davis Street along their entire frontage to a width of 48 feet (curb to curb) to provide the westbound left turn lane.**
- **Prior to occupancy of the first building, the applicant shall provide an all-way STOP traffic control at the intersection of the new access road and the westward extension of the drive serving Waste Management.**
- **In order to maintain acceptable LOS at the Doolittle/Davis intersection, the office use in the development shall be limited to less than 15,000 square feet. This shall be made a condition of project approval.**

A standard condition of approval for non-residential development projects is a requirement for payment of Development Fees for Street Improvements (DFSI) fees. The exact fee is based upon the amount of net new development, with credit given for existing on-site square footage. It should be noted that the developer has committed to making a contribution to the San Leandro LINKS shuttle program and will encourage businesses located at the site to have their employees ride the shuttle, which provides a connection to the San Leandro BART station.

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		2
b. Police protection?			X		2
c. Schools?			X		2
d. Parks?			X		2
e. Other public facilities?			X		2

**EXPLANATION:** Portions of the project area have been previously developed and it can be described as an urban environment. Given the urban context, the fact that the site has been served by public services in the past, and the fact that the scale of proposed development is in keeping with that envisioned in the General Plan, public service impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. The applicant shall be required to pay state-mandated school fees to the appropriate local school district prior to issuance of building permits. The new access roadway will be private and will be maintained via CC&R's established by the developer. The project site would be served by a new ACFD station, which is currently under construction on Williams Street, less than 1 mile from the site.

**12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:**

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X		2
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		2
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			2
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?		X			2
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		2
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X		2
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		2
h.. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to discharge of storm waters?			X		2

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

**EXPLANATION:** Limited sanitary sewer is available within the project site, inasmuch as development was concentrated in the northern third of the property. Water service is also currently available along Davis Street. Given the fact that the project site has been previously developed, and the proposed industrial use and density of development proposed are in keeping with that anticipated in the General Plan, staff does not anticipate potentially significant impacts related to sanitary sewer or water supply. A standard Engineering Department condition requires the applicant to submit plans showing the water service extension, network analysis and looping requirements to EBMUD for review and approval. Any new water or wastewater lines required to serve the project sites would be located within Davis Street and the new private access road. Given the existing on-site wetland mitigation area, the development has been designed to minimize impacts to this area, both during the construction phase and upon project buildout. Consultation and approval of plans by the ACE and CDFG will ensure that any potential impacts to this area are minimal. The project site will be served by a private trash collecting company (ACI), which take refuse to the local transfer station (located adjacent to the west), where it is separated before undergoing further on-site procedures (i.e., composting), or is trucked off-site to the Altamont landfill, which has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. New businesses will be provided with all necessary waste/recycling containers and will be required to comply with all statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The following mitigation measures are recommended in order to reduce potentially significant impacts related to wastewater and storm water discharge to a level of insignificance:

- **Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall provide an analysis prepared by a registered Civil Engineer to determine the utility needs for the project site and possible upsizing of existing facilities, to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. All improvements needed as a result of this analysis shall be implemented as part of the overall on- and off-site improvements.**
- **Prior to issuance of grading permit approval, hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and Alameda County Public Works Agency. Storm water runoff from the project site shall be designed to be collected in an underground system and conveyed to an appropriate storm drain system. The system shall be adequate for tidal influence and shall not cause flooding. This shall be indicated on the Improvement Plan for the Final Map.**

Staff notes that the project developer has entered into a financial partnership with the Alameda County Waste Management Authority WMA and the California State Waste Board to develop the industrial park as an "eco-industrial" park. An eco-industrial park is a community of businesses seeking enhanced environmental and economic performance through collaboration in managing environmental and resource issues including energy, water and materials. Future tenants are being targeted as businesses that are manufacturers and value-added processors who use recycled materials, such as paper, glass, metals, rubber, foam, plastics and wood recovered and purchased locally to produce new products. A development of such a park would be especially advantageous being located adjacent to the Davis Street Transfer Station. In addition, as part of the developer's partnership with WMA, development of the buildings will be required to be in part "green", that is, utilizing environmentally-friendly products and/or recycled products in their construction.

**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?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>
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?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>

**EXPLANATION:** For the purposes of this analysis, the physical development of the project area would include eight new industrial park buildings and a new private roadway. Given the urban context, and because the proposed new uses and intensities would be consistent with the General Plan, significant impacts to local and regional recreation facilities are not anticipated.

**14. AESTHETICS. Would the project:**

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			<b>X</b>		<b>2</b>
---	--	--	----------	--	----------

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X		2
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X		2
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		2
e. Create significant shadow effects on adjacent buildings?			X		2
<p><b>EXPLANATION:</b> Typical street lights associated with the new private road and outdoor lighting associated with the new buildings would significantly increase the amount of light emanating from the project site. However, standard conditions of approval, which require that lighting be designed so that no light spills off-site, would reduce this potentially significant impact to a level of insignificance. Because the proposed development is located within an urban context with no adjacent residential or other sensitive uses, no significant impacts regarding shadows on adjacent properties are anticipated. The new buildings may be visible from the Oyster Bay Regional Park, which is located to the west. However, the new buildings would conform with the maximum building height permitted in the IG Zoning District, will be conditioned to require a landscape buffer around all buildings, would not be out of context with the surrounding industrial uses, and would therefore not create a significant visual impact as viewed from the park.</p>					
<p><b>15. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b></p>					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in section 15064.5?			X		2
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5?			X		2
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		2
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X		2
<p><b>EXPLANATION:</b> There are no known cultural resources in the project area, and given it's history of agricultural uses and as a slaughterhouse , it is unlikely that any cultural resources would be encountered during site development. Potential impacts related to unknown cultural resources that may be encountered during the construction phase can be mitigated to a level of insignificance with implementation of the following mitigation measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>In the event that archaeological resources, prehistoric or historic artifacts are discovered during any construction or excavation, the following procedures shall be followed: Construction and/or excavation activities shall cease immediately and the Development Services Department shall be notified. A qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether any such materials are significant prior to resuming ground-breaking construction activities. Standardized procedures for evaluating accidental finds and discovery of human remains shall be followed as prescribed in Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 of the California Environmental Quality Act.</b></li> </ul>					
<p><b>16. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:</b></p>					
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	2, 11

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	2, 11
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	2, 11
<b>EXPLANATION:</b> Although a portion of the project site has been used for a number of years as a cattle feed lot and associated grain fields, underlying soils are not considered prime farmland and the project site it not zoned for agricultural uses, nor has it ever been under a Williamson Act contract. There are no agricultural uses in the vicinity that might be affected by the change in use on this site to an industrial park use. Therefore, no agricultural resources impacts are anticipated.					
<b>17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>					
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
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			2
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		2
<b>EXPLANATION:</b> The project site contains an existing wetland mitigation measure, which is still being reviewed for compliance by the Army Corps of Engineers. The developer plans to maintain the wetland area and has designed the project to minimize impacts to the mitigation area to a level of insignificance. Due to the scale of the proposed project and the fact that a portion of the project site has been previously developed, implementation of the proposed project, which would result in subdivision of the property and development of eight industrial buildings totally approximately 311,100 square feet, is not anticipated to result in significant cumulative impacts other than for cumulative traffic. As indicated in the Transportation section, two project area intersections would operate under constrained levels even without the project. The applicant will be required to contribute his fair share towards future improvements, which reduces the project’s cumulative impact to a level of insignificance. The proposed development intensity (FAR) is in keeping with the levels anticipated by General Plan. As evidenced by the technical reports submitted to date, the project is not anticipated to have substantial adverse effects, either directly or indirectly, on human beings.					

<b>18. SOURCE REFERENCES</b>	
1.	Determination based on location of project
2.	Determination based on staff office review
3.	Determination based on field review
4.	Determination based on San Leandro General Plan
5.	Determination based on San Leandro Zoning Code
6.	Determination based on <i>Geotechnical Investigation-Federal Express/Davis Street Industrial Development</i> ; Treadwell&Rollo; November 14, 2001
7.	Determination based on <i>Hydrologic &amp; Hydraulic Calculations Commentary for Bayside Business Park - 2500 Davis Street</i> ; CenterLine Land Surveying, Inc.; undated.
8.	Determination based on <i>Hohener Property Wetland Mitigation Site As-Built Plan</i> ; H. T. Harvey & Associates, July 7, 1999.
9.	Determination based on <i>Phase I &amp; II Environmental Site Assessment-2500 Davis Street</i> ; Treadwell&Rollo; November 12, 2001
10.	Determination based on <i>Hohener Property Redevelopment Traffic Study</i> ; TJKM; June 6, 2002
11.	Not Applicable

## ATTACHMENTS

1. Regional Map
2. Location Map
3. Preliminary Site Plan for 2500 Davis Street

## TECHNICAL APPENDICES

*The following technical appendices are bound separately and are available for review at the City of San Leandro Community Development Department, Planning & Housing Services Division, between the hours of 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Mondays through Fridays. City Hall is located at 835 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street.*

- *Geotechnical Investigation-Federal Express/Davis Street Industrial Development*; Treadwell&Rollo; November 14, 2001
- *Hydrologic & Hydraulic Calculations Commentary for Bayside Business Park - 2500 Davis Street*; CenterLine Land Surveying, Inc.; undated.
- *Hohener Property Wetland Mitigation Site As-Built Plan*; H. T. Harvey & Associates, July 7, 1999.
- *Phase I & II Environmental Site Assessment-2500 Davis Street*; Treadwell&Rollo; November 12, 2001
- *Hohener Property Redevelopment Traffic Study*; TJKM Transportation Consultants; June 6, 2002



## CITY OF SAN LEANDRO

# MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that the City of San Leandro finds that no significant effect on the environment as prescribed by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended will occur for the following proposed project:

### **I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Tentative Map; Rezone from IG-Industrial General to IG-PD, Industrial General, Planned Development Overlay District; Planned Development, and Master Sign Program for a proposed new eco-industrial business park, located on the former Hohener property. The project site comprises approximately 21+ acres and is proposed to be subdivided into nine parcels, ranging in size from 0.98 acres to 6.58 acres. Parcels A-G will be developed with speculative industrial buildings, ranging in size from 15,600 square feet to 58,700 square feet, for a total of 311,100 square feet of development. A new FedEx Ground parcel processing facility is proposed for Parcel H, the largest of the parcels. Parcel I would be comprised of the private ingress/egress road that would serve the business park, and an existing wetlands mitigation area, located west of the proposed FedEx Ground facility.

The underlying IG zoning district allows for a variety of general industrial, manufacturing, and office uses. It should be noted that future tenants of the speculative buildings may be required to undergo separate environmental review should the specifics of their proposal fall outside of the assumptions made for the traffic report utilized for this Initial Study and/or if the proposed use requires additional discretionary review pursuant to the City's Zoning Code, such as a Conditional Use Permit.

### **II. DECLARATION THAT PROJECT WILL NOT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECT ENVIRONMENT:**

With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the proposed project will have no significant effect on the area's resources, cumulative or otherwise.

### **III. FINDINGS SUPPORTING DECLARATION:**

A. This project is considered an in-fill development and would convert land that is partially developed with food manufacturing uses, (and had supported this use for approximately 60 years, until it was discontinued approximately 10 years ago) to a new industrial business park. The zoning on the property is IG Industrial General District in which industrial uses are a permitted use. The proposed project would be consistent with past and present policy direction and would not result in any potential land use conflicts. In addition, because the proposed project is in proximity to other industrial and

- manufacturing uses, and would replace an abandoned industrial use, development of the project would not result in a physical division of the established community.
- B. The proposed project has been reviewed according to the standards and requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and an Initial Study Environmental Evaluation Checklist has been prepared with a determination that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment as long as the applicant complies with all identified mitigation measures.
- C. The project area is located within the seismically-active Bay Area, therefore it is likely that during the lifetime of future residences constructed on the project site, they will be subject to seismic shaking and other earthquake-induced effects. The geotechnical report prepared for the project site found that on-site soils consisted of up to 10' of fill, moderately compressible clay, medium stiff to very stiff native clays and medium dense to dense sands. Laboratory tests indicate the native clay is highly expansive. Groundwater depths ranged from about 6 to 12 feet below the existing ground surface. The groundwater level at the site may fluctuate a few feet due to seasonal precipitation and tidal influence. It is anticipated that specific engineering will be required for some of the proposed truck docks in order to address the shallow water table. The geotechnical report indicates that the site has a low potential for liquefaction and liquefaction-induced settlements. However, during a large earthquake some soil layers or isolated pockets may liquefy. The potential for lateral spreading at the site is surmised to be low, and settlements related to differential compaction are considered negligible. Due to the project's location on relatively flat topography and not adjacent to a creek or the Bay, potential impacts related to landslides, erosion and modification to streams or bays are not anticipated. Due to the relatively flat topography, potentially significant impacts related to erosion are not anticipated either during the construction phase or upon project buildout. Potential erosion/sedimentation impacts as they relate to the on-site wetlands are discussed in the Biological Resources section. The project site is not located adjacent to a beach, river or the Bay. Potential impacts related to on-site soils and grading can be adequately mitigated as long as mitigation identified by staff is implemented prior to issuance of grading permits. The mitigation measures are conditions of approval.
- D. The proposal includes construction of a new private access roadway and eight industrial buildings, with average lot coverage by buildings of approximately 38 percent (plus approximately 15 percent additional coverage associated with the roadway). Therefore, it can be anticipated that implementation of the proposed project may result in potentially significant impacts related to water quality, groundwater, drainage patterns, and increased run-off. Preliminary hydrologic and hydraulic calculations prepared for the project indicate that storm drainage effluent will be split between the Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District (ACFC) facilities located in Davis Street, and the jurisdictional wetlands located in the southwest portion of the property. These wetlands are tidal impacted through a city-owned storm drainpipe system running parallel to the railroad tracks at the southern end of the site. The project site is located within the 100-year flood zone

- (Zone VE), identified as coastal flooding with velocity hazard (wave action). The base flood elevation established is 71 feet. Properties to the south and east currently have problems with flooding, which limits the amount of runoff that can be directed to the wetlands to the south. In addition, in order to protect the salt-sensitive vegetation of the jurisdictional wetlands, the applicant is proposing to limit the runoff rate from the portion of the site that cannot drain to ACFC facilities in Davis Street. Potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality can be adequately mitigated as long as mitigation identified by staff is implemented prior to issuance of grading permits. The mitigation measures are conditions of approval.
- E. Construction-related activities are anticipated to occur over a period of 18 months, and would be expected to generate substantial amounts of dust, which would result in temporary potential health and nuisance impacts in the immediate project vicinity. Potential impacts for construction-related air quality impacts can be adequately mitigated as long as mitigation identified by staff is implemented prior to issuance of grading permits and during the construction phase. The mitigation measures are conditions of approval.
- F. The proposed project includes subdivision of the property into nine parcels, with eight of the parcels to be developed with industrial buildings. As proposed, the existing on-site wetland mitigation area, along with the new private access road would constitute the ninth parcel. Two potentially significant impacts could result with this project as follows: 1) development of the site, in particular the FedEx Ground facility to the east of the wetland mitigation area, could affect the existing wetlands by increasing sedimentation during the grading phase and increasing on-site impervious surfaces (with a resultant increase in site runoff) upon project completion; and 2) the new private roadway as proposed would result in the removal of less than 1/10 acre of wetland habitat (near the new crossing proposed for Waste Management). Potential impacts related to on-site wetlands can be adequately mitigated as long as mitigation identified by staff is implemented prior to issuance of demolition and grading permits. The mitigation measures are conditions of approval.
- G. The project site was utilized for approximately 60 years as a meatpacking plant, with associated cattle pens and agricultural production. Phase I and II Environmental Assessments prepared for the project site indicate that the potential exists for asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint to be present on the site structures, given that they were constructed prior to the early 1970's. In addition, several above-ground tanks are located on the property. Potential impacts related to hazardous materials in relation to proposed site demolition and development on the project sites can be adequately mitigated as long as mitigation identified by staff is implemented prior to issuance of demolition and grading permits. The mitigation measures are conditions of approval.
- H. A traffic study prepared for the project indicates that the project will contribute towards year 2025 conditions at nearby project area intersections. In addition, the project will require improvements along the public street frontage at the site in order to

accommodate future plans for improvements to nearby intersections. Local, non-signalized intersections (both at the entrance to the project site and internally on the site) will require controls in order to facilitate proper and safe movement of vehicles. Potential impacts related to the project's contribution toward cumulative transportation impacts can be mitigated as long as mitigation identified by staff is implemented prior to building occupancy. The mitigation measures are conditions of approval.

- I. Site-specific wastewater, water supply and storm drainage information has not been fully gathered and analyzed. Potential impacts related to wastewater, water supply and storm drain discharge can be mitigated as long as mitigation identified by staff is implemented prior to issuance of grading permits. The mitigation measures are conditions of approval.
  - J. There is no evidence of historical or archaeological resources within the project area. Potential impacts to unknown resources can be adequately mitigated as long as mitigation identified by staff is implemented during the construction phase. The mitigation measures are conditions of approval.
-

**IV. PERSON WHO PREPARED INITIAL STUDY:**

---

Debbie Pollart, Planner III

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**V. REVIEW PERIOD:**

The review period is from June 28, 2002 to July 29, 2002. All written comments regarding this Mitigated Negative Declaration must be received by the City of San Leandro, Community Development Department, 835 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, San Leandro, California 94577, no later than 5:00 P.M., July 29, 2002.

A Planning Commission meeting has been tentatively set for July 30, 2002 and a City Council meeting has been tentatively set for September 3, 2002. The Planning Commission will consider the project and make its recommendation to the City Council, who is the final decisionmaker. Written and oral comments may also be made during these public meeting.

***COPY OF INITIAL STUDY IS ATTACHED***

---

For additional information, please contact the City of San Leandro, Community Development Department, 835 East 14<sup>th</sup> Street, San Leandro, CA 94577, telephone (510) 577-3371, or e-mail [dpollart@ci.san-leandro.ca.us](mailto:dpollart@ci.san-leandro.ca.us).

---











**BAYSIDE BUSINESS PARK  
2500 DAVIS STREET – PLN2002-00031**

**DRAFT MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN**

	<b>IMPACT</b>	<b>MITIGATION REQUIRED</b>	<b>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</b>	<b>TIMING</b>
	<p>asbestos or lead.</p>	<p>to the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and the City’s Environmental Services Manager for review and approval prior to issuance of demolition permits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All asbestos-containing materials shall be required to be abated by the applicant prior to demolition. Non-friable materials observed can be disposed of as non-hazardous waste. Worker protection, dust controls, packaging in a sealed dumpster or closed truck, and asbestos registration of the demolition contractor shall be required in compliance with Cal/OSHA regulation 8 CCR 1529 and the California Business Code. Friable asbestos shall be removed under full isolation abatement procedures. All thermal system insulation is classified as friable asbestos and shall be removed under Work Class I procedures in compliance with 8 CCR 1529. All asbestos removal operations shall be conducted with the oversight and approval of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.</li> <li>• If soil from areas containing concentrations of heavy petroleum hydrocarbons is excavated during site development, it may be graded under the proposed buildings and parking lot area. A Soil Mitigation Plan shall be prepared to outline proper soil handling procedures to be implemented during construction. The plan shall be submitted prior to issuance of grading permits and reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and Environmental Services Manager.</li> <li>• Site area groundwater shall not be used for drinking water by future on-site uses. If groundwater is pumped during site development near boring B-8 (as identified in the Treadwell &amp; Rollo study), next to the former auto services barn, it may require treatment prior to sewer discharge to meet discharge criteria. This shall be accomplished to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and City Environmental Services Manager.</li> </ul>	<p>BAAQMD</p> <p>City Engineer and Environmental Services Manager</p> <p>RWQCB and City Environmental Services Manager</p>	<p>Prior to demolition</p> <p>Prior to issuance of grading permits</p> <p>Prior to sewer discharge, as necessary</p>

**BAYSIDE BUSINESS PARK  
2500 DAVIS STREET – PLN2002-00031**

**DRAFT MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN**

	<b>IMPACT</b>	<b>MITIGATION REQUIRED</b>	<b>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</b>	<b>TIMING</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two on-site groundwater wells shall be properly abandoned prior to issuance of building permits, to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City’s Environmental Services Manager.</li> </ul>	RWQCB and City Environmental Services Manager	Prior to issuance of building permits
<b>Transportation</b>				
10 b.	Project would contribute to impacts on the Davis/Doolittle intersection under the cumulative analysis scenario.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prior to occupancy of the first building or at such time as determined by the City Engineer, the applicant shall pay their fair share (as determined by the City Engineer) towards the eventual improvements of Davis and Doolittle, with the widening of eastbound and northbound approaches.</li> <li>Prior to occupancy of the first building or at such time as determined by the City Engineer, the applicant shall commit to participation in a local assessment district for the development of Eden Road, which will need to be developed sometime between 2006 and 2025 to maintain better, if not acceptable, levels of service at the Davis/Doolittle intersection. The applicant’s fair share contribution shall be determined by the City Engineer.</li> <li>Prior to occupancy of the first building, the applicant shall be required to widen Davis Street along their entire frontage to a width of 48 feet (curb to curb) to provide the westbound left turn lane.</li> <li>Prior to occupancy of the first building, the applicant shall provide an all-way STOP traffic control at the intersection of the new access road and the westward extension of the drive serving Waste Management.</li> <li>In order to maintain acceptable LOS at the Doolittle/Davis intersection, the office use in the development shall be limited to less than 15,000 square feet. This shall be made a condition of project approval.</li> </ul>	<p>City Engineer</p> <p>City Engineer</p> <p>City Engineer</p> <p>City Engineer</p> <p>City Engineer and Community Development Director</p>	<p>Prior to occupancy of the first building or at such time as determined by the City Engineer.</p> <p>Prior to occupancy of the first building or at such time as determined by the City Engineer.</p> <p>Prior to occupancy of the first building.</p> <p>Prior to occupancy of the first building.</p> <p>Indicated on plans submitted for building plan check.</p>

