



Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan

Draft Environmental Impact Report

SCH# 2017032016

prepared by

City of San Leandro

Community Development Department

835 East 14th Street

San Leandro, California 94577

Contact: Tom Liao, Deputy Community Development Director

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

449 15th Street, Suite 303

Oakland, California 94612

September 2017

Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan

Draft Environmental Impact Report

SCH# 2017032016

prepared by

City of San Leandro

Community Development Department

835 East 14th Street

San Leandro, California 94577

Contact: Tom Liao, Deputy Community Development Director

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

449 15th Street, Suite 303

Oakland, California 94612

September 2017



Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Environmental Scientists Planners Engineers

www.rinconconsultants.com

This report prepared on 50% recycled paper with 50% post-consumer content.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Project Synopsis	1
Project Objectives	2
Alternatives.....	3
Areas of Known Controversy	4
Issues to be Resolved.....	4
Issues Not Studied in Detail in the EIR.....	4
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4
1 Introduction	27
1.1 Specific Plan Background	27
1.2 Purpose and Legal Authority.....	28
1.3 Scope and Content of the EIR	29
1.4 Lead, Responsible, and Trustee Agencies	32
1.5 Intended Uses of the EIR.....	33
1.6 Environmental Review Process.....	33
2 Project Description	37
2.1 Lead Agency/Project Applicant.....	37
2.2 Location and Setting	37
2.2.1 Specific Plan Area Setting	37
2.2.2 Regulatory Setting	42
2.3 Specific Plan Components.....	43
2.3.1 Overview.....	43
2.3.2 Land Use Concept	44
2.3.3 Transportation and Circulation.....	44
2.3.4 Development Standards	47
2.3.5 Infrastructure and Services.....	50
2.3.6 Implementation	50
2.3.7 Buildout Projections	50
2.4 Project Objectives	51
2.5 Required Approvals.....	53
3 Environmental Setting	55
3.1 Regional Setting	55
3.2 Project Site Setting.....	55
3.3 Cumulative Development	56
4 Environmental Impact Analysis	57
4.1 Aesthetics.....	59
4.1.1 Setting.....	59
4.1.2 Impact Analysis	70

City of San Leandro
Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan

4.2	Air Quality	77
4.2.1	Setting.....	77
4.2.2	Impact Analysis	84
4.3	Biological Resources.....	95
4.3.1	Setting.....	95
4.3.2	Impact Analysis	115
4.4	Cultural, Tribal Cultural, and Paleontological Resources.....	127
4.4.1	Setting.....	127
4.4.2	Existing Conditions.....	136
4.4.3	Impact Analysis	139
4.5	Geology and Soils	149
4.5.1	Setting.....	149
4.5.2	Impact Analysis	160
4.6	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	167
4.6.1	Setting.....	167
4.6.2	Impact Analysis	173
4.7	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	183
4.7.1	Setting.....	183
4.7.2	Impact Analysis	189
4.8	Hydrology and Water Quality	197
4.8.1	Setting.....	197
4.8.2	Impact Analysis	209
4.9	Land Use and Planning.....	223
4.9.1	Setting.....	223
4.9.2	Impact Analysis	226
4.10	Noise	241
4.10.1	Setting.....	241
4.10.2	Impact Analysis	249
4.11	Population and Housing.....	261
4.11.1	Setting.....	261
4.11.2	Analysis	264
4.12	Public Services, Schools, and Recreation	269
4.12.1	Setting.....	269
4.12.2	Impact Analysis	284
4.13	Transportation and Traffic	293
4.13.1	Setting.....	293
4.13.2	Impact Analysis	316
4.14	Utilities and Service Systems	339
4.14.1	Setting.....	339
4.14.2	Impact Analysis	347
4.15	Effects Found Not to Be Significant	359
4.15.1	Aesthetics	359
4.15.2	Agricultural Resources.....	360
4.15.3	Air Quality.....	360
4.15.4	Biological Resources	360
4.15.5	Cultural, Tribal Cultural, and Paleontological Resources.....	360
4.15.6	Geology and Soils.....	361
4.15.7	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	361

4.15.8	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	361
4.15.9	Hydrology and Water Quality	362
4.15.10	Land Use and Planning	362
4.15.11	Mineral Resources	363
4.15.12	Noise	363
4.15.13	Population and Housing	364
4.15.14	Public Services, Schools, and Recreation	364
4.15.15	Transportation and Traffic	364
4.15.16	Utilities and Service Systems	365
5	Other CEQA Required Discussions	367
5.1	Growth Inducement	367
5.1.1	Population and Economic Growth	367
5.1.2	Removal of Obstacles to Growth	368
5.2	Irreversible Environmental Effects	368
5.3	Energy Effects	369
6	Alternatives	373
6.1	Alternative 1: No Project/ 2035 General Plan Buildout	375
6.1.1	Description	375
6.1.2	Impact Analysis	375
6.2	Alternative 2: Residential Focus	376
6.2.1	Description	376
6.2.2	Impact Analysis	377
6.3	Alternative 3: Office Focus	387
6.3.1	Description	387
6.3.2	Impact Analysis	387
6.4	Environmentally Superior Alternative	397
7	References and Preparers	399
7.1	Bibliography	399
7.2	List of Preparers	408

Tables

Table 1	Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts	5
Table 2	NOP Comments and EIR Response	29
Table 3	Ambient Air Quality Standards & Basin Attainment Status	80
Table 4	Ambient Air Quality Data	81
Table 5	2017 Clean Air Plan Control Measures	90
Table 6	Sensitive Communities and Critical Habitats Documented within a 5-mile Radius of the Plan Area	99
Table 7	Special Status Animal Species Known to Occur or with Potential to Occur within the Vicinity of the Plan Area	101
Table 8	Special Status Plant Species Known to Occur or with Potential to Occur within the Vicinity of the Plan Area	105

City of San Leandro
Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan

Table 9	Specific Plan Area Soil Parameters.....	152
Table 10	Specific Plan Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	178
Table 11	Specific Plan Consistency with Applicable San Leandro Climate Action Plan Goals.....	180
Table 12	Specific Plan Consistency with Plan Bay Area 2040.....	181
Table 13	Cleanup Sites in the Specific Plan Area.....	185
Table 14	Policy Consistency with San Leandro 2035 General Plan.....	228
Table 15	Noise Measurement Results.....	244
Table 16	Vibration-Related Building Damage Thresholds.....	250
Table 17	Significance of Changes in Operational Roadway Noise Exposure.....	251
Table 18	Maximum Estimated Noise Levels from Construction Equipment.....	254
Table 19	Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment at Noise-Sensitive Receptors.....	256
Table 20	Cumulative Contribution to Daily Area Roadway Traffic Levels in Future Year 2035.....	258
Table 21	Current Housing and Population in San Leandro and Alameda County.....	261
Table 22	2035 General Plan Population, Housing, and Jobs Projections.....	262
Table 23	ABAG Housing and Employment Projections.....	262
Table 24	Employee Generation Assumptions.....	265
Table 25	Specific Plan Growth Comparison.....	265
Table 26	Current (2017) Enrollment and Capacities of Bay Fair Area Attended Districts and Schools.....	275
Table 27	Level of Service Definition for Intersections.....	300
Table 28	Existing Intersection Level of Service.....	301
Table 29	Arterial Segment Level of Service – Existing Conditions.....	302
Table 30	Level of Service Definitions for Freeway Mainline Segments.....	303
Table 31	Freeway Level of Service – Existing Conditions.....	304
Table 32	Existing AC Transit Weekday Service.....	306
Table 33	Existing and Planned Bicycle Facilities.....	309
Table 34	Study Intersection LOS Standards.....	318
Table 35	Intersection Level of Service for Cumulative Conditions, without and with Proposed Specific Plan.....	327
Table 36	VMT Per Capita – Existing and Projected.....	328
Table 37	MTS Freeway LOS Results for 2040.....	331
Table 38	MTS Arterial LOS, 2040 Cumulative Conditions, without and with Proposed Specific Plan.....	332
Table 39	Proposed Specific Plan Trips on BART.....	336
Table 40	City-Service Landfill Capacity.....	344

Table 41 Estimated Wastewater Generation349

Table 42 Estimated Specific Plan Water Demand351

Table 43 Preliminary EBMUD Baseline Supply and Demand Analysis.....352

Table 44 Proposed Specific Plan Solid Waste Generation.....356

Table 45 Specific Plan Growth Comparison.....367

Table 46 Plan Energy Use Relative to Statewide Energy Use370

Table 47 Project Operational Vehicle Fuel Consumption.....371

Table 48 Building Performance Standards in the Proposed Specific Plan.....372

Table 49 Comparison of Specific Plan Alternatives’ Buildout Characteristics374

Table 50 Alternative 2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions379

Table 51 Alternative 2 Population, Jobs and Housing381

Table 52 Alternative 2 Peak Hour Trip Generation.....383

Table 53 Alternative 2 Intersection Analysis383

Table 54 MTS Arterial LOS, 2040 Cumulative Conditions, Alternative 2384

Table 55 Alternative 2 Estimated Wastewater Generation.....385

Table 56 Alternative 2 Water Demand.....386

Table 57 Alternative 2 Solid Waste Generation386

Table 58 Alternative 3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions389

Table 59 Alternative 3 Population, Jobs and Housing392

Table 60 Alternative 3 Peak Hour Trip Generation.....393

Table 61 Alternative 3 Intersection Analysis393

Table 62 MTS Arterial LOS, 2040 Cumulative Conditions, Alternative 3394

Table 63 Alternative 3 Estimated Wastewater Generation.....395

Table 64 Alternative 3 Estimated Water Demand.....396

Table 65 Alternative 3 Solid Waste Generation396

Table 66 Impact Comparison of Alternatives398

Figures

Figure 1 Environmental Review Process.....35

Figure 2 Regional Location.....38

Figure 3 Specific Plan Area Location39

Figure 4 Main Subareas within the Specific Plan Area40

Figure 5 Specific Plan Street Network.....46

City of San Leandro
Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan

Figure 6	Specific Plan Bicycle Network	48
Figure 7	Specific Plan Transit Network	49
Figure 8a	View Looking South along Hesperian Boulevard near Thornally Drive	60
Figure 8b	View Looking North along Hesperian Boulevard near Fairmont Drive.....	60
Figure 8c	Retail Stores in the Fairmont Square Shopping Center	61
Figure 8d	Retail Stores at Bayfair Center Shopping Mall.....	61
Figure 8e	View of Estudillo Canal near Movie Theater.....	62
Figure 8f	View of the Bay Fair BART Station	62
Figure 8g	View of Residences at Intersection of East 14th Street and Thrust Avenue	63
Figure 8h	View Looking South along East 14th Street near 152nd Avenue	63
Figure 9	San Leandro Significant Views and Gateways.....	65
Figure 10	Eligible State Scenic Highway Proximity	66
Figure 11	Photographs of Estudillo Canal	96
Figure 12	Drainages and Wetlands	97
Figure 13	Results of CNDDDB Records Query for Special Status Species and Federally Designated Critical Habitat	100
Figure 14	Geologic Map	137
Figure 15	Paleontological Sensitivity Map	140
Figure 16	Regional Fault Map	150
Figure 17	Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone Map	151
Figure 18	Specific Plan Area Soils Map	153
Figure 19	Liquefaction Susceptibility Map.....	156
Figure 20	Landslide Hazard Map.....	157
Figure 21	Cleanup Sites in the Specific Plan Area	184
Figure 22	Stormwater, Drainage, and Creeks in and Around the Specific Plan Area	198
Figure 23	Floodplains in and Around the Specific Plan Area	201
Figure 24	Existing Zoning in the Specific Plan Area	224
Figure 25	Noise Measurement Locations	245
Figure 26	San Leandro Land Use Compatibility Guidelines	247
Figure 27	Police and Fire Station Locations Map.....	270
Figure 28	Public Schools that Serve the Specific Plan Area	276
Figure 29	Library Locations that Serve the Specific Plan Area.....	279
Figure 30	Location of Recreational Facilities that Service the Specific Plan Area	282

Figure 31 Traffic Study Area Freeways, Roadways, and Intersections294

Figure 32 Existing AM and PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Intersections 1-4297

Figure 33 Existing AM and PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Intersections 5-9298

Figure 34 Existing AM and PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Intersections 10-12299

Figure 35 Rail and Transit Network.....305

Figure 36 Existing and Planned Bicycle Facilities310

Figure 37 Cumulative Conditions AM and PM Intersection Volumes – Intersections 1-4.....321

Figure 38 Cumulative Conditions AM and PM Intersection Volumes – Intersections 5-9.....322

Figure 39 Cumulative Conditions AM and PM Intersection Volumes – Intersections 10-12323

Figure 40 Cumulative plus Project AM and PM Intersection Volumes – Intersections 1-4.....324

Figure 41 Cumulative plus Project AM and PM Intersection Volumes – Intersections 5-9.....325

Figure 42 Cumulative plus Project AM and PM Intersection Volumes – Intersections 10-12.....326

Appendices

Appendix A Notice of Preparation (NOP) and NOP Responses

Appendix B Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling Results

Appendix C Noise Measurements Results

Appendix D Traffic Impact Study

Appendix E Water Supply Assessment

This page intentionally left blank.

Executive Summary

This document is a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) analyzing the environmental effects of the proposed Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan (proposed Specific Plan). This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed Specific Plan, alternatives to the proposed Specific Plan that are analyzed in this EIR, and the environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with the proposed Specific Plan.

Project Synopsis

Lead Agency and Contact Person

City of San Leandro
835 East 14th Street
San Leandro, California 94577
Tom Liao, Deputy Community Development Director, (510) 577-6003

Project Description

The proposed project involves the adoption of the Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan (“proposed Specific Plan”). The proposed Specific Plan includes policies and development standards to guide future development in the Specific Plan Area within the City of San Leandro. The proposed Specific Plan is intended to implement the guidance provided in the City’s 2035 General Plan. The 2035 General Plan envisions Bay Fair as a dynamic, walkable, transit-oriented area with a mix of uses – including retail, office, higher density housing, and open space – that leverage their prime location near BART and two major multi-jurisdictional arterial streets (Hesperian Boulevard and East 14th Street). A reasonable and conservative estimate of buildout associated with the General Plan through 2035 would include development of 2,540 housing units and 300,000 square feet of office space, as well as the removal of an estimated 161,000 square feet of retail space.

The proposed Specific Plan has two major components: (1) the long term vision and policy component (Chapters 2 through 4) and (2) the development standards (Chapter 5). The vision and policy component provides the goals and policies related to land use and circulation. The regulatory component would enact development standards and guidelines that apply to all future development projects in the Specific Plan Area. Together, these two components are intended to serve as a comprehensive document for development within the Specific Plan Area. Chapter 7 includes policies related to infrastructure that would serve the Specific Plan Area and Chapter 6 recommends implementing programs and financing options to achieve the Specific Plan goals.

The proposed Specific Plan contains the following Chapters:

- The **Introduction and Context** chapter (Chapter 1) describes the Specific Plan Area conditions and context, the purpose of the document, and the community engagement and plan development process.

- The **Vision and Planning Framework** chapter (Chapter 2) provides the long-term vision and desired outcomes for the Specific Plan Area.
- The **Mobility** chapter (Chapter 3) presents the circulation network and design concepts that are intended to improve connections and enhance walkability along and across existing corridors. Transportation demand management and parking are also addressed in this Chapter.
- The **Land Use and Housing** chapter (Chapter 4) provides policy direction for the range of future land uses envisioned in the Specific Plan Area. The chapter also includes more detailed policies for housing and affordable housing.
- The **Development Standards and Guidelines** chapter (Chapter 5) provides development standards and guidelines that apply to all future private development projects and major rehabilitation projects in the Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan Area, as well as to new publicly funded improvements. The following topics are addressed: building frontages; height limits and transitions; building and site design; open space; and fences and signs.
- The **Infrastructure and Services** chapter (Chapter 6) includes policies for the provision of wet and dry infrastructure as well as services such as police, fire, and waste collection.
- The **Implementation and Financing** chapter (Chapter 7) presents the programs and physical improvements to achieve the Specific Plan’s vision. The chapter lists funding sources to implement the Plan’s programs and improvements.

Additional detail about the proposed Specific Plan is provided in Section 2, *Project Description*.

Project Objectives

The Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan is intended to achieve the following project objectives and desired outcomes as it is implemented over time:

1. **More Parks and Open Space.** Increase the amount of parks, green space, plazas, and other public space that encourages pedestrian activity, recreation, and access to nature.
2. **More Walkable Environment.** Improve the pedestrian experience, public space, aesthetics, and design quality throughout the Specific Plan Area to attract visitors, serve residents and promote walking.
3. **Better Mobility and Connectivity.** Improve pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicle connections in the Specific Plan Area through the creation of an interconnected street grid, with a focus on better pedestrian connections between the Bay Fair BART station and the adjacent shopping areas.
4. **Improved Safety and Less Crime.** Improve safety in and around the Specific Plan Area through a range of strategies including increased pedestrian activity; more “eyes on the street;” enhanced and more coordinated policing; better lighting pathways; activation of vacant spaces; and an increased sense of ownership and stewardship by residents, workers, and visitors.
5. **Compatibility with Adjacent Neighborhoods.** Ensure compatibility with the residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Specific Plan Area – including those in unincorporated Alameda County as well as the City of San Leandro – and encourage sensitive design transitions, public amenities, and uses and services that benefit surrounding neighborhoods.

6. **Diversity of Uses.** Support a diverse, sustainable mix of uses including retail, housing, workplaces, and community spaces. Encourage a variety of essential goods and services such as grocery stores, pharmacies, banks, social services, restaurants, and other businesses.
7. **Diverse and Affordable Housing.** Support both market rate and affordable housing, and seek to protect existing residents from involuntary displacement.
8. **Range of Educational Opportunities.** Provide a range of services to provide opportunities for higher education, business incubation, and vocational and employment training programs for all age groups.
9. **Community Facilities.** Provide community facilities necessary to support the level and type of additional growth including schools, community and senior centers, child care centers, and public safety facilities.
10. **Efficient and Shared Parking.** Implement parking management solutions that most efficiently use parking resources, including sharing of public and private parking spaces between different uses and sharing between different use types such as residential, office, and commercial.
11. **BART and Bus Station Improvement.** Support and improve the Bay Fair BART and bus stations as integral amenities for the surrounding neighborhoods, the City, the County, and the region.
12. **Zoning Aligned with Community Vision.** Ensure future zoning is aligned with the community vision, while allowing flexibility to adjust to changing trends and land ownership.
13. **Local and Regional Destination.** Provide excellent public space, outdoor dining, and dynamic retail experiences to create central gathering places that serve local and regional populations.
14. **Infrastructure.** Improve and maintain basic infrastructure such as stormwater management facilities, flood control, and water, sewer, and gas service.
15. **Environmental Sustainability.** Create a sustainable urban environment that incorporates green building features, green infrastructure and ecology, sustainable energy systems, water efficiency and conservation, and sustainable transportation systems.

Alternatives

As required by Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, this section of the EIR examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Specific Plan. The following alternatives are evaluated in this EIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project/ 2035 General Plan Buildout
- Alternative 2: Residential Focus Alternative
- Alternative 3: Office Focus Alternative

The Office Focus Alternative (Alternative 3) would be considered the environmentally superior alternative, as it would reduce impacts related to traffic and utilities, due primarily to the reduction in housing units. However, this alternative would not eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact at the intersection of Hesperian Boulevard and Thornally Drive. No mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact in the available right-of-way without removal of bike lanes. Therefore, the impact to this intersection would remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative 3. In addition, the impact at Hesperian Boulevard south of East 14th Street would remain significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed Specific Plan. Because of the significant traffic impacts, the significant impacts related to transit operations would also remain under this

Alternative 3. This alternative would generally meet most of the project objectives, but would meet Objective 6 (to provide a diversity of uses) to a lesser degree than the proposed project.

Refer to Section 6, *Alternatives*, for the complete alternatives analysis.

Areas of Known Controversy

The City identified the following major areas of known controversy for the proposed Specific Plan through the EIR scoping process: traffic congestion, crime, noise, and parking. Responses to the Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR and input received at the EIR scoping meeting held by the City are summarized in Section 1, *Introduction*.

Issues to be Resolved

Issues to be resolved include the City's decision makers' choice among the alternatives, and whether or how to mitigate the identified significant effects.

Issues Not Studied in Detail in the EIR

As detailed in Section 4.15, *Effects Found Not to Be Significant*, there is no substantial evidence that significant impacts would occur related to Agricultural Resources and Mineral Resources. Section 4.15 also addresses other issue areas that are less than significant and not studied in detail in this EIR.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table 1 summarizes the environmental impacts of the proposed Specific Plan, proposed mitigation measures, and residual impacts (the impact after application of mitigation, if required). Impacts are categorized as follows:

- **Significant and Unavoidable.** An impact that cannot be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued if the project is approved per *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15093.
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** An impact that can be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires findings under *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091.
- **Less than Significant.** An impact that may be adverse, but does not exceed the threshold levels and does not require mitigation measures.
- **No Impact.** A finding of no impact is made when the analysis concludes that the proposed project would not affect the particular environmental resource or issue.

Table 1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
Aesthetics		
<p>Impact AES-1. The proposed Specific Plan would facilitate increases in the intensity, scale and visibility of development in the Specific Plan Area, and would include changes to circulation patterns and block sizes. However, plan implementation would not significantly block or otherwise adversely affect scenic vistas. Therefore, impacts related to scenic vistas would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>Impact AES-2. The proposed Specific Plan would facilitate changes to the visual character of the Specific Plan Area relative to existing conditions, including potentially substantial increases in building height and massing and overall development intensity. However, the proposed policies, planning framework, and development standards and guidelines for future development in the specific plan would improve the visual quality of the environment, and the proposed design review criteria for new development would help ensure visual compatibility with existing development in the Specific Plan Area. Impacts to visual character would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>Impact AES-3. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in new sources of light and glare in and around the project a Specific Plan Area. However, these new sources would not substantially increase the amount of light and glare in the already urbanized Specific Plan Area, and would be regulated by the City’s adopted 2035 General Plan, and Municipal Code requirements, and specific plan provisions. This would be a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
Air Quality		
<p>Impact AQ-1. Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would result in the temporary generation of air pollutants during construction, which would affect local air quality. Compliance with the BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures would require future projects within the Specific Plan Area to implement measures to reduce construction emissions. Impacts would be significant but mitigable.</p>	<p>MM AQ-2B-1 Construction Emissions As part of the City’s development approval process, the City shall require applicants for future development projects to comply with the current Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s basic control measures for reducing construction emissions of PM₁₀ (Table 8-2, Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for All Proposed Projects, of the May 2017 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines).</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Impact AQ-2. The proposed Specific Plan would be consistent with BAAQMD’s 2017 Clean Air Plan. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
<p>Impact AQ-3. The proposed Specific Plan would not create objectionable odors that would affect neighboring properties. Impacts related to odors would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>Biological Resources</p>		
<p>Impact BIO-1. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may result in impacts to special status plant and animal species. Impacts would be significant but mitigable.</p>	<p>MM BIO-1(A) Biological Resources Screening and Assessment For projects within the Specific Plan Area that may affect sensitive biological resources, the project proponent shall hire a City-approved biologist to perform a preliminary biological resource screening as part of the environmental review process to determine whether the project has any potential to impact biological resources. If it is determined that the project has no potential to impact biological resources, no further action is required. If the project would have the potential to impact biological resources, prior to construction, a City-approved biologist shall conduct a biological resources assessment (BRA) or similar type of study to document the existing biological resources within the project footprint plus a minimum buffer of 150 feet around the project footprint, as is feasible, and to determine the potential impacts to those resources. The BRA shall evaluate the potential for impacts to all biological resources including, but not limited to special status species, nesting birds, wildlife movement, sensitive plant communities, critical habitats, and other resources judged to be sensitive by local, state, and/or federal agencies. Pending the results of the BRA, design alterations, further technical studies (e.g., protocol surveys) and consultations with the USFWS, NMFS, CDFW, and/or other local, state, and federal agencies may be required. The following mitigation measures [B-1(b) through B-1(k)] shall be incorporated, only as applicable, into the BRA for projects where specific resources are present or may be present and significantly impacted by the project. Note that specific surveys described in the mitigation measures below may be completed as part of the BRA where suitable habitat is present.</p> <p>MM BIO-1(B) Special Status Plant Species Surveys If completion of the project-specific BRA determines that special status plant species may occur on-site, surveys for special status plants shall be completed prior to any vegetation removal, grubbing, or other construction activity (including staging and mobilization). The surveys shall be floristic in nature and shall be seasonally timed to coincide with the target species identified in the project-specific BRA. All plant surveys shall be conducted by a City-approved biologist no more than two years between one year and six months before initial ground disturbance. All special status plant species identified on site shall be mapped onto a site-specific aerial photograph or topographic map with the use of Global Positioning System (GPS) unit. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the most current protocols established by the CDFW, USFWS, and the local jurisdictions if said protocols exist. A report of the</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	<p>survey results shall be submitted to the implementing agency, and the CDFW and/or USFWS, as appropriate, for review and/or approval.</p> <p>MM BIO-1(C) Special Status Plant Species Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation If federally and/or state listed or CRPR List 1B or 2 species are found during special status plant surveys [pursuant to mitigation measure B-1(b)], then the project shall be re-designed to avoid impacting these plant species, where feasible. Rare plant occurrences that are not within the immediate disturbance footprint, but are located within 50 feet of disturbance limits shall have bright orange protective fencing installed at least 30 feet beyond their extent, or other distance as approved by a City-approved biologist, to protect them from harm.</p> <p>MM BIO-1(D) Restoration and Monitoring If special status plants species cannot be avoided and will be impacted by development under the Specific Plan, all impacts shall be mitigated by the project applicant at a minimum ratio of 2:1 to be determined by the City in coordination with CDFW and USFWS (as applicable) (number of acres/individuals restored to number of acres/individuals impacted) for each species as a component of habitat restoration. A restoration plan shall be prepared by the project applicant and submitted to the City for review and approval. (Note: if a federally and/or state listed plant species will be impacted, the restoration plan shall be submitted to the USFWS and/or CDFW for review). The restoration plan shall include, at a minimum, the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description of the project/impact site (i.e., location, responsible parties, areas to be impacted by habitat type). ▪ Goal(s) of the compensatory mitigation project [type(s) and area(s) of habitat to be established, restored, enhanced, and/or preserved; specific functions and values of habitat type(s) to be established, restored, enhanced, and/or preserved]. ▪ Description of the proposed compensatory mitigation site (location and size, ownership status, existing functions and values). ▪ Implementation plan for the compensatory mitigation site (rationale for expecting implementation success, responsible parties, schedule, site preparation, planting plan). ▪ Maintenance activities during the monitoring period, including weed removal as appropriate (activities, responsible parties, schedule). ▪ Monitoring plan for the compensatory mitigation site, including no less than quarterly monitoring for the first year (performance standards, target functions and values, target acreages to be established, restored, enhanced, and/or preserved, annual monitoring reports). 	

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Success criteria based on the goals and measurable objectives; said criteria to be, at a minimum, at least 80 percent survival of container plants and 30 percent relative cover by vegetation type. ▪ An adaptive management program and remedial measures to address any shortcomings in meeting success criteria. ▪ Notification of completion of compensatory mitigation and agency confirmation. ▪ Contingency measures (initiating procedures, alternative locations for contingency compensatory mitigation, funding mechanism). <p>MM BIO-1(E) Endangered/Threatened Species Habitat Assessments and Protocol Surveys</p> <p>Specific habitat assessments and survey protocols are established for several federally and state endangered or threatened species. If the results of the BRA determine that suitable habitat may be present for any such species, protocol habitat assessments/surveys shall be completed in accordance with CDFW and/or USFWS protocols prior to issuance of any construction permits. If through consultation with the CDFW and/or USFWS it is determined that protocol habitat assessments/surveys are not required, said consultation shall be documented prior to issuance of any construction permits. Each protocol has different survey and timing requirements. The applicants for each project shall be responsible for ensuring they understand the protocol requirements and shall hire a City-approved biologist to conduct protocol surveys.</p> <p>MM BIO-1(F) Endangered/Threatened Species Avoidance and Minimization</p> <p>The habitat requirements of endangered and threatened species are highly variable. The potential impacts from any given project implemented under the Specific Plan are likewise highly variable. However, there are several avoidance and minimization measures that can be applied for a variety of species to reduce the potential for impact, with the final goal of no net loss of the species. The following measures may be applied to aquatic and/or terrestrial species. The City shall select from these measures as appropriate and the project applicant shall be responsible for implementing selected measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ground disturbance shall be limited to the minimum necessary to complete the project. The project limits of disturbance shall be flagged. Areas of special biological concern within or adjacent to the limits of disturbance shall have highly visible orange construction fencing installed between said area and the limits of disturbance. ▪ All projects occurring within/adjacent to aquatic habitats (including riparian habitats and wetlands) shall be completed between April 1 and October 31, if feasible, to avoid impacts to sensitive aquatic species. 	

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All projects occurring within or adjacent to sensitive habitats that may support federally and/or state listed endangered/threatened species shall have a CDFW- and/or USFWS-approved biologist present during all initial ground disturbing/vegetation clearing activities. Once initial ground disturbing/vegetation clearing activities have been completed, said biologist shall conduct daily pre-activity clearance surveys for endangered/threatened species. Alternatively, and upon approval of the CDFW and/or USFWS, said biologist may conduct site inspections at a minimum of once per week to ensure all prescribed avoidance and minimization measures are fully implemented. ▪ No endangered/threatened species shall be captured and relocated without express permission from the CDFW and/or USFWS. ▪ If at any time during construction of the project an endangered/threatened species enters the construction site or otherwise may be impacted by the project, all project activities shall cease. A CDFW/USFWS-approved biologist shall document the occurrence and consult with the CDFW and USFWS, as appropriate, to determine whether it was safe for project activities to resume. ▪ For all projects occurring in areas where endangered/ threatened species may be present and are at risk of entering the project site during construction, exclusion fencing shall be placed along the project boundaries prior to start of construction (including staging and mobilization). The placement of the fence shall be at the discretion of the CDFW/USFWS-approved biologist. This fence shall consist of solid silt fencing placed at a minimum of 3 feet above grade and 2 feet below grade and shall be attached to wooden stakes placed at intervals of not more than 5 feet. The fence shall be inspected weekly and following rain events and high wind events and shall be maintained in good working condition until all construction activities are complete. ▪ All vehicle maintenance/fueling/staging shall occur not less than 100 feet from any riparian habitat or water body . Suitable containment procedures shall be implemented to prevent spills. A minimum of one spill kit shall be available at each work location near riparian habitat or water bodies. ▪ No equipment shall be permitted to enter wetted portions of any affected drainage channel. ▪ All equipment operating within streams shall be in good conditions and free of leaks. Spill containment shall be installed under all equipment staged within stream areas and extra spill containment and clean up materials shall be located in close proximity for easy access . ▪ If project activities could degrade water quality, water quality sampling shall be implemented to identify the pre-project baseline, and to monitor during construction for comparison to the baseline. 	

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If water is to be diverted around work sites, a diversion plan shall be submitted (depending upon the species that may be present) to the CDFW, RWQCB, USFWS, and/or NMFS for their review and approval prior to the start of any construction activities (including staging and mobilization). If pumps are used, all intakes shall be completely screened with wire mesh not larger than five millimeters to prevent animals from entering the pump system. ▪ At the end of each workday, excavations shall be secured with cover or a ramp provided to prevent wildlife entrapment. ▪ All trenches, pipes, culverts or similar structures shall be inspected for animals prior to burying, capping, moving, or filling. ▪ The CDFW/USFWS-approved biologist shall remove invasive aquatic species such as bullfrogs and crayfish from suitable aquatic habitat whenever observed and shall dispatch them in a humane manner and dispose of properly. ▪ Considering the potential for projects to impact federal and state listed species and their habitat, the City shall contact the CDFW and USFWS to identify mitigation banks within Alameda County during development of the proposed Specific Plan. Upon implementation of development projects included in the proposed Specific Plan, but on a project-by-project basis, if the results of the BRA determines that impacts to federal and state threatened or endangered species habitat are expected, the applicant shall explore species-appropriate mitigation bank(s) servicing the region for purchase of mitigation credits. <p>MM BIO-1(G) Non-listed Special Status Animal Species Avoidance and Minimization</p> <p>Several State Species of Special Concern may be impacted by development facilitated by the Specific Plan. The ecological requirements and potential for impacts is highly variable among these species. Depending on the species identified in the BRA, several of the measures identified under B-1(f) shall be applicable to the project. In addition, the City shall select measures from among the following to be implemented by the project applicant to reduce the potential for impacts to non-listed special status animal species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For non-listed special status terrestrial amphibians and reptiles, coverboard surveys shall be completed within three months of the start of construction. The coverboards shall be at least four feet by four feet and constructed of untreated plywood placed flat on the ground. The coverboards shall be checked by a City-approved biologist once per week for each week after placement up until the start of vegetation removal. All non-listed special status and common animals found under the coverboards shall be captured and placed in five-gallon buckets for transportation to relocation sites. All relocation sites shall be reviewed by the City-approved biologist and shall consist of suitable habitat. Relocation sites shall be as close to the capture site as possible but far enough away to ensure the 	

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	<p>animal(s) is not harmed by construction of the project. Relocation shall occur on the same day as capture. CNDDDB Field Survey Forms shall be submitted to the CDFW for all special status animal species observed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-construction clearance surveys shall be conducted within 14 days of the start of construction (including staging and mobilization). The surveys shall cover the entire disturbance footprint plus a minimum 200-foot buffer, if feasible, and shall identify all special status animal species that may occur on-site. All non-listed special status species shall be relocated from the site either through direct capture or through passive exclusion (e.g., burrowing owl). A report of the pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the City for their review and approval prior to the start of construction. ▪ A City-approved biologist shall be present during all initial ground disturbing activities, including vegetation removal to recover special status animal species unearthed by construction activities. ▪ Upon completion of the project, a City-approved biologist shall prepare a Final Compliance Report documenting all compliance activities implemented for the project, including the pre-construction survey results. The report shall be submitted to the City within 30 days of completion of the project. ▪ If special status bat species may be present and impacted by the project, a City-approved biologist shall conduct, within 30 days of the start of construction, presence/absence surveys for special status bats in consultation with the CDFW where suitable roosting habitat is present. Surveys shall be conducted using acoustic detectors and by searching tree cavities, crevices, and other areas where bats may roost. If active roosts are located, exclusion devices such as netting shall be installed to discourage bats from occupying the site. If a roost is determined by a City-approved biologist to be used by a large number of bats (large hibernaculum), bat boxes shall be installed near the project site. The number of bat boxes installed will depend on the size of the hibernaculum and shall be determined through consultations with the CDFW. If a maternity colony has become established, all construction activities shall be postponed within a 500-foot buffer around the maternity colony until it is determined by a City-approved biologist that the young have dispersed. Once it has been determined that the roost is clear of bats, the roost shall be removed immediately. <p>For projects that may result in removal of trees or vegetation that may contain a nesting bird, if feasible, construction activities should occur generally between September 16 to January 31 (thus outside of the nesting season). However, if construction activities must occur during the nesting season (generally February 1 to September 15), surveys for nesting birds covered by the California Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act shall be conducted by a City-approved biologist no more than 14 days prior to vegetation removal. The surveys shall include</p>	

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	<p>the entire segment disturbance area plus a 200-foot buffer around the site. If active nests are located, all construction work shall be conducted outside a buffer zone from the nest to be determined by the City-approved biologist. The buffer shall be a minimum of 50 feet for non-raptor bird species and at least 150 feet for raptor species. Larger buffers may be required depending upon the status of the nest and the construction activities occurring in the vicinity of the nest. The buffer area(s) shall be closed to all construction personnel and equipment until the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site. A City-approved biologist shall confirm that breeding/nesting is completed and young have fledged the nest prior to removal of the buffer. A report of these preconstruction nesting bird surveys shall be submitted by the project applicant to the City to document compliance within 30 days of its completion.</p> <p>MM BIO-1(I) Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP)</p> <p>If potential impacts to special status species are identified by the BRA, prior to initiation of construction activities (including staging and mobilization), all personnel associated with project construction shall attend WEAP training, conducted by a City-approved biologist, to aid workers in recognizing special status resources that may occur in the Specific Plan Area. The specifics of this program shall include identification of the sensitive species and habitats, a description of the regulatory status and general ecological characteristics of sensitive resources, and review of the limits of construction and mitigation measures required to reduce impacts to biological resources within the work area. A fact sheet conveying this information shall also be prepared for distribution to all contractors, their employers, and other personnel involved with construction of the project. All employees shall sign a form documenting provided by the trainer indicating they have attended the WEAP and understand the information presented to them. The form shall be submitted to the City to document compliance.</p> <p>MM BIO-1(J) Invasive Weed Prevention and Management Program</p> <p>Prior to start of construction for projects occurring within or adjacent to sensitive habitats, as determined by the BRA, an Invasive Weed Prevention and Management Program shall be developed by a City-approved biologist to prevent invasion of native habitat by non-native plant species. A list of target species shall be included, along with measures for early detection and eradication. All disturbed areas shall be hydroseeded with a mix of locally native species upon completion of work in those areas. In areas where construction is ongoing, hydroseeding shall occur where no construction activities have occurred within six (6) weeks since ground disturbing activities ceased. If exotic species invade these areas prior to hydroseeding, weed removal shall occur in consultation with a City-approved biologist and in accordance with the restoration plan. Landscape species shall not include noxious, invasive,</p>	

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	and/or non-native plant species that are recognized on the Federal Noxious Weed List, California Noxious Weeds List, and/or California Invasive Plant Council Lists 1, 2, and 4.	
<p>Impact BIO-2. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive habitats. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
<p>Impact BIO-3. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may result in impacts to federally protected wetlands. This impact would be significant but mitigable.</p>	<p>MM BIO-2 Jurisdictional Delineation If potentially jurisdictional wetlands are identified by the BRA, a City-approved biologist shall complete a jurisdictional delineation. The jurisdictional delineation shall determine the extent of the jurisdiction for CDFW, USACE, and/or RWQCB, and shall be conducted in accordance with the requirement set forth by each agency. The result shall be a preliminary jurisdictional delineation report that shall be submitted to the implementing agency, USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW, as appropriate, for review and approval. If jurisdictional areas are expected to be impacted, then the RWQCB would require a Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permit and/or Section 401 Water Quality Certification (depending upon whether or not the feature falls under federal jurisdiction). If CDFW asserts its jurisdictional authority, then a Streambed Alteration Agreement pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code would also be required prior to construction within the areas of CDFW jurisdiction. If the USACE asserts its authority, then a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would likely be required. Furthermore, a compensatory mitigation program shall be implemented in accordance with Mitigation Measure BIO-1(D) and the measures set forth by the aforementioned regulatory agencies during the permitting process.</p>	Less than significant.
<p>Impact BIO-4. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may impact the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. This impact would be significant but mitigable.</p>	<p>MM BIO-3 Native Amphibian Protection If construction within Estudillo Canal is planned in wetted areas a pre-construction survey shall be conducted for native amphibians. This survey shall be conducted by a City-approved biologist and shall document the species and life stages of amphibians found during the survey. If a significant number of non-listed species are found, they will be relocated outside of the work area prior to the start of construction. Wildlife exclusion fencing may be installed under the direction of the approved biologist to prevent wildlife from entering the work area during construction. If listed species are detected, measures BIO-1(f) and BIO-1(l) shall also be implemented.</p>	Less than significant.
<p>Impact BIO-5. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
<p>Impact BIO-6. Implementation of the proposed specific plan would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>Cultural, Tribal Cultural, and Paleontological Resources</p>		
<p>Impact CR-1. The Specific Plan Area is not known to contain buildings that are eligible for listing or listed as a historical resource. Nonetheless, development facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan has the potential to impact unknown historical resources and archaeological resources. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.</p>	<p>MM CR-1 Historical Built-Environment</p> <p>At the time of application for discretionary land use permits or subdivisions that involve the demolition or alterations of buildings or structures greater than 50 years old, the project applicant shall retain a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards to document and evaluate the historical significance of the affected buildings or structures. If such documentation and evaluation indicates that the building or structure qualifies as a significant historical resource, the resource shall be avoided and preserved in place if feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, further documentation or action to reduce impacts on historical resources shall be provided, including but not limited to archival quality photographs, measured drawings, oral histories, interpretive signage, and/or other measures including, potentially, alteration of the resource in accordance with Secretary of the Interior’s standards or relocation of the resource.</p> <p>Historical documentation shall be submitted for review and discretionary approval by the City prior to issuance of any permits for demolition or alteration of structures greater than 50 years old.</p> <p>The City shall site inspect during grading and prior to occupancy clearance to ensure compliance with measures recommended through the historical documentation.</p> <p>MM CR-2 Archaeological Resources</p> <p>At the time of application for discretionary land use permits or subdivisions that will involve grading, trenching, or other ground disturbance, the project applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior (SOI) standards in archaeology to complete a Phase 1 archaeological inventory of the project site. A Phase 1 archaeological inventory shall include an archaeological pedestrian survey of the project site and sufficient background archival research and field sampling to determine whether subsurface prehistoric or historic remains may be present. Archival research should include a records search conducted at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) and a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search conducted with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).</p> <p>Prehistoric or historic archaeological remains so identified shall be avoided and preserved in place if where feasible. Where preservation is not feasible, the significance of each resource shall be evaluated for significance and eligibility to the</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	<p>CRHR. Phase 2 evaluation shall include any necessary archival research to identify significant historical associations as well as mapping of surface artifacts, collection of functionally or temporally diagnostic tools and debris, and excavation of a sample of the cultural deposit to characterize the nature of the sites, define the artifact and feature contents, determine horizontal boundaries and depth below surface, and retrieve representative samples of artifacts and other remains.</p> <p>Excavation at Native American sites shall be monitored by a geographically affiliated tribal representative. as agreed upon in any formal consultation proceedings with the geographically affiliated tribe or as indicated by the NAHC. Cultural materials collected from the sites shall be processed and analyzed in the laboratory according to standard archaeological procedures. The age of the remains shall be determined using radiocarbon dating and other appropriate procedures; lithic artifacts, faunal remains, and other cultural materials shall be identified and analyzed according to current professional standards. The significance of the sites shall be evaluated according to the criteria of the CRHR. The results of the investigations shall be presented in a technical report following the standards of the California Office of Historic Preservation publication “Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Content and Format (1990 or latest edition)” (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/armr.pdf). Upon completion of the work, all artifacts, other cultural remains, records, photographs, and other documentation shall be curated an appropriate curation facility. All fieldwork, analysis, report production, and curation shall be fully funded by the applicant.</p> <p>If the resources meet CRHR significance standards, the City shall ensure that all feasible recommendations for mitigation of archaeological impacts are incorporated into the final design and permits issued for development. Necessary data recovery excavation shall be carried out by a qualified archaeologist meeting the SOI standards for archaeology according to a research design reviewed and approved by the City prepared in advance of fieldwork and using appropriate archaeological field and laboratory methods consistent with the California Office of Historic Preservation Planning Bulletin 5 (1991), Guidelines for Archaeological Research Design, or the latest edition thereof.</p> <p>As applicable, the final Phase 1 Inventory, Phase 2 Testing and Evaluation, or Phase 3 Data Recovery reports shall be submitted to the City prior to issuance of construction permit. Recommendations contained therein shall be implemented throughout all ground disturbance activities.</p>	
<p>Impact CR-2. Ground-disturbing activities associated with development facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan could result in damage to or destruction of paleontological resources. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.</p>	<p>MM CR-3 Paleontological Resources Assessment</p> <p>For projects in the Specific Plan Area that would involve ground disturbance below five feet in undisturbed sediments, the City shall require a paleontological assessment, and avoidance and/or mitigation for potential impacts to paleontological resources. Specific requirements include:</p>	

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	<p>a. Retain a Qualified Paleontologist. Prior to initial ground disturbance, the applicant shall retain a project paleontologist, defined as a paleontologist who meets the SVP standards for Qualified Professional Paleontologist, to direct all mitigation measures related to paleontological resources. A qualified paleontologist (Principal Paleontologist) is defined by the SVP standards as an individual with an M.S. or Ph.D. in paleontology or geology who is experienced with paleontological procedures and techniques, who is knowledgeable in the geology of California, preferably northern California, and who has worked as a paleontological mitigation project supervisor for a least one year (SVP 2010).</p> <p>b. Paleontological Resources Assessment. Prior to any construction activity, a Qualified Professional Paleontologist should prepare a Paleontological Resources Assessment to identify the geologic units that may be impacted by project development, determine the paleontological sensitivity of geologic units within the project site using the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (SVP 2010), assess potential for impacts to paleontological resources from development of the proposed project, and recommend mitigation measures to avoid or mitigate impacts to scientifically significant paleontological resources. The Paleontological Resources Assessment may also require a field survey, but this will need to be determined on a project-by-project basis. If the project paleontologist determines that sediments within a project site are sensitive for potentially significant paleontological resources, the following steps (CR-2c to g) should be taken prior to, during, and after construction activities.</p> <p>c. Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program. Prior to construction activity a qualified paleontologist should prepare a Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program to be implemented during ground disturbance activity for the proposed project. This program should outline the procedures for construction staff Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training, paleontological monitoring extent and duration, salvage and preparation of fossils, the final mitigation and monitoring report, and paleontological staff qualifications.</p> <p>d. Paleontological Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). Prior to the start of construction, the project paleontologist or his or her designee, shall conduct training for construction personnel regarding the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff. The WEAP shall be fulfilled at the time of a preconstruction meeting at which a qualified paleontologist shall attend. In the event of a fossil discovery by construction personnel, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find before restarting work in the area. If it is determined that the fossil(s) is(are) scientifically significant, the qualified paleontologist shall complete the following conditions to mitigate impacts to significant fossil</p>	

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	<p>resources.</p> <p>e. Paleontological Resource Construction Monitoring. Ground disturbing construction activities (including grading, trenching, foundation work and other excavations) in undisturbed sediments, below five feet, with high paleontological sensitivity should be monitored on a full-time basis by a qualified paleontological monitor during initial ground disturbance. The Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program shall be supervised by the project paleontologist. Monitoring should be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor, who is defined as an individual who has experience with collection and salvage of paleontological resources. The duration and timing of the monitoring will be determined by the project paleontologist. If the project paleontologist determines that full-time monitoring is no longer warranted, he or she may recommend that monitoring be reduced to periodic spot-checking or cease entirely. Monitoring would be reinstated if any new or unforeseen deeper ground disturbances are required and reduction or suspension would need to be reconsidered by the Supervising Paleontologist. Ground disturbing activity that does not occur in undisturbed sediments with high paleontological sensitivity would not require paleontological monitoring.</p> <p>f. Fossil Salvage. If fossils are discovered, the project paleontologist or paleontological monitor should recover them. Typically fossils can be safely salvaged quickly by a single paleontologist and not disrupt construction activity. In some cases larger fossils (such as complete skeletons or large mammal fossils) require more extensive excavation and longer salvage periods. In this case the paleontologist should have the authority to temporarily direct, divert or halt construction activity to ensure that the fossil(s) can be removed in a safe and timely manner.</p> <p>Once salvaged, significant fossils should be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready condition and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection (such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology), along with all pertinent field notes, photos, data, and maps. Fossils of undetermined significance at the time of collection may also warrant curation at the discretion of the project paleontologist.</p> <p>g. Final Paleontological Mitigation Report. Upon completion of ground disturbing activity (and curation of fossils if necessary) the qualified paleontologist should prepare a final mitigation and monitoring report outlining the results of the mitigation and monitoring program. The report should include discussion of the location, duration and methods of the monitoring, stratigraphic sections, any recovered fossils, and the scientific significance of those fossils, and where fossils were curated.</p>	

City of San Leandro
 Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
<p>Impact CR-3. Ground-disturbing activities associated with development under the proposed Specific Plan could result in damage to or destruction of human burials. However, adherence to existing regulations regarding the discovery of human remains would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>Impact CR-4. Construction associated with individual projects that would as a result from pursuant to implementation of the proposed Specific Plan could involve ground-disturbing activities such as grading and surface excavation, which have the potential to unearth or adversely impact previously unidentified tribal cultural resources. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</p>	<p>MM-CR-4 Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources In the event that potential tribal cultural resources are identified during the implementation of the requirements under Mitigation Measure CR-2, the qualified expert performing the cultural resources study, along with the project applicant and the City, will contact California Native American tribe(s) that have expressed interest and begin or continue consultation procedures with that tribe(s). If, as a result of the consultation, the City determines that the resource is a tribal cultural resource and the proposed project will have a potentially significant impact, additional mitigation measures as discussed with the tribe to avoid or reduce impacts to the resource shall be required and implemented where feasible.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Geology and Soils</p>		
<p>Impact GEO-1. The Specific Plan Area is near the Hayward Fault Zone. Therefore, the Specific Plan Area is subject to seismically-induced ground shaking and other seismic hazards, including liquefaction, which could damage structures in the Specific Plan Area and result in loss of property and risk to human health and safety. However, incorporation of state-mandated building standards and compliance with 2035 General Plan policies would ensure impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>Impact GEO-2. With adherence to applicable laws and regulations, the proposed specific plan would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>Impact GEO-3. The Specific Plan Area is located on expansive soils. Proper soils engineering practices would be required to ensure that soil conditions would not result in significant adverse impacts. With required implementation of standard engineering practices, impacts associated with unstable or expansive soils would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>Impact GEO-4. The proposed Specific Plan would not include septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
Impact GHG-1. Specific Plan operational emissions from buildout in the year 2035 would not exceed the efficiency threshold of 2.32 MT CO ₂ e per person per year. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would not generate GHG emissions that would directly or indirectly have a significant impact on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact GHG-2. The proposed Specific Plan would be generally consistent with San Leandro's Climate Action Plan and Plan Bay Area 2040. Therefore, the Specific Plan's impact related to consistency with plans to address climate change would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Impact HAZ-1. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would include development of residential or commercial land uses that could involve the use, storage, disposal or transportation of hazardous materials. In addition, upset or accident conditions within the Specific Plan Area could involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, required adherence to existing regulations, programs, and 2035 General Plan policies would ensure that this is a less than significant impact.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact HAZ-2. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not involve facilities that would produce or emit hazardous materials near schools. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
Impact HAZ-3. There are no properties within or around the Specific Plan Area with localized contamination or concentrations of hazardous substances that would affect development in the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, workers or residents in the Specific Plan Area would not be exposed to hazards resulting from development of a hazardous materials site and impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1. Future development under the Specific Plan would involve intensification of existing development in the Specific Plan Area that could affect water quality of surface waters, alter existing drainage patterns, or increase impervious surfaces. In addition, development under the Specific Plan would involve ground-disturbing activities and the use of heavy machinery that could release materials, including sediments and fuels, which could	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation

City of San Leandro
 Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
<p>adversely affect water quality. Operation of potential future development could also result in discharges of wastewater that could be contaminated and affect downstream waters. However, compliance with required permits and existing regulations, and implementation of best management practices contained therein, would ensure that potential water quality impacts would be less than significant.</p>		
<p>Impact HYD-2. Construction of future development under the Specific Plan would not 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. Further, implementation of required low impact development measures and on-site infiltration required under the C.3 provisions of the Alameda County Clean Water Program as well as Compliance with the General Plan goals and policies, the San Leandro Municipal Code, and the Specific Plan strategies, policies, guidelines, and standards could reduce impervious surfaces as compared to existing conditions and increase the potential for groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>IMPACT HYD-3. Construction of future development under the Specific Plan would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Specific Plan 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; or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site. Impacts related to drainage patterns would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>IMPACT HYD-4. Development that could be facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan would place housing and other structures within FEMA-designated flood hazard areas. However, required compliance with City building standards and adopted City policies would reduce potential effects associated with flood events. Development under the proposed Specific Plan would not expose people or structures to other flood hazards such as tsunamis, seiches, or flooding as the result of dam or levee failure. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
Land Use and Planning		
<p>Impact LU-1. The proposed Specific Pan would implement and be consistent with the goals and policies of the 2035 General Plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
Noise		
<p>Impact N-1. New development facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan would be required to comply with the City’s land use compatibility guidelines for exposure to ambient noise and with the California Building Code’s standard of 45 dBA CNEL for interior noise in habitable rooms. The impact related to exposing people or generating noise levels in excess of standards would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation</p>
<p>Impact N-2. Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would intermittently generate high noise levels within and adjacent to the Specific Plan Area. However, buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would be restricted to the City’s allowed daytime hours and would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure NOI-4 in 2035 General Plan EIR to minimize construction noise. Therefore, the impact from construction noise would be significant but mitigable.</p>	<p>MM NOI-4 Construction Noise The City of San Leandro shall adopt the following measures as Standard Conditions of Approval or Construction Development Standards for new construction in the city. The Standard Conditions of Approval/ Construction Development Standards shall include an exception that states that the Engineering & Transportation Director or his/her designee may waive individual measures upon individual written request from an Applicant after City review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction activities shall be restricted to the daytime hours of between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, or between 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on Sunday and Saturday. ▪ Prior to the start of construction activities, the construction contractor shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Maintain and tune all proposed equipment in accordance with the manufacturer’s recommendations to minimize noise emission. □ Inspect all proposed equipment and fit all equipment with properly operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds that are no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer. □ Post a sign, clearly visible at the site, with a contact name and telephone number of the City of San Leandro’s authorized representative to respond in the event of a noise complaint. □ Place stationary construction equipment and material delivery in loading and unloading areas as far as practicable from the residences. □ Limit unnecessary engine idling to the extent feasible. □ Use smart back-up alarms, which automatically adjust the alarm level based on the background noise level, or switch off back-up alarms and replace with 	<p>Less than significant.</p>

City of San Leandro
 Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
	human spotters. <input type="checkbox"/> Use low-noise emission equipment. <input type="checkbox"/> Limit use of public address systems. <input type="checkbox"/> Minimize grade surface irregularities on construction sites.	
<p>Impact N-3. Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would intermittently generate groundborne vibration within and adjacent to the Specific Plan Area. However, anticipated vibration levels would not exceed federal transit administration thresholds for disturbance of human activity at sensitive land uses. New non-residential construction also would be subject to a standard condition of approval required by the 2035 General Plan to limit vibration within 50 feet of sensitive receptors. Therefore, the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact from groundborne vibration.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
<p>Impact N-4. Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would generate new vehicle trips in the Specific Plan Area. However, the Specific Plan’s proposed “road diet” on Hesperian Boulevard would reduce its roadway capacity, thereby reducing traffic noise. Although cumulative growth would substantially increase traffic volumes and associated traffic noise on arterial roadways in the Specific Plan Area, the Specific Plan would not considerably contribute to this effect. Therefore, the Specific Pan would have a less than significant impact related to traffic noise.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
<p>Impact N-5. Operational activities associated with buildout of the Specific Plan would generate noise that may periodically be audible to noise-sensitive receptors near the Specific Plan Area. Noise sources would include stationary equipment, such as rooftop ventilation and heating systems, and delivery and trash hauling trucks. However, operational noise would not exceed ambient noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive receptors. Therefore, operational noise impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
Population and Housing		
<p>Impact PH-1. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may lead to growth within the Specific Plan Area that could add up to 2,540 residential units and an estimated 7,239 residents and 725 jobs to the Specific Plan Area by 2035. However, the proposed Specific Plan would not cause substantial population growth in the City. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
<p>Impact PH-2. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the Specific Plan Area’s housing stock. Impacts resulting from temporary displacement would be reduced with adherence to proposed Specific Plan policies and existing City programs. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
Public Services, Schools, and Recreation		
<p>Impact PS-1. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would introduce development intensity and population growth in the Specific Plan Area, generating additional need for Alameda County Fire Department protection services. However, compliance with the City’s 2035 General Plan policies and actions would ensure impacts to fire protection services would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
<p>Impact PS-2. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would add new residential and non-residential uses to the Specific Plan Area, generating additional need for the San Leandro Police Department’s protection services. However, with adherence to the City’s 2035 General Plan policies, impacts to police protection services would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
<p>Impact PS-3. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would add an estimated 1,778 students to the Specific Plan Area. However, with payment of state-mandated school impact fees, impacts related to public school operating capacity would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
<p>Impact PS-4. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the service population of the South Branch Library by as much as 7,239 customers. However, because existing libraries have adequate capacity to serve population increases under the proposed Specific Plan, impacts to the San Leandro library system would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
<p>Impact PS-5. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would add an estimated 2,540 residential units and an estimated 7,239 residents to the Specific Plan Area, which would increase use of recreational facilities and contribute to their physical deterioration. Payment of in-lieu public park fees and the establishment of new open space areas within the Specific Plan Area would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
Transportation and Traffic		
<p>Impact T-1. Increases in traffic in the Specific Plan Area under cumulative (year 2035) conditions compared to growth anticipated under the existing 2035 General Plan would cause intersection operating conditions to exceed one or more significance thresholds at three signalized study area intersections. Mitigation would reduce impacts at the Hesperian Boulevard/Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive and East 14th Street/Fairmont Drive intersections. However, no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts at the Hesperian Boulevard/Thornally Drive intersection and the East 14th Street/Fairmont Drive intersection is within Caltrans control and the City cannot guarantee implementation of mitigation. Therefore, impacts at these intersections would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>MM T-1: Hesperian Boulevard/Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive The City of San Leandro shall implement a signal timing improvement project within the coordinated signal group for the intersection of Hesperian Boulevard and Halcyon Drive. The improvement shall occur when the proposed road diet on Hesperian Boulevard is implemented.</p> <p>MM T-2: East 14th Street/Fairmont Drive The City of San Leandro shall coordinate with Caltrans to implement a signal timing improvement project within the coordinated signal group for the intersection of East 14th Street and Fairmont Drive by funding actual cost. This mitigation measure is to occur when new projects within the Specific Plan Area generate a cumulative total of approximately 350 AM peak hour trips.</p>	<p>Hesperian Boulevard/Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive intersection: less than significant</p> <p>Hesperian Boulevard/Thornally Drive intersection: significant and unavoidable</p> <p>East 14th Street/Fairmont Drive intersection: significant and unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact T-2. Development facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan would increase traffic on CMP freeway and arterial segments under cumulative (year 2040) conditions. No significant impacts would occur at CMP freeway segments. However, with the proposed Specific Plan, four arterial segments would exceed one or more CMP thresholds. There are no feasible improvements that could be implemented within the available right-of-way of the significantly affected intersections that would reduce impacts. Therefore, impacts at these segments would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>None available.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact T-3. The proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit and would not degrade or decrease the performance of the BART system. However, because of the significant increase in vehicle delay at the intersection of Hesperian Boulevard and Thornally Drive as discussed under Impact T-1, buses would also experience significant operational delays approaching this intersection. Therefore, impacts to bus operation would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>None available.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
Utilities and Service Systems		
<p>Impact UTL-1. Development associated with buildout under the proposed Specific Plan would generate new sources of wastewater, which would flow through the existing Oro Loma Sanitary District (OLSD) conveyance system to the OLSD wastewater treatment plant. The wastewater treatment plant has adequate capacity to serve development associated with the Specific Plan. Local conveyance infrastructure would be upgraded as part of implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and would have capacity to serve new development in the Specific Plan Area. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
<p>Impact UTL-2. Development under the proposed Specific Plan would increase water demand. Existing and projected water supply would be adequate to serve the Specific Plan Area demands beyond 2035 (the horizon year of the Specific Plan) through the year 2040 and existing or planned water conveyance infrastructure is sufficient to deliver projected water supply requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation
<p>Impact UTL-3. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would generate an increase of approximately 1.1 tons of solid waste per day, or 20 cubic yards per day. However, because landfills that serve San Leandro have adequate capacity to serve development under the proposed Specific Plan, impacts related to solid waste facilities would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation

This page intentionally left blank