MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 25, 2018

TO: Elizabeth Dunn, Community Development Department, City of El Cerrito

FROM: Kyle Simpson, Associate/Project Manager
       Judith Malamut, AICP, Principal

SUBJECT: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Exemption Memo for the 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project, El Cerrito, California

This memorandum and attachments provide a description of the proposed 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project (project) and substantial evidence to confirm that the potential project is exempt from further environmental analysis per Section 15168(c) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The approximately 0.5-acre project site is located at 10135 San Pablo Avenue in the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County. The proposed project would involve demolition of an existing vacant surface parking lot on the site and construction of a new six-story mixed-use building with five floors for multi-family residential units above a commercial ground floor. The building would include 72 dwelling units; 4,413 square feet of retail space; 45 covered parking spaces; and ground level public open space.

Attachment A provides a description of the proposed project. This attachment includes a description of the project, location, existing site characteristics, the proposed project and required approvals and entitlements. The City of El Cerrito (City) is the CEQA lead agency for the project.

The responses in an environmental checklist (included in Attachment B to this memorandum) prepared for the project demonstrate for each CEQA topic that because the proposed project was evaluated and impacts were mitigated to the degree possible as part of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP) Project and Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), no additional CEQA review is required. CEQA Guidelines 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR. The responses contained in the checklist confirm that the project was considered within the scope of the evaluation within the SPASP FEIR and no new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required.

The City can approve the proposed project as being within the scope of the SPASP covered by its FEIR and no new environmental document for the purposes of CEQA clearance is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project is exempt from further review under CEQA. This analysis finds that a Notice of Exemption may be prepared for the project and filed with the Contra Costa County Clerk.
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ATTACHMENT A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
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1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following describes the proposed 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project (project), which is located within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP). This section includes a summary description of the project’s location and existing site characteristics, required approvals, and entitlements. The City of El Cerrito (City) is the lead agency for review of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

1.1 PROJECT SITE

The following section describes the location and characteristics of the project site and provides a brief overview of the existing land uses within and in the vicinity of the site.

1.1.1 Location

The approximately 0.5-acre (21,809-square-foot) project site is located at 10135 San Pablo Avenue in the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County. The site is bounded by San Pablo Avenue to the east, a quick-service food restaurant and Central Avenue to the south, single-family and multi-family homes and Carlson Boulevard to the west, and a recently re-opened quick-service food restaurant and Avila Street to the north.

Regional vehicular access to the project site is provided by San Pablo Avenue which is State Route 123. In addition, Interstate 80 (I-80) is located to the west of the site. The El Cerrito Plaza Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Station is located approximately 0.2 miles east of the site.

Figure 1-1 shows the site’s regional and local context. Figure 1-2 depicts an aerial photograph of the project site and surrounding land uses.

1.1.2 Site Characteristics and Current Site Conditions

The project site is generally level and consists of two parcels, Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) 510-034-001 and 510-034-002. The project site is currently developed with a surface parking lot that formerly served as an automobile sales lot. Vegetation within the project site includes ruderal vegetation and streetscape landscaping including trees and shrubs along San Pablo Avenue. Existing site conditions are depicted in Figure 1-3.

1.1.3 Existing General Plan and Zoning

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented High-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) in the City’s General Plan, and the zoning designation is also TOHIMU. The TOHIMU designation allows for mixed use development with a 65-foot height limit.
FIGURE 1-1
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1.1.4 San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

In 2014, the City of El Cerrito adopted the SPASP to provide a guide for the future of San Pablo Avenue, identify improvements, and adopt context-sensitive regulations that can be applied along its length and to adjacent areas. The SPASP creates a framework for transforming San Pablo Avenue into a multimodal corridor that functions as a place that can provide a multitude of opportunities for living, working and community life. SPASP key principles are to deepen a sense of place and community identity; attract private investment; strengthen partnerships; enhance the public realm; promote the everyday use of transit, walking, and biking; and foster environmental sustainability.

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP were evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Report (SPASP FEIR).\(^1\) The SPASP FEIR, certified in 2014, evaluates the environmental impacts of approximately:

- 1,706 units of residential development;
- 3,840 new residents; and
- 243,112 square feet of commercial floor area.

The SPASP includes form-based code that regulates development along the corridor, a plan for complete streets, and infrastructure analysis. The Complete Streets Plan addresses circulation and public investment needs along San Pablo Avenue and adjoining streets to attract new users to the area while proactively mitigating the impacts of future population growth on mobility in the SPASP area. The infrastructure analysis identifies the utility providers for San Pablo Avenue, provides a general review of capacity limitations, and recommends feasible improvements and associated costs to avoid significant impacts on the level of service.

1.1.5 Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within the San Pablo Avenue corridor that is predominantly developed with commercial, retail uses and multi-family residential uses. Between the project site and Carlson Boulevard to the west of the project site, are several single-family and multi-family residential units. A vacant portable office structure and a recently re-opened quick-service restaurant are located to the south between the project site and Central Avenue. A pedestrian pathway between San Pablo Avenue and Avila Street is located directly north of the project site. A vacant quick-service restaurant building is located north of the pedestrian pathway and it adjoins auto-oriented retail uses.

1.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

This section provides a description of the proposed project as identified in the materials provided by LZI International (the project applicant) dated May 17, 2018. The project applicant proposes to develop the site with a new six-story mixed-use building with five floors for multi-family residential units above a commercial ground floor. The building would include 72 dwelling units; 4,413 square feet of retail space; 45 covered parking spaces; and ground level public open space.

1.2.1 Building Program

The project would result in the construction of a six-story residential building with 72 market-rate apartment units and ground-level parking and street-facing commercial space. Figures 1-4 and 1-5 depict the overall conceptual site plan and first floor site plan for the proposed project. Figure 1-6 through Figure 1-10 show the proposed floor plans for the second through sixth floor, respectively. Figure 1-11 shows the proposed roof plan. Figures 1-12 and 1-13 show the conceptual elevations of the proposed building.

As shown in Figure 1-4, four retail stores are proposed to be constructed totaling 4,413 square feet. A separate ADA bathroom would be provided for each retail space, and one of the four retail spaces would be made ready for a restaurant operation with dedicated kitchen ventilation to the roof. In addition to the retail uses, a residential entrance lobby would be located on the ground floor which would be accessible from the north side of the proposed building, and a parking garage would be located behind the retail uses.

The residential entrance and residential lobby would be located at the northern end of the building on the ground floor. A mezzanine level would be accessible from the residential lobby and would include a leasing office. A total of 72 dwelling units are proposed with 42 two-bedroom/two-bathroom units, 26 one-bedroom/one-bathroom units, and 4 two-bedroom/one-bathroom units. Two elevators and two stairways would serve all residential units on levels two through six. The elevators and one stairway would be accessed from the residential lobby. The second stairway would be located at the southern end of the project site and would provide access from the parking garage. An exterior walkway would be located along the western edge of the project site on the second level, and would provide access from the south stairway to an access stairway at the north end of the project site. Common open space areas would be located on the second and sixth floors each including landscaping and sitting areas.

1.2.2 Open Space and Landscaping

The project would include 2,295 square feet of ground level public open space located at the northern end of the project site. The public open space would include tables, chairs, benches, public art and planters, and potted vegetation, as shown in Figure 1-14. The project would also include 2,054 square feet of common open space on the second floor (shown in Figure 1-15), and 991 square feet of common open space on the sixth floor (shown in Figure 1-15). The common open space would be accessible to residents and would include sitting areas and planters. In addition, private open space in the form of balconies and decks attached to residential units would total 4,219 square feet.

1.2.3 Access, Circulation, and Parking

A secured parking garage would be located on the ground floor behind the retail space. As shown in Figure 1-5, primary automobile access to the project site would occur through a proposed 18-foot two-way private driveway from San Pablo Avenue to the garage. The driveway would be restricted to right-in/right-out only, due to the existing landscaped median on San Pablo Avenue. A public walkway on the north side of the project would provide non-motorized access between Avila Street and San Pablo Avenue.
FIGURE 1-4
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The project would include 45 automobile parking spaces of various types including shared, stacked, and unbundled parking spaces. Of the 45 automobile parking spaces located in the garage, 40 parking spaces would be mechanical stacked parking spaces, and the remaining five surface-parking spaces would be provided with electrical vehicle charging stations. Two of the five surface parking spaces would be ADA-compliant.

For residential uses, eight short-term bicycle parking spaces and 114 long-term bicycle parking spaces would be provided, and located in the parking garage. For retail uses, two short-term bicycle spaces would be provided and located along San Pablo Avenue, and eight long-term bicycle spaces would be provided in the parking garage.

1.2.4 Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site is located in an urban area and is currently served by existing utilities, including: water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, electricity, and telecommunications infrastructure. Existing and proposed utility connections are discussed below.

1.2.4.1 Water

Water service in the City of El Cerrito is provided by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). The Pardee Reservoir (supplied by the Mokelumne River Basin system) is the main source of water for EBMUD. A 12-inch water line is located along San Pablo Avenue and would serve the project site through a connection.

1.2.4.2 Wastewater

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along San Pablo Avenue, including the proposed project site. Wastewater generated at the project site would be collected via an 8-inch collector main along Central Avenue that collects flows along San Pablo Avenue between El Dorado Street and Central Avenue. Per Section 7.3 of the SSD Ordinance Code, SSD requires payment of a sewer connection charge to the District.

1.2.4.3 Stormwater

The existing asphalt paving and impervious surfaces on the project site account for approximately 20,000 square feet of the 22,000-square-foot project site. The project would incorporate a variety of low impact development stormwater treatment facilities including bio-filtration plants for stormwater treatment and discharge and bay-friendly landscaping that would use a selection of native and drought-tolerant plants.

1.2.4.4 Electricity and Natural Gas

Electricity and natural gas services to the site are provided by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). An existing underground natural gas line runs under San Pablo Avenue, and would serve the project site via a new connection. In addition, an underground electric line is located on San Pablo Avenue and can serve the project.
1.3 APPROVALS/PERMITS

The following approvals and permits would be required for the project:

- City of El Cerrito, grading and building permit approval
- EBMUD water connection approval
- Stege Sanitary District, District-wide and SPASP-specific per fixture sewer connection charges
- PG&E electricity and gas connection approvals
- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Stormwater Control Plan
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), encroachment permit for service connections
ATTACHMENT B
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2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This checklist confirms that the proposed 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project (project) is within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Final EIR (SPASP FEIR)\(^1\) and will have no new significant environmental effects and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP FEIR and, as such, the City of El Cerrito (City) can approve the 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project as being within the scope of the SPASP covered by its EIR and no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project is exempt from further review under CEQA.

2.1 AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1 Discussion

As described in more detail in the project description (Attachment A – Project Description), the approximately 0.5-acre project site is currently developed with a surface parking lot that formerly served as an automobile sales lot. Vegetation on the site is limited to ruderal vegetation and streetscape landscaping including trees and shrubs along San Pablo Avenue. The proposed project would demolish and remove the existing surface pavements on the site and construct a six-story, mixed-use residential apartment building as well as associated open space and landscaping, circulation and parking, and infrastructure improvements. The new building would include five floors of multi-family residential units above a commercial ground floor and ground-floor parking garage and public open space.

As noted in the SPASP FEIR, implementation of the SPASP would enhance the visual and aesthetic character of the planning area by incorporating Form-Based Code (FBC) and Complete Streets design and development standards into new projects to support and maintain a strong sense of place and

visual identity on San Pablo Avenue. These design and development standards are included in Chapter 2, Form Based Code and Chapter 3, Complete Streets of the SPASP.

The primary potentially significant impact to scenic resources identified in the SPASP FEIR was the potential for implementation of the SPASP to obstruct scenic views of Mt. Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco skyline, East Bay Hills, and Albany Hill from public rights-of-way including roadways and sidewalks, BART station platforms, and areas of lower elevation hillside homes in El Cerrito and Richmond (Impact 4-1). While this impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable; the Specific Plan EIR requires individual development projects to complete further evaluation to determine if they meet the standards and guidelines set forth in the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan addresses views from the public rights-of-way of east-west streets that run east and west, as well as, from the BART platforms. The project applicant modeled the views from the platform of the El Cerrito Plaza BART station, with the addition of the project, as shown in Figure 2-1. These images show that that the project will not have an impact on views to the west of elements identified in the Specific Plan (Albany Hill, Mount Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, and the San Francisco skyline) for the following reasons:

- The project site is located within the southwestern portion of the City, which has a lower elevation and denser development.

- Streets that run east and west with potential to be within the viewshed of the project include Central Avenue, Lincoln Avenue, and Avila Street. Due to the surrounding topography, existing views toward the project site from Central Avenue and Eureka Avenue are obscured by the elevated BART tracks and existing trees. Views toward the East Bay Hills from Avila Street may be affected by the project. However, views of the East Bay Hills will still be possible from the public right-of-way of Avila Street after development of the project.

- The Specific Plan limits building lengths to 200 feet in order to preserve intermittent views. The project would be less than 200 feet in length.

In accordance with Mitigation Measure 4-1 of the SPASP FEIR, it should be noted that the proposed project would develop a new six-story building that is approximately 65 feet in height which could alter views of the East Bay Hills from the residences immediately surrounding the project site. The proposed project is located within the SPASP’s Transit-Oriented Higher Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) zone, which allows building heights of up to 65 feet (85 feet for affordable housing projects). The proposed project would be within the allowable height limit established within the SPASP and would therefore be consistent with the conclusions of the SPASP FEIR. Furthermore, the SPASP FEIR states that Mitigation Measure 4-1 shall be implemented through subsequent permits, conditions, agreements, or other measures consistent with Specific Plan Section 2.02. The SPASP FEIR also found that potentially significant impacts could result from the introduction of new light and glare in the plan area (Impact 4-2), but concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, which requires the installation of non-reflective building materials and windows, would reduce potential glare impacts of individual development projects to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would not cause any new light and glare impacts.
Photo 1: View from El Cerrito Plaza BART Station Platform - Northern End

Photo 2: View from El Cerrito Plaza BART Station Platform - Southern End
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2.1.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 4-1 and 4-2, are required.

2.1.3 Conclusion

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR, is within the allowable height and length limits, would be consistent with policies related to visual character and design, and would not result in a substantial increase in light and glare. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated visual resource impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no agricultural or forestry resources located within or near the project site. The SPASP area is predominantly urbanized and is classified as “Urban and Built-Up Land” by the State Department of Conservation. The City of El Cerrito, and the SPASP area, does not contain any land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The proposed project is also not located on land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract. In

---


addition, the City does not contain woodland or forestland cover, nor land zoned for timberland production. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to agriculture or forestry resources.

2.3 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1 Discussion

2.3.1.1 Clean Air Plan Consistency

An air quality plan describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or region classified as a non-attainment area. The main purpose of an air quality plan is to bring an area into compliance with the requirements of federal and State air quality standards.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) guidelines were referenced to determine if the project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan, which for the SPASP FEIR was the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan. The SPASP FEIR found that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would increase at a lower rate under the SPASP than population or service population growth, thus resulting in a less-than-significant impact related to consistency with the applicable clean air plan.

The BAAQMD’s current clean air plan is the 2017 Clean Air Plan, which was adopted on April 19, 2017. The 2017 Clean Air Plan provides a regional strategy to protect public health and protect the climate. To protect public health, the plan describes how the BAAQMD will continue progress toward attaining all State and federal air quality standards and eliminating health risk disparities from exposure to air pollution among Bay Area communities. To protect the climate, the plan defines a vision for transitioning the region to a post-carbon economy needed to achieve ambitious
greenhouse gas reduction targets for 2030 and 2050, and provides a regional climate protection strategy that will put the Bay Area on a pathway to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets.

The 2017 Clean Air Plan (CAP) includes a wide range of control measures designed to decrease emissions of the air pollutants that are most harmful to Bay Area residents, such as particulate matter, ozone, and toxic air contaminants, to reduce emissions of methane and other “super-GHGs” that are potent climate pollutants in the near-term, and to decrease emissions of carbon dioxide by reducing fossil fuel combustion.

The proposed project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services. The proposed project would develop high-intensity, transit-oriented residential and commercial uses on the site, similar to what the SPASP envisioned. In addition, the population and housing units included in the proposed project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, as mentioned in Section XIII, Population and Housing. The proposed project would not result in new or more significant population growth impacts than were analyzed and described in the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the population growth associated with the proposed project is consistent with the SPASP.

Consistency with the CAP is determined by whether or not the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts or hinder implementation of control measures (e.g., excessive parking or preclude extension of transit lane or bicycle path). As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase population, vehicle trips, or vehicle miles traveled. Additionally, the project would not result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. Therefore the project would support the goals of the CAP and would not conflict with any of the control measures identified in the plan or designed to bring the region into attainment. This impact would remain less than significant as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

2.3.1.2 Construction-Related Impacts

The SPASP FEIR identified that construction activities associated with implementation of the SPASP would result in short-term emissions from construction activities including site grading, asphalt paving, building construction, and architectural coating. Emissions commonly associated with construction activities include fugitive dust from soil disturbance, fuel combustion from mobile heavy-duty diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, and worker commute trips. During construction fugitive dust is generated when wheels or blades disturb surface materials. Uncontrolled dust from construction can become a nuisance and potential health hazard to those living and working nearby. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-1 to reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Development of the proposed project would result in similar construction-related, short-term air quality impacts as those impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new or more significant construction-related air quality impacts than were evaluated in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant with mitigation as identified in the SPASP FEIR.
2.3.1.3 Ambient Air Quality Impacts

The SPASP FEIR identified that monitoring data from all ambient air quality monitoring stations in the Bay Area indicate that existing carbon monoxide levels are currently below national and California ambient air quality standards. Monitored carbon monoxide (CO) levels have decreased substantially since 1990 as newer vehicles with greatly improved exhaust emission control systems have replaced older vehicles. The Bay Area has been designated as an attainment area for the CO standards. At the time that the SPASP FEIR was certified, the highest measured levels in San Pablo (the closest monitoring station to the plan area) during the past three years were 1.3 ppm (parts per million) for 8-hour averaging periods, compared with the State and federal criteria of 9.0 ppm.

Even though CO levels in the Bay Area are well below ambient air quality standards, and there have been no exceedances of CO standards in the Bay Area since 1991, elevated levels of CO still warrant analysis. CO hotspots (occurrences of localized high CO concentrations) could still occur near busy congested intersections. Recognizing the relatively low CO concentrations experienced in the Bay Area, the BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines state that a project would have a less-than-significant impact if it would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. As identified in the SPASP, peak hour traffic volumes attributed to implementation of the SPASP would be far below this threshold. Since intersections affected by the project would have volumes less than the threshold of 44,000 vehicles per hour, the impact of the project related to localized CO concentrations would therefore be less than significant.

As identified in Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, the proposed project would generate fewer vehicle trips than the uses assumed for this project site in the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, impacts related to CO hotspots would remain less-than-significant.

2.3.1.4 Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants

Sensitive receptors are defined as residential uses, schools, daycare centers, nursing homes, and medical centers. Individuals particularly vulnerable to diesel particulate matter are children, whose lung tissue is still developing, and the elderly, who may have serious health problems that can be aggravated by exposure to diesel particulate matter. Exposure from diesel exhaust associated with construction activity contributes to both cancer and chronic non-cancer health risks.

According to the BAAQMD, a project would result in a significant impact if it would: individually expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (TACs) resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 10.0 in one million, increased non-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), or an annual average ambient PM$_{2.5}$ increase greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$). A significant cumulative impact would occur if the project in combination with other projects located within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site would expose sensitive receptors to TACs resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 100.0 in one million, an increased non-cancer risk of greater than 10.0 on the hazard index (chronic), or an ambient PM$_{2.5}$ increase greater than 0.8 $\mu g/m^3$ on an annual average basis. Impacts from substantial pollutant concentrations are discussed below.
The SPASP FEIR determined that construction activities could result in short-term emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM), a known TAC. Construction could result in the generation of DPM emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading and excavation, paving, and other construction activities. The amount to which the receptors are exposed (a function of concentration and duration of exposure) is the primary factor used to determine health risk (i.e., potential exposure to TAC emission levels that exceed applicable standards). Health-related risks associated with diesel-exhaust emissions are primarily linked to long-term exposure and the associated risk of contracting cancer. The calculation of cancer risk associated with exposure to TACs is typically based on a 70-year period of exposure. The use of diesel-powered construction equipment, however, would be temporary and episodic and would occur over a relatively large area. The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-2 would be required to reduce potential impacts associated with TAC exposure. Mitigation Measure 5-2 requires individual projects to undergo individual assessment for construction health risks, either through screening or refined modeling.

Sensitive receptors are located adjacent to the project site. Construction of the proposed project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (i.e., usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, construction contractors would be required to implement the best management practices during construction, as required by Mitigation Measure 5-1. Enhanced control measures recommended by the BAAQMD in Mitigation Measure 5-2 would also be implemented. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 5-1 and 5-2, project construction emissions would be below the BAAQMD’s significance thresholds as described above. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during project construction. The proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to short term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.

2.3.1.5 Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants

Implementation of the SPASP would allow new residential land uses that could include sensitive receptors, as well as new non-residential land uses that would be potential new emissions sources. The roadway screening analysis tables from the SPASP FEIR indicate that health risk from high volume surface streets such as San Pablo Avenue, Central Avenue, Carlson Boulevard, and Potrero Avenue would be less-than-significant at average daily traffic volumes (ADT) of 40,000 vehicles or less at a distance of 10 feet. The SPASP FEIR determined that if projects under the SPASP are located within close proximity to surface streets with daily traffic volumes higher than 40,000 ADT, this would represent a potentially significant impact. The project site is located approximately 70 feet from the centerline of San Pablo Avenue. Based on the BAAQMD’s Highway Screening Analysis Tool, the proposed project would be exposed to an inhalation cancer risk of 5.983 in 1 million, which is below the threshold of 10 in 1 million. The maximum chronic Hazard Index would be 0.007 and the maximum acute Hazard Index would be 0.016, which would both be below the BAAQMD significance threshold of 1.0. The tool also indicates that the maximum PM$_{2.5}$ concentration would be 0.074 µg/m$^3$, which is also below the BAAQMD significance threshold of 0.3 µg/m$^3$. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to long term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.
2.3.1.6 Odors

The SPASP FEIR identified that the SPASP area would include potential odor sources that could affect new sensitive receptors. Most of these major existing sources are however already buffered by existing uses. Responses to odors are subjective, and vary by individual and type of use. Sensitive land uses that include outdoor uses, such as residences and possibly daycare facilities, are likely to be affected most by odors. Consistent with SPASP policies and SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-4, the proposed project would be located in an area surrounded by residential and commercial uses and would not be a source of odors or located in an area where substantial odors (such as those associated with industrial, manufacturing, processing, or treatment uses) are generated.

2.3.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measure 5-1, are required.

2.3.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and construction activities would be required to comply with SPASP Mitigation Measure 5-1. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential air quality impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact associated with air quality.
## 2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR found that implementation of the SPASP would largely result in minimal impacts to biological resources because the SPASP area is a highly developed urban area with approximately 90 percent of the land developed, recently disturbed, or ruderal. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the plan area does not contain any plant or animal species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), nor does the plan area contain any federally protected wetlands. The only identified riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community in the plan area is riparian habitat adjacent to Cerrito Creek (near the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center parking lot and Ohlone Greenway) and Baxter Creek. However, the project is not located within the vicinity of either of these resources and therefore would not result in any impacts to these habitats.
The SPASP FEIR identified potential impacts associated with the removal of existing trees with implementation of the SPASP. Removal of existing trees containing nests or eggs of migratory birds, raptors, or bird species during the nesting season could be considered an "unlawful take" under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and USFW provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds. The proposed project would result in the removal of existing grass and shrubs on the project site. However, tree removal would comply with all City requirements to minimize impacts on biological resources during removal. The FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 6-1 to minimize potentially significant impacts associated with tree removal on nesting birds to less-than-significant levels.

2.4.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measure 6-1, are required.

2.4.3 Conclusion

The proposed project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR. Tree removal activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 6-1. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential biological impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact on biological resources.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR identified properties or features within the SPASP area that may be eligible for listing in a local, State, or federal register of historic resources (Impact 7-1). However, the project site is currently vacant and was not identified as one of the properties potentially eligible for listing as a historic resource; therefore, Mitigation Measure 7-1 does not apply.
The SPASP FEIR concluded that the potential impact of development within the plan area on cultural resources, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains would be less than significant with implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Specifically, disturbance of previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources, including human remains, could occur during grading and development of individual project sites within the SPASP area, and there is a reasonable possibility that archaeological and paleontological resources could be uncovered during these activities (Impacts 7-2 and 7-3). The SPASP FEIR identifies Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3 that would reduce the potential impacts on known or undisclosed cultural resources to less-than-significant levels.

LSA conducted a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for the proposed project in October 2017 to identify any previously-recorded cultural resources within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site and to identify any previous-completed cultural resource studies of the project site. The records search, summarized in a memorandum included as Appendix A, identified no recorded cultural resources at the project site and two cultural resources within the 0.25-mile of the project site. There are no reports of previous cultural resource investigations of the project site on file at the NWIC.

The Directory of Properties for Contra Costa County, published by the State Office of Historic Preservation, lists two buildings near the project site at 10102 San Pablo Avenue and 10116 San Pablo Avenue. The Office of Historic Preservation has assigned these two resources a status code of “7R”, indicating that these buildings have been identified as part of a historical resource survey but have not been evaluated for their eligibility for listing in either the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources. Neither of the two buildings is directly adjacent to the project site, nor would they be directly affected by construction or operation of the proposed project.

2.5.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, are required.

2.5.3 Conclusion

The proposed project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR. Ground disturbing activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resource impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact on cultural resources.
## 2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the geologic and soil impacts in the plan area are primarily related to potential ground shaking and associated impacts related to ground failure. Since the SPASP is not located within an Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone, the likelihood of surface fault rupture is minimal. In addition, the SPASP FEIR found that the slope instability hazards are also minimal due to the absence of appreciable slopes in the SPASP area. Furthermore, the SPASP area is served by a comprehensive, integrated wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system. Neither septic tank systems nor alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the SPASP, including the proposed project.

The Hayward Fault is the nearest active fault to the plan area and is approximately 1.0 mile to the east. The SPASP area is susceptible to ground shaking from the Hayward Fault or one of the other active faults in the region. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant with compliance with the latest California Building Standards Code. The proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with these requirements.
The SPASP FEIR concluded that grading and construction activities within the SPASP area may result in minor erosion or the minor loss of some topsoil. However, implementation of City-required grading and construction-period erosion control techniques would mitigate potential geological impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would have potentially significant impacts related to earthquake-induced on-site liquefaction, differential settlement, lateral spreading, and subsidence, and associated damage to project buildings and other improvements within the SPASP area. However, potential impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-1, which requires preparation and implementation of the recommended measures of a site-specific design-level geotechnical study for individual development projects. A Geotechnical Investigation was prepared for the proposed project, included as Appendix B, and determined that development of the proposed project is suitable on the project site and also provided earthwork and foundation recommendations for use in design and construction of the project site. These recommendations would be incorporated in the proposed project to ensure that impacts remain at less-than-significant levels.

2.6.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.6.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with the California Building Code, City-required erosion control techniques, and recommendation from the Geotechnical Report. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential geology and soil impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact associated with geology and soils.

2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2.7.1 Discussion

As identified in the SPASP FEIR, the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines contain methodology and thresholds of significance for evaluating GHG emissions. The BAAQMD suggests applying a specific plan-level GHG efficiency threshold of 4.6 MT per year per capita. Specific plans with emissions above the threshold would be considered to have an impact that, cumulatively, would be significant.

For the SPASP, GHG emissions were computed for two traffic scenarios, Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift, with operational emissions in 2040 using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2.2. SPASP land use types and size, plus trip generation rates, were input to CalEEMod. CalEEMod predicts emissions of GHGs in the form of equivalent carbon dioxide emissions (CO₂e).

For construction-related GHG emissions, the BAAQMD does not have an adopted threshold of significance. The BAAQMD encourages the incorporation of best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction where feasible and applicable, including, but not limited to: using local building materials of at least 10 percent, and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. The 2016 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) requires a diversion rate of at least 65 percent of construction waste or demolition materials.

The SPASP FEIR found that 2040 full development capacity associated with development under the SPASP would have per capita emissions of 3.9 and 3.7 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e per year under Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift cases, respectively, which would not exceed the BAAQMD specific plan-level threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂e/year. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

In addition, the SPASP FEIR found that the SPASP would be subject to new requirements under rule making developed at the State and local level regarding GHG emissions. The SPASP would also be subject to local and General Plan policies, including the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, that are expected to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

The proposed project adheres to the building guidelines of the SPASP, is consistent with the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, and promotes reductions in GHG emissions through mixed-use development in close proximity to transit. The proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to GHG emissions than analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.

2.7.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.
2.7.3 Conclusion
The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential GHG emissions impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact associated with GHG emissions.

2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8.1 Discussion
The SPASP FEIR concluded that there are no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials within the SPASP plan area. The SPASP did identify the potential to expose construction workers to existing spilled, leaked, or otherwise discharged hazardous materials or wastes during project construction due to the large number of auto-related businesses in the SPASP.
area. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that compliance with all applicable, existing jurisdictional City-, regional-, and State-mandated site assessment, remediation, removal, and disposal requirements for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination would ensure potential impacts are less than significant. Specifically, compliance with City, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) requirements would ensure that health and safety impacts associated with implementation of individual development projects are less than significant.

According to these requirements, the proposed project would be required to investigate any potential soil or groundwater contamination at the site and comply with existing regulations. The project site is not identified as a cleanup site but is located adjacent to a Leaking Underground Storage Site (LUST), at 3160 Carlson Blvd. However, the cleanup of this site has been completed and the case is now closed.

The SPASP FEIR determined that the residential, commercial, and open space uses proposed as part of the SPASP would not involve the routine transport, use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials to the extent that a significant public or environmental hazard would occur. Operations in the SPASP area may involve the occasional transport, use, storage, or disposal of common hazardous substance such as fuel, pain, and solvents but would be subject to local, State, and Federal regulations. The SPASP determined that implementation of these standard regulations would ensure potential impacts would be less than significant.

The nearest school to the project site is Fairmont Elementary School located 0.4 miles north of the project site, Harding Elementary School located 0.6 miles east of the project site, and El Cerrito High School located 0.6 miles east of the project site. Since there are no schools within 0.25 miles from the project site, no impacts related to handling hazardous materials near a school would occur. The project site is located approximately 29 miles northwest of the nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport. As the project is not located within the Oakland International Airport Influence Area, no safety hazards would be anticipated. No private airstrips are located in the project vicinity. In addition, the SPASP area, including the project site, is not within or adjacent to wildland area and would not be subject to wildland fire risks.

2.8.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

---

6 Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission, 2010. Oakland International Airport, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Figure 3-2. September.
### 2.8.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to hazardous soil or groundwater conditions at the site during ground disturbing activities. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials at or affecting the proposed project site and there would be no new impact associated with hazards and hazardous materials.

### 2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR determined that long-term water quality impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP could result in contamination of plan area stormwater runoff with petroleum and other contaminants from motor vehicles; however, the compliance with Water Board and jurisdictional City-required post-construction, non-point source pollution control measures would ensure that such impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the SPASP FEIR determined that compliance with applicable Water Board, City of El Cerrito, and City of Richmond water quality protection requirements and conditions would ensure any potential construction period and post-construction water quality impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

In addition, construction projects are required to prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, which requires implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control stormwater peak flows and pollutant levels. This requirement is stipulated in Provision C.3 of the Contra Costa County National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). All projects within the SPASP area must comply with NPDES requirements, including the proposed project. The applicant submitted a Stormwater Control Plan as part of the project application materials, and it is included in Appendix C. The City will confirm that this plan conforms to all applicable local and State requirements as part of the development review process.

The proposed increase in population and traffic associated with the project could increase discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff beyond current levels after partial or full build-out of the SPASP. However, the proposed project would increase the amount of pervious surface on the site by replacing existing impervious surfaces on the site with pervious surfaces including bio-filtration plants for stormwater treatment and discharge and bay-friendly landscaping that would use a selection of native and drought-tolerant plants at the ground level as well as on the roof garden. The project would increase pervious surface coverage from approximately 1,773 square feet to approximately 6,265 square feet. In addition, full compliance with the Contra Costa County NPDES permit guidelines for stormwater discharge would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR identified that portions of the plan area in Richmond along Central Avenue are located within a 100-year flood zone. However, the proposed project site is not located within this zone and would therefore not result in any impacts related to flooding. Furthermore, the SPASP area is also not subject to inundation by seiche or mudflow. The southwest portion of the SPASP along Central Avenue in the City of Richmond is located near a Tsunami Inundation Zone; however, the proposed project is not located near this area.
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2.9.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.9.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to stormwater discharge. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the hydrology and water quality impacts of the proposed project and here would be no new impact associated with hydrology and water quality.

2.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.10.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR concluded that implementation of the SPASP would provide for the expansion of housing choices by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing and mixed-use (commercial/housing) development in the plan area at densities and heights greater than currently permitted. Implementation of the SPASP would not result in the division of an established community because the area was primarily developed prior to completion of the SPASP. The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would result in beneficial effects related to land use and planning by revitalizing the San Pablo Avenue corridor; facilitating development where services and infrastructure can be most efficiently provided by promoting higher residential densities near or within an existing shopping, service, employment, and public transportation centers; and promoting compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development patterns and land uses.

The project site is designated TOHIMU in the City’s General Plan and SPASP. In addition, the site is also zoned as TOHIMU. The intent of the TOHIMU designation is to provide for a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented higher density area within 0.5 miles of BART that allows a variety of uses including retail, commercial, residential, and public uses in the Downtown and Uptown areas. The TOHIMU
designation allows for a 65-foot height limit (85 feet is permissible for affordable housing projects) and requires a minimum height limit of three stories for residential uses. The proposed project is consistent with the mix, intensity, and scale of development contemplated by the SPASP in this location.

### 2.10.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

### 2.10.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR; therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the land use impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts related to land use and planning would result.

#### 2.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of El Cerrito General Plan does not identify mineral resources within the Specific Plan area. Therefore, the proposed project would have no new impacts on mineral resources.
2.12 NOISE

Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.12.1 Discussion

This section compares noise impacts from the proposed project with impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. The proposed project would include residential and commercial uses in a developed area in the City of El Cerrito. Operational noise can be categorized as mobile source noise and stationary source noise. Mobile source noise would be attributable to the additional trips that would be a result of the proposed project. Stationary source noise includes noise generated by the residential and commercial land uses.

A Noise Impact Analysis Memorandum (Noise Memorandum)\(^9\) was conducted for the proposed project and is referenced in this section, and is included in Appendix D. The Noise Memorandum is intended to satisfy the City’s requirement for a project-specific noise impact analysis, per SPASP Mitigation Measure 13-1, and examines the impacts of the proposed noise-sensitive uses on the project site together with the project design features and standard conditions. Future noise level impacts are based on the noise measurement data gathered at the project site to account for the impacts associated with the surrounding traffic and commercial uses.

The primary existing noise sources in the project area are transportation facilities. Traffic on San Pablo Avenue contributes to the ambient noise environment. In addition, operational noise from adjacent uses (e.g., nearby parking lot noise and pedestrians) is audible on the project site.

As identified in the Noise Memorandum, to assess existing noise levels, LSA conducted a short-term (15-minute) and a long-term noise measurement (24-hour) measurement at different on-site locations. The short-term measurement was conducted at 1:46 p.m. on October 4, 2017. The long-term measurement was conducted from October 3, 2017 to October 4, 2017. The short-term noise measurement indicates that ambient noise in the project site vicinity is approximately 63.2 dBA Leq. The long-term noise measurement indicates that noise levels on the project site are approximately 64.1 dBA Ldn.

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples of these include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, childcare facilities, and senior housing. The project site is located within the San Pablo Avenue corridor that is predominantly developed with commercial, retail uses and multi-family residential uses. The closest sensitive receptors include the adjacent single- and multi-family residences, located approximately 15 feet from the project site.

2.12.1.1 Noise and Land Use Compatibility

The SPASP FEIR found that residential land uses facilitated by the SPASP would be exposed to exterior noise levels exceeding 70 dBA Ldn from traffic and BART noise. Future noise levels would exceed both El Cerrito’s and Richmond’s noise and land use compatibility standards. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-1, which requires project-specific acoustical analyses, to reduce potential noise and land use compatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The Noise Memorandum identified the dominant sources of noise in the project vicinity as traffic on San Pablo Avenue, nearby parking lot noise, and pedestrians. Noise levels on the project site measured approximately 64.1 dBA Ldn at the center of the project site, approximately 140 feet west of the centerline of San Pablo Avenue. The proposed residences would be located within 70 feet of the centerline of San Pablo Avenue; therefore, when adjusted for distance, the proposed residences would be exposed to a noise level of approximately 70.1 dBA Ldn.

The City sets forth normally acceptable noise level standards for land use compatibility and interior noise exposure of new development. The normally acceptable exterior noise level for residential units is 60 dBA Ldn. Noise levels of 60 to 75 dBA Ldn are considered conditionally acceptable when a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements and noise insulation features are included in the design to meet the interior noise standard. The normally acceptable interior noise level for residential units is 45 dBA Ldn, and the maximum instantaneous noise level should not exceed 50 dBA in bedrooms and 55 dBA in other rooms.

**Interior Noise Analysis.** Based on the site plans for the proposed project, calculations were completed for the bedrooms located on the northeast corner of the property with the largest window-to-wall ratio. The calculations assume typical stucco construction and two walls exposed to traffic noise. The results of the analysis show an approximate 29 dBA exterior-to-interior noise reduction. These calculations (shown in Appendix D) assume a wall rating of STC-46 and window rating of STC-28. With windows closed, interior noise levels at the guest rooms would be approximately 41.1 dBA (i.e., 70.1 dBA - 29 dBA = 41.1 dBA), which is below the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard with windows closed for noise-sensitive land uses. Therefore, with standard building
construction, central air conditioning allowing windows to remain closed, and windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 28 or higher, noise impacts associated with traffic would meet the City’s normally acceptable interior noise level criterion of 45 dBA.

**Instantaneous Noise Analysis.** The short-term noise measurement indicated a maximum instantaneous noise level of 71.2 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$. With windows and doors closed, maximum instantaneous noise levels would be approximately 46.2 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$ (i.e., $71.2 - 25 = 46.2$). This maximum instantaneous noise level would not exceed the City’s instantaneous noise level standards of 50 dBA in bedrooms and 55 dBA in other rooms.

**Exterior Noise Analysis.** In addition, as identified above, exterior noise levels on the project site are approximately 70.1 dBA $L_{\text{dn}}$. This noise level would be within the City’s conditionally acceptable noise level of 60 to 75 dBA $L_{\text{dn}}$ for residential land uses when noise reduction requirements and noise insulation features are included in the design to meet the interior noise standard. As noted above, interior noise levels would meet the City’s standards with the project-specific noise reduction measures outlined above. Therefore, the project would meet the City’s land use compatibility standards.

### 2.12.1.2 Stationary Source Noise Impacts

The SPASP FEIR identified that implementation of the SPASP would introduce commercial uses adjacent to residential land uses. Specific tenants for the proposed commercial uses have not been identified, but uses could include retail stores, grocery stores, restaurants, or cafes. New commercial development proposed along with or next to residential development could result in noise levels exceeding City standards. Typical noise levels generated by loading and unloading would be similar to noise levels generated by truck movements on local roadways. Mechanical equipment would also have the potential to generate noise and would be a potential noise impact. The SPASP FEIR identified this as a potentially significant impact and identified Mitigation Measure 13-2, which requires site-specific analysis for proposed commercial uses to reduce long-term noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. A site specific analysis of the noise levels associated with these uses, including other stationary source, is provided below.

Implementation of the proposed project would generate various on-site stationary noise sources, including heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, parking lot activities, and loading dock operations. The nearest off-site sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project are the adjacent single- and multi-family residences, located approximately 15 feet from the project site.

HVAC equipment is typically the primary noise source associated with residential and some commercial uses. HVAC equipment is often mounted on rooftops, located on the ground, or located within mechanical rooms. The noise sources could take the form of fans, pumps, air compressors, chillers, or cooling towers. HVAC operations would be required to meet all noise standards.

Precise details of HVAC equipment, including future location and sizing, are unknown at this time; therefore, for purposes of this analysis, 75 dBA at 3 feet was assumed to represent HVAC-related
noise. Some off-site noise-sensitive receptors would be within 20 feet of proposed multi-family residential buildings. Adjusted for distance to the nearest off-site sensitive receptors, the off-site residences would be exposed to a noise level of 59 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$ generated by HVAC equipment. This noise level is lower than the City’s maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 $L_{\text{max}}$ during the day and 60 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$ during the night. Therefore, operations associated with the HVAC equipment would be in compliance with the City’s exterior daytime and nighttime noise standards for residential uses.

Parking lot noise, including engine sounds, car doors slamming, car alarms, loud music, and people conversing, would occur as a result of the proposed project at the project site and on nearby streets. Typical parking lot activities, such as people conversing or doors slamming, generates approximately 60 dBA to 70 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$ at 50 feet. Existing sensitive receptors are located approximately 20 feet from the proposed parking garage. The parking garage would be enclosed; therefore, the building structure would provide a 15 dBA reduction in noise. Accounting for the enclosure, and when adjusted for distance, the nearest off-site residences would be exposed to a noise level of 53 to 63 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$ generated by parking lot activities. This noise level would not exceed the City’s maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 $L_{\text{max}}$ during the day and 60 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$ during the night. The nearest residential receptors have wood fences, which would reduce noise levels by an additional 5 dBA approximately. Therefore, parking lot noise associated with the proposed project would not be expected to substantially increase noise levels.

Additional on-site stationary noise sources would include delivery trucks and loading noise. Of the on-site stationary noise sources, noise generated by delivery truck activity would generate the highest maximum noise levels. Delivery truck loading and unloading activities would result in maximum noise levels from 75 dBA to 85 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$ at 50 feet. There are generally two types of loading that would occur on the site: small deliveries like parcels and packages, and large deliveries such as retail items. The former are typically made via passenger car, van, or single-unit truck. These activities are potential noise sources that could affect noise-sensitive receptors in the project site vicinity. Based on the site plans for the proposed project, loading areas would occur within the enclosed garage, which would shield the adjacent residences from loading dock and delivery noise.

In addition, peak noise levels from loading and unloading would be intermittent and when averaged over a one hour period would be much lower than the peak noise levels. In accordance with Mitigation Measure 13-2, as identified in the SPASP FEIR, to reduce loading dock and delivery noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors, design considerations and shielding must be implemented to ensure that the loading and delivery activities are located in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between loading- and delivery-related noise sources and nearest off-site sensitive receptors. In addition, noise-generating activities, such as maintenance activities and loading and unloading activities, are reduced to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

2.12.1.3 Mobile Source Noise Impacts

Motor vehicles with their distinctive noise characteristics are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity. The amount of noise varies according to many factors, such as volume of traffic,
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vehicle mix (percentage of cars and trucks), average traffic speed, and distance from the observer. Implementation of the proposed project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project site vicinity. A characteristic of sound is that a doubling of a noise source is required in order to result in a perceptible (3 dBA or greater) increase in the resulting noise level.

The SPASP FEIR found that cumulative traffic noise levels, with or without implementation of the SPASP, are not anticipated to increase substantially along the roadways serving the Specific Plan area, and the project’s contribution to cumulative traffic noise level increases is calculated to be less than 1 dBA L_{eq}. Cumulative traffic noise increases would not be considered substantial, and the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to increased noise levels. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project site vicinity. The project would generate an estimated 670 daily vehicle trips, with 25 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 47 trips occurring during the PM peak hour, which is less than what was identified for this project site in the SPASP FEIR. Project daily trips would not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any roadway segment in the project vicinity, and therefore would not result in a perceptible increase in traffic noise levels at receptors in the project vicinity. This impact would remain less than significant.

2.12.1.4 Construction Noise

The highest construction noise levels would be generated during grading and excavation, with lower noise levels occurring during building construction. Large pieces of earth-moving equipment, such as graders, scrapers, and bulldozers, generate maximum noise levels of 85 to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels are about 80 to 85 dBA measured at a distance of 50 feet from the site during busy construction periods. In addition, pile driving may occur at some of the project sites. This type of construction activity can produce very high noise levels of approximately 105 dBA at 50 feet, which are difficult to control. These noise levels drop off at a rate of about 6 dBA per doubling of distance between the noise source and receptor. Intervening structures or terrain would result in lower noise levels.

The SPASP identified that although construction noise would be localized to the individual site location, businesses and residences would be intermittently exposed to high levels of noise throughout the plan horizon. Construction would elevate noise levels at adjacent businesses and residences by 15 to 20 dBA or higher. Such a large increase in noise levels, although short-term in duration, would be a potentially significant impact. The SPASP identified Mitigation Measure 13-3, but identified that construction noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The noise analysis presented in the Noise Memorandum assumed a typical maximum noise level of 86 dBA L_{max} at 50 feet during the noisiest construction phases. The Noise Memorandum identified that the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are adjacent single- and multi-family residences, located approximately 15 feet from the project site. At 15 feet, there would be an
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increase of approximately 8 dBA from the increased distance from the active construction area. Therefore, the closest off-site sensitive receptors may be subject to short-term construction noise reaching 94 dBA Lmax when construction is occurring at the project site boundary. Construction is permitted by the City when activities occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. No construction activity is allowed on Sundays and holidays.

The proposed project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period noise impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. The proposed project would require the implementation of the Municipal Code, the City of El Cerrito General Plan, and Mitigation Measure 13-3, as included in the SPASP FEIR.

2.12.1.5 Construction-Related Vibration

The SPASP FEIR identified that construction projects within the SPASP area may, in some cases, be located directly adjacent to existing structures, including weakened structures. Construction activities may include demolition of existing structures, site preparation work, excavation of below-grade levels, foundation work, pile driving, and new building erection. Demolition for an individual site may last several weeks and at times may produce substantial vibration. Excavation for underground levels would also occur on some project sites and vibratory pile driving could be used to stabilize the walls of the excavated area. Piles or drilled caissons may also be used to support building foundations.

Depending on the proximity of existing structures to each construction site, the structural soundness of the existing buildings, and the methods of construction used, vibration levels may be high enough to damage existing structures. Given the scope of the SPASP and the close proximity of many existing structures, ground-borne vibration impacts would be potentially significant.

As with any type of construction, vibration levels may at times be perceptible. However, construction phases that have the highest potential of producing vibration (pile driving and use of jackhammers and other high power tools) would be intermittent and would only occur for short periods of time for any individual project site. By use of administrative controls such as notifying neighbors of scheduled construction activities and scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with least potential to affect nearby businesses, perceptible vibration can be kept to a minimum and would not result in a physical or perceived significant impact.

The SPASP FEIR found construction-related vibration impacts to be potentially significant. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-4. However, it may not be possible to avoid using pile drivers, vibratory rollers, and tampers entirely during construction associated with the SPASP. Due to the density of development in the area, some of these activities may take place near sensitive areas. In these cases, Mitigation Measure 13-4 may not be sufficient to reduce ground-borne vibrations below a level of significance. Therefore, this impact was considered to be significant and unavoidable.
Common sources of ground-borne vibration and noise include trains and construction activities such as blasting, pile driving and operating heavy earthmoving equipment. Construction of the proposed project would involve grading, site preparation, and construction activities but would not involve the use of construction equipment that would result in substantial ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise on properties near to the project site. No pile driving, blasting, or significant grading activities are proposed.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period vibration impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. The proposed project would require the implementation of the Mitigation Measure 13-4, as included in the SPASP FEIR.

2.12.1.6 Ground Vibration from BART Operations

The SPASP FEIR identified that future development under the SPASP would not expose persons to excessive vibration from BART operations. This impact is considered less than significant.

Along the entire SPASP area, BART operates on an elevated platform. According to data in the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, vibration levels resulting from BART would be well below the 72 VdB guidelines for Category 2 land uses near the footprint of the elevated structure. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

The proposed project is located over 1,000 feet west of BART; therefore, the proposed project would be exposed to significant groundborne vibration associated with BART and would not result in any new or more significant impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. In addition, implementation of SPASP policies would reduce potential groundborne vibration impacts on future or existing sensitive receptors to less-than-significant levels.

2.12.1.7 Aircraft Noise

The SPASP FEIR did not address potential aircraft noise impacts for the proposed project. The proposed project is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport. Oakland International Airport is the closest airport and is located approximately 15 miles south of the project site. Aircraft noise is occasionally audible at the project site; however, no portion of the project site lies within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contours of any public airport nor does any portion of the project site lie within 2 miles of any private airfield or heliport. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to the excessive noise levels form aircraft noise sources.

2.12.2 Applicable Mitigation

The proposed project would result in an increase in people living close to San Pablo Avenue which could expose sensitive receptors to higher noise levels from traffic. However, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to noise levels above normally acceptable levels with standard building construction, central air conditioning allowing windows to remain closed, and windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 28 or higher installed in the proposed residential units. In addition, an alternative method of supplying fresh air (e.g., mechanical ventilation) is required to ensure that windows can remain closed for a prolonged period of time. Implementation of these measures, as detailed in project-specific conditions of approval, would reduce potential
operational noise impacts on future sensitive receptors to less-than-significant levels. With implementation of this measure, SPASP Mitigation Measure 13-1 is satisfied, and no further analysis is required. Implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4 are also applicable to the proposed project.

2.12.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of the project-specific noise reduction measures outlined above and SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4, the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in noise levels. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the noise impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts related to noise would result.

2.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR evaluated potential environmental impacts that could be associated with approximately 243,112 net new square feet of commercial space, 1,706 units of residential development, and 3,840 new residents. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the population growth associated with the SPASP would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth beyond the SPASP boundaries. SPASP implementation would facilitate the projected residential and commercial growth within a transit-rich, mixed-use plan area identified for such growth in both local and regional plans and forecasts.

Table 2.A below shows the housing and population assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR and also shows existing and proposed housing development within the SPASP area. As the population and housing units proposed by the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with population and housing.
Table 2.A: Existing and Proposed Housing Units and Population Within the SPASP Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluated Within the SPASP FEIR</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Remaining Development Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,706(^a)</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,840(^b)</td>
<td>2,446(^b)</td>
<td>162(^b)</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of El Cerrito, 2018.
\(^a\) El Cerrito, City of, 2014. Final San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.
\(^b\) Estimated population associated with approved units, under construction units, and the proposed project was determined by using an average of 2.25 persons per household (3,840 residents / 1,706 units = 2.25 residents per unit).

2.13.2 Applicable Mitigations

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.13.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be within the growth projections evaluated in the SPASP; therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the population and housing impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts would result.

2.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 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:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Fire protection?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Schools?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Parks?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.14.1 Discussion

The SPASP area is located within the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD). The SPASP FEIR evaluated the impact that the SPASP’s anticipated 1,706 new residences, and associated
increase in expected student population, would have on the services provided and facilities operated by the WCCUSD. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the new residences would generate approximately 1,147 new students in the District schools over the approximately 25-year horizon of the SPASP implementation. The SPASP FEIR concluded that new students would be accommodated in existing schools, and plan implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. As the population and housing units proposed by the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR (refer to Section XIII, above), the project would also generate students allowed for and analyzed within the SPASP FEIR. As such, existing school facilities could accommodate the proposed project.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the El Cerrito Fire Department and Richmond Fire Department would not need to expand fire protection facilities and personnel to accommodate additional demand associated with implementation of the SPASP. Specifically, the SPASP FEIR identified that any demand for additional fire protection personnel or equipment resulting from SPASP implementation would be funded by currently adopted public facility fees levied on the new development (in Richmond) and by the annual budget review and allocation (in El Cerrito). Given this, impacts to fire protection services are anticipated to be less than significant. As the population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with fire services.

As noted in the SPASP FEIR, the increased demand associated with implementation of the SPASP would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities. The SPASP FEIR also determined that implementation of the SPASP would result in more “eyes-on-the-street” by facilitating a more pedestrian-friendly plan area which would provide a safer public environment. The SPASP identified police department approvals that would be required on a project-by-project basis that would ensure the department is equipped and has the ability to maintain acceptable levels of service. The City will coordinate with the police department for these approvals. In addition, the proposed project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR and would not result in new impacts associated with police services.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the combination of parks and recreation facilities meets the expected park requirements for the SPASP area given the anticipated population associated with implementation of the SPASP. As discussed in further detail in Section XV, Recreation of this checklist, the SPASP FEIR concluded that the impacts to parks and recreation would be less than significant with compliance with plan provisions for new open spaces. The proposed project includes 2,295 square feet of public open space. In addition, the SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would not facilitate the need for new or physically altered government facilities.

2.14.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.
2.14.3 Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluates public service impacts and the proposed project’s impacts are included in and analyzed by the SPASP FEIR. Development of the proposed project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project has no new impacts on public services.

2.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.15.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the combination of parks and greenways within the SPASP area would meet the expected park requirements for the SPASP area given the anticipated population at full implementation of the SPASP. Specifically, implementation of the SPASP would generate 1,706 new residences and increase the local population by 3,840 people. The increase in residents in the area would increase the demand for parks and recreational facilities, reducing the City’s level of service to 5.85 acres per 1,000 residents (below the 2010 level of 6.67 acres per 1,000 residents) with no increase in acreage of parks or open spaces; however, this ratio is above the level of service standard adopted under the City’s General Plan.

The project would include approximately 2,295 square feet of public open space and public art located on the ground level. In addition, the project would provide approximately 7,264 square feet of common and private open space in the form of a central courtyard and walkway on the second floor and private decks and balconies. As the population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, and the project would conform to SPASP open space and public art standards, the project would result in no new impacts associated with parks and recreational facilities.
2.15.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.15.3 Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP, including parks and recreations impacts. Development of the proposed project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project has no new impacts on parks and recreation.

2.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location which results in substantial safety risks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.16.1 Discussion

This section compares traffic impacts from the proposed project with impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. A Preliminary Transportation Analysis (TIA), included in Appendix E, was conducted for the proposed project and is referenced in this section. The report includes an analysis to ensure that sufficient traffic operations are maintained with the construction of the proposed project.12

2.16.1.1 Trip Generation

Table 2.B presents the trip generation for the proposed project and the adjacent development located at 10167 San Pablo Avenue, and compares the trips generated to the assumptions provided in the SPASP FEIR. Using the same trip generation methodology used in the SPASP FEIR, it is estimated that the two projects would generate a total of 43 AM peak-hour and 75 PM peak-hour trips. The SPASP assumed 60 residential units and 12,000 square feet of commercial use for the site, which would generate 28 AM peak-hour and 67 PM peak-hour trips. The proposed project would generate 10 percent fewer trips in the AM and 30 percent fewer trips in the PM peak hours than assumed in the SPASP EIR. Thus, the two developments would generate 54 percent more trips in the AM peak hour and 12 percent more trips in the PM peak hour than assumed in the SPASP EIR.

The SPASP EIR assumed development of approximately 1,706 residential units and 243,100 square feet of commercial space throughout the SPASP area as part of the traffic analysis. Since the proposed project is within the SPASP area, this analysis also compares the total proposed, approved, and under construction projects as identified by the City,13 to the total increase in development analyzed in the EIR to ensure that the current projects combined would not exceed the SPASP EIR assumptions.

Since the certification of the SPASP EIR, 22 developments, including this proposed project, have been proposed and are in various stages of the City’s approval process. Table 2.C summarizes the total land uses for these developments, which includes 1,087 residential units and 65,571 square feet of commercial uses. The combined land uses for the proposed developments is less than the residential dwelling unit assumptions by 36 percent and is less than the commercial square footage assumptions by 73 percent as compared to the SPASP EIR land use assumptions. Thus, the proposed project combined with all planned, approved, and under construction projects in the SPASP area would not result in significant impacts beyond the ones identified in the SPASP EIR.

### Table 2.B: Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Size&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Daily AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Daily PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project – 10135 San Pablo Avenue (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments (223)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72 DU</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Shopping Center (820)&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Development – 10167 San Pablo Avenue (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments (223)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>62 DU</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Assumption (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments (223)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60 DU</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Shopping Center (820)&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12.0 KSF</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPASP Assumption (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Difference (C = A - B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>a</sup> KSF = 1,000 square feet; DU = dwelling unit

<sup>b</sup> ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 223 (mid-rise apartments), adjusted by 12 percent based on the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology. Daily Average Rate = 5.90 trips per DU; AM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.26 trips per DU (31 percent in, 69 percent out); PM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.34 trips per DU (58 percent in, 42 percent out)

<sup>c</sup> ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 820 (shopping center), adjusted by 12 percent based on the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology. Daily Average Rate = 37.60 trips per KSF; AM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.84 trips per KSF (62 percent in, 38 percent out); PM Peak Hour Average Rate = 3.26 trips per KSF (48 percent in, 52 percent out)

#### 2.16.1.2 Vehicle Access and On-Site Circulation

Residents and visitors would access the site through a driveway on San Pablo Avenue. Vehicular access on San Pablo Avenue would be restricted to right-in/right-out only, due to the existing landscaped median on San Pablo Avenue. Northbound vehicles traveling to the site on San Pablo Avenue would make a U-turn on San Pablo Avenue at the intersection with El Dorado Street. Vehicles exiting the site intending to travel northbound on San Pablo Avenue would make a U-turn on San Pablo Avenue at Central Avenue.

The project would provide a total of 45 parking spaces. Four spaces on the ground-level garage would be dedicated for commercial uses, and 41 spaces would be dedicated for residential uses. The parking spaces would consist of three standard spaces, two ADA spaces, and 40 stacker spaces.

To ensure that vehicles exiting the site are restricted to right-turns only and to minimize traffic and sidewalk conflicts, the following project-specific condition of approval shall be implemented.

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:**

Provide signing and striping at both the garage driveway and San Pablo Avenue driveway to restrict vehicles to right-turns only. This revision shall be incorporated on plans submitted for building permit issuance.

With implementation of the above recommended project-specific condition of approval, impacts associated with vehicle access and circulation would be less than significant.
Table 2.C: LAND USE COMPARISON FOR ALL PROPOSED PROJECTS IN THE SPASP AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Residential (DU)</th>
<th>Commercial (KSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Projects(^a)</td>
<td>1,087 DU</td>
<td>65.6 KSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Assumed in SPASP EIR(^b)</td>
<td>1,706 DU</td>
<td>243.1 KSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) KSF = 1,000 square feet; DU = dwelling unit
\(^b\) Land use assumption details identified by the City in El Cerrito, El Cerrito San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area: Development Proposed, Under Construction or Recently Completed. Available online at: https://el-cerrito.org/DocumentCenter/View/7106/Development-Map_12_15_17.
\(^c\) Land use includes all projects analyzed in the SPASP, summarized in Appendix D of the SPASP EIR

2.16.1.3 Project Driveway Sight Distance

Adequate sight distance is defined as a clear line-of-sight between a motorist 10 feet back from the sidewalk and a pedestrian 10 feet away on each sides of the driveway. The project driveway on San Pablo Avenue would not provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk south of the driveway. Additionally, vehicles parked on the north side of the San Pablo Avenue driveway may block the sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and vehicles on southbound San Pablo Avenue. Trees planted on the north side of the driveway may also affect sight lines of exiting vehicles if the tree canopy is lower than 6 feet from the ground.

To ensure that sight distance is adequate, the following project-specific conditions of approval shall be implemented.

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:**

- Consider revising the driveway design or providing mirrors at the driveway to ensure adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the garage and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk south of the driveway.

- Ensure that on-street parking and trees on the north side of the project driveway on San Pablo Avenue would not restrict sight distance for exiting vehicles by providing at least 10 feet of red curb and ensuring that the tree canopies are higher than six feet from the ground on the north side of the driveway.

With implementation of the above recommended project-specific conditions of approval, impacts associated with sight distance would be less than significant.

2.16.1.4 Bicycle Parking, Access and On-Site Circulation

Section 2.05.07.04 of the SPASP Form-Based Code requires bicycle parking for residential and commercial uses, as shown in Table 2.D. The project would consist of 72 residential units and 4,413
square feet of commercial space, requiring 9 short-term bicycle parking spaces (7 for residential and 2 for retail) and 109 long-term bicycle parking spaces (108 for residential and 1 for retail). The project would provide 10 short-term bicycle parking spaces; 8 short-term bicycle parking spaces for residents located in the parking garage, and 2 short-term bicycle parking spaces for retail users located in front of the retail spaces along San Pablo Avenue. The project would also provide 118 long-term parking spaces; 114 long-term bicycle parking spaces for residents and 4 long-term bicycle parking spaces for retail uses, all located in the parking garage. In total, the project would provide 10 short-term bicycle and 118 long-term parking spaces, exceeding City requirements. Pedestrians and cyclists would access the short-term and long-term garage bicycle parking via the residential lobby on the public walkway on the north side of the project.

To minimize potential conflicts between vehicles and cyclists, the following project-specific condition of approval shall be implemented.

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:**

Relocate short-term bicycle parking from the garage to the sidewalk along San Pablo Avenue to improve parking visibility for cyclists and ensure proximity to the main entrance of the building.

With implementation of the above recommended project-specific condition of approval, impacts associated with bicycle parking, access and circulation would be less than significant.

2.16.1.5 **Pedestrian Access and On-Site Circulation**

Pedestrians would access the retail area via the entrances located on San Pablo Avenue and the public walkway to the north of the project. The residential entrance is located on the north side of the building, and provides access to the building lobbies, elevators, and staircases. The garage can be accessed by pedestrians using multiple entrances, including the lobby, the garage pedestrian entrance just west of the residential entrance on the public walkway, and a staircase and ramp on the south side of the project building with access on San Pablo Avenue.

The SPASP Form-Based Code (2.04.02) requires a minimum pedestrian zone of eight feet on all sidewalks along San Pablo Avenue. The project would provide eight feet of pedestrian zone for pedestrians along San Pablo Avenue, and the curb-cut for the garage driveway would not disrupt the pedestrian zone, meeting City requirements.

The multi-modal improvements identified in the SPASP include providing a midblock crosswalk on San Pablo Avenue, just north of Avila Street. As mentioned previously, the crosswalk would not be feasible with the proposed project driveway. The City of El Cerrito is currently in the process of refining the multimodal improvements identified in the SPASP and developing a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to determine fair share payment by the development projects facilitated by the Specific Plan for these improvements. Per the below project-specific condition of approval, the project applicant is required to contribute the fair share towards the TIF.
Table 2.D: Bicycle Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Short-Term Spaces</th>
<th>Long-Term Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Rate</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min. 2 spaces or 1 space/10 units, whichever is greater</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Required Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>KSF</td>
<td>Min 2. Spaces or 1.5 spaces/3,000 square feet, whichever is greater</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Parking ratios based on Section 2.05.07.04 of the SPASP Form-Based Code.

Project-Specific Condition of Approval:

The project applicant shall be required to make a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal improvements identified by the SPASP. One option is to participate in the payment of the City of El Cerrito Transportation Impact Fee (TIF), currently under development.

With implementation of the above recommended project-specific condition of approval, impacts associated with pedestrian access and on-site circulation would be less than significant.

2.16.1.6 Transit Access

The El Cerrito Plaza BART station is located less than 0.5 miles east of the project site.

AC Transit provides bus service to the project site with bus stops on northbound and southbound San Pablo Avenue just north of Central Avenue, and on Central Avenue, just west of San Pablo Avenue. Both bus stops on San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue provide a bench but do not include a bus shelter.

The multi-modal improvements identified in the SPASP include relocating the existing bus stop on southbound San Pablo Avenue from the near side (just north of intersection) to the far side (just south of intersection) at Central Avenue. As mentioned in Section 2.16.1.5, the project applicant will contribute to these improvements by making a fair share contribution to these improvements, such as paying the TIF, currently under development.

2.16.1.7 Parking and TDM Requirements

The proposed project would include a garage with 45 parking spaces. Based on the project site plan, 41 spaces would be designated for the residential component of the project and 4 spaces would be designated for the commercial component of the project. The parking spaces would be unbundled, and include 40 mechanically stacked parking spaces. The 45 parking spaces also include two ADA
spaces that are located near the entrance to the elevator lobby. The project also provides five parking spaces (10 percent of all parking spaces) with electric vehicle charging stations, meeting the Form Based Code requirement (Section 2.05.07.07).

The SPASP Form-Based Code requirements for the TOHIMU zoning district apply to the project site. TOHIMU zoning (Section 2.05.07.04) limits parking to a maximum of 1.0 automobile parking space per dwelling unit, a maximum of 1.0 space per 1,000 square feet of commercial space, and a basic Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan.

Table 2.E summarizes the code-required maximum and proposed parking for the project. The code would limit parking to a maximum of 72 off-street residential parking spaces and a maximum of four commercial spaces for the project. Based on the site plan dated May 17, 2018, the project would provide 41 residential parking spaces and four commercial spaces, meeting Code requirements.

The project is required to implement a basic TDM plan. The project proposes the following TDM strategies that would reduce automobile trips and parking demand generated by the project:

- Long-term and short-term bicycle parking that exceeds Code requirements
- Unbundled parking for residential units

With implementation of the above recommended project-specific conditions of approval and with implementation of the project-specific TDM requirements, impacts associated with parking code requirements would be less than significant.

2.16.2 Applicable Mitigation

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of the project-specific conditions of approval, the proposed project would not result in new impacts related to transportation. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the transportation impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts related to transportation would result.

2.16.3 Conclusion

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and with implementation of the project-specific conditions of approval, no new impacts related to transportation would result.
Table 2.E: Required Maximum and Proposed Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size(^a)</th>
<th>Required Parking Supply</th>
<th>Parking Supply</th>
<th>Within Range?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>73 DU(^b)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4.4 KSF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^a\) Source: SPASP Form-Based Code Section 2.05.07.04 - TOHIMU Zone Off-Street Parking Requirements for Residential = max 1.0 space per DU and for commercial = max 1.0 space per 1,000 sf

\(^b\) DU = dwelling unit

2.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)? Or

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

2.17.1 Discussion

As previously discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources of this checklist, the SPASP FEIR determined that impacts to cultural and historic resources would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measures 7-2 through 7-2. This finding applies to tribal cultural resources.

In addition, since certification of the SPASP FEIR, the California Legislature passed AB 52, which provides for consultation with Native American tribal organizations during the CEQA process.
Effective July 1, 2015, prior to the release of an environmental document for public review, a lead agency must provide the opportunity to consult with local tribes. However, because the SPASP FEIR was certified prior to July 1, 2015, and because this document supports the finding that the proposed project is Categorically Exempt from further CEQA review and public review is not required for this document, the City is not required to conduct formal consultation under AB 52 for this project.

2.17.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.17.3 Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resources impacts (and by extension, impacts to tribal cultural resources) of the proposed project and no new impacts would result.

2.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.18.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR determined that there would be an increase in water demand as a result of build-out of the SPASP – average daily demand would be 882,720 gallons per day (gpd) which represents approximately 0.38 percent of the planning level water demand forecasted in the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The SPASP FEIR concluded that this represents a small increase and is considered a less-than-significant impact on water supply. The SPASP FEIR also noted that development within the SPASP would incorporate the City’s requirements for providing adequate water supply, including compliance with adopted performance standards, application of these standards in each jurisdictional City’s development review process, coordination of development review with EBMUD (including consistency with the UWMP), and the requirement that new development pay its share of the costs associated with provision of water facilities through project-specific mitigations required as conditions of approval. The SPASP FEIR concluded that since future development facilitated by the SPASP, including the proposed project, would require about 0.38 percent of EBMUD’s forecasted planning level water demand for its service area by the year 2040, and would be subject to EBMUD and jurisdictional City plans, regulations, and ordinances regarding water supply, the impact on water supply is considered less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that development associated with the SPASP would result in less-than-significant impacts on utilities and service systems, including water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, and solid waste disposal. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that the water, wastewater, and storm drainage infrastructure systems would require improvements, including the upgrading of existing deficiencies, in order to accommodate new development facilitated by the SPASP. The SPASP FEIR provided recommendations and design considerations for proposed infrastructure improvements. The construction of the project-related utility infrastructure would be temporary and would occur within existing public rights-of-way, City property, a project development site, or private property subject to a municipal easement.

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along San Pablo Avenue, including the proposed project site. Wastewater generated at the project site would be collected via a 10-inch collector main along Cutting Boulevard that collects flows along San Pablo Avenue between Knott Avenue and Cutting Boulevard. Per Section 7.3 of the SSD Ordinance Code, payment of a District-wide sewer connection/capacity charge and a SPASP-specific sewer connection/capacity charge to the District. The connection/capacity charges will fund sewer capacity improvements needed to serve projected growth within the SPSPA.

The increase in commercial and residential density under the SPASP would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste generated within the SPASP area. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the increase in solid waste generation would be incremental but would not exceed acceptable rates established by plans, policies, and regulation. Moreover, the projected solid waste would be served by solid waste and recycling facilities with sufficient capacities to accommodate development included as part of the SPASP, including the proposed project. As such, solid waste impacts would remain less than significant.
2.18.2  Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.18.3  Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP, including utilities and infrastructure impacts. Development of the proposed project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project has no new impacts related to utilities and infrastructure.
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