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1.0 INTRODUCTION
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

This document is a consistency memorandum and environmental checklist to examine the environmental effects of the proposed 921 Kearney Street project (project). This document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the City of El Cerrito. According to Section 15168(c)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, a program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) can be used in compliance with CEQA to address the effects of a subsequent activity so long as the activity is within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR and no new effects are found and no new mitigation measures would be required.

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 EIR. This consistency memorandum provides a description of the proposed project and substantial evidence to confirm that the environmental effects of the project are covered by the analysis contained within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (SPASP FEIR) and would have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP FEIR. As such, the City of El Cerrito (City) can approve the 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 proposed project does not require any further review under CEQA. The analysis finds that a Notice of Exemption may be prepared for the project and filed with the Contra Costa County Clerk.

1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary responsibility over a proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15051(b)(1), “the lead agency will normally be the agency with general governmental powers.” The project will require approvals from the City, including Tier II Design Review, grading, and building permit approvals. Therefore, based on the criteria described above, the City of El Cerrito is the lead agency for the proposed project.

1.3 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This document is divided into the following chapters:

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an introduction and describes the purpose and organization of this document.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This chapter includes a detailed description of the proposed project. It also includes background information on the SPASP EIR, the project site location, existing site characteristics, and required approvals and entitlements.
3.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

This chapter provides an environmental checklist for the project, consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

4.0 **REFERENCES**

This chapter identifies resources used in the preparation of this document.
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION
This chapter describes the proposed 921 Kearney Street Project (project), which is located in the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP). This chapter includes a summary description of the project 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).

2.1 PROJECT SITE

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

LOCATION

The project site is approximately 0.31 acre (13,359 square feet) and is located at 921 Kearney Street, in El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, on the block bounded by Moeser Lane to the north, Waldo Avenue to the south, Kearney Street to the east, and San Pablo Avenue to the west. The west side of San Pablo Avenue is the El Cerrito city limit boundary with Richmond. The site is approximately 0.75 mile east of the Richmond Inner Harbor of the San Francisco Bay. Regional vehicular access to the project site is via Interstate 80 (I-80), which is approximately 0.5 mile to the west. The El Cerrito Plaza Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station is approximately 0.7 mile to the south, and the El Cerrito del Norte BART station is approximately 1.1 miles to the north. Alameda-Contra Costa (AC) Transit bus service is available within 0.25 mile of the project site.

The general area is surrounded by commercial and residential uses and a vacant parcel. Figure 2.0-1, Project Regional Vicinity, shows the site’s regional and local context. Figure 2.0-2, Project Location, depicts the project site and surrounding land uses.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND CURRENT SITE CONDITIONS

The project site is generally level and consists of two adjacent parcels (Assessor’s Parcel Numbers [APN] 503-233-007 and 503-233-032). The project site is vacant, fenced, and overgrown with vegetation.

The site is in an urban area, adjacent to residential and commercial properties. Utilities, including water, electricity, natural gas, and sewer service, are readily available.

2.2 EXISTING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) in the City’s General Plan, as shown on Figure 2.0-3, General Plan Land Use. The site is zoned TOMIMU, as shown on Figure 2.0-4, Zoning Districts. The TOMIMU designation allows for mixed-use development with a 55-foot height limit.

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 the roadway’s length and to adjacent areas. The SPASP creates a framework for transforming San Pablo Avenue into a multimodal corridor that functions as a place which 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
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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). 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 a Form-Based Code that regulates development along the corridor, a plan for complete streets, and an infrastructure analysis. The complete streets plan addresses circulation and public investment needs along San Pablo Avenue and adjoining streets to improve the user experience in 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, includes a general review of capacity limitations, and recommends feasible improvements and associated costs to avoid significant impacts on the level of service.

2.3 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would result in the construction of a 50,513-square-foot, five-story, 55-foot-tall multifamily residential structure. The project would include 71 dwelling units and 51 below-grade parking spaces, accessed via a driveway from Kearney Street (see Figure 2.0-5, Proposed Site Plan, Figure 2.0-6, Project Elevations, and Figure 2.0-7, Perspective Project View from Southeast). The project would include private roof decks accessible from the second through fifth floors and from the rooftop. The project would also include 8 short-term and 110 long-term spaces for bicycle parking.

The proposed residential units include a combination of studios, 1-bedroom units, and 2-bedroom units, as summarized in Table 2.0-1. Detailed project plans are included in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Unit Information</th>
<th>Unit Area</th>
<th>Unit Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studio</strong></td>
<td>400–522 SF</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 BR/1 BA</strong></td>
<td>500–750 SF</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 BR/2 BA</strong></td>
<td>782–1,223 SF</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residential Square Footage</strong></td>
<td>44,236 SF</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Unit Size</strong> = 623 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: SF = square feet

OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING

The proposed project would include a total of 8,685 square feet of private open space area in the form of outdoor balconies and a 5,963-square-foot roof deck for residents. The project applicant would pay in-lieu fees instead of providing public open space.
ACCESS, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING

The project would include an underground parking garage with 51 garage parking spaces reserved for residents, including 2 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) spaces, 5 electric vehicle (EV) charging stations to accommodate electric vehicles, and 1 car share space. Vehicles would access the site via a driveway on Kearney Street.

In addition to vehicular parking, a total of 110 stacked, long-term bicycle parking spaces would be included in the garage. In addition, 8 short-term bicycle parking spaces would be provided on Kearney Street.

Pedestrian access to the structure would via an entrance on Kearney Street.

PROJECT CONSTRUCTION

Construction is estimated to commence in spring of 2019 and be complete in approximately 12 months. Construction activities would be performed in accordance with the City’s Municipal Code, which permits construction 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.

Construction of the project would involve approximately 6,900 cubic yards of soil export from the site.

UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The project site is in an urban area and is currently served by existing utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, electricity and natural gas, and telecommunications infrastructure. The site is currently vacant and was previously the site of a nursery. To the extent that there are existing utilities, most of the existing utilities within the project site would be removed and replaced as required by excavation. Existing and proposed utility services and connections are discussed below.

Water

Water service in El Cerrito is provided by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). The project would connect to an existing water main located along Kearney Street adjacent to the project site.

Wastewater

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along and near San Pablo Avenue, including the proposed project site. An existing sewer main runs along Kearney Street adjacent to the project site.

Stormwater

The project would include 11,011 square feet of impervious surfaces (roof and paving) and 1,955 square feet of pervious surfaces (landscaping), as shown on Figure 2.0-8, Stormwater Control Plan. In addition, the project would incorporate five flow-through planter areas, totaling 393 square feet, to which stormwater would drain.
2.4 Approvals/Permits

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

- City of El Cerrito CEQA review, various entitlements including Tier II Design Review, grading permit, and building permit approvals
- East Bay Municipal Utility District approval of water connections
- Stege Sanitary District approval of sewer capacity and connections (per SSD Ordinance 7.2 and California Government Code Section 66013(a))
- Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) approval of electricity and natural gas connections
- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) approval per stormwater discharge orders R2-2009-0074 and R2-2011-0083
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FIGURE 2.0-5
Proposed Site Plan
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FIGURE 2.0-8
Stormwater Control Plan
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3.0 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 an environmental impact report (EIR). This checklist confirms that the proposed 921 Kearney Street Project (project) is within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR (SPASP EIR) and will have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP EIR. As such, the City of El Cerrito (City) can approve the 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 project does not require any further review under CEQA.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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 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 that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

As noted in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, the 0.31-acre project site is currently vacant. The general area surrounding the property is developed with commercial and residential uses. The site is approximately 0.75 mile east of the Richmond Inner Harbor of the San Francisco Bay and 0.5 mile east of Interstate 80 (I-80). There are no designated scenic highways or scenic vistas within 1 mile of the project site (Caltrans 2018; El Cerrito 2014a). Therefore, the project would not adversely affect scenic resources or scenic highways.

The proposed project would result in the construction of a 50,513-square-foot, five-story, 55-foot-tall multifamily residential building with 71 dwelling units. Compared to the existing vacant lot, the project would improve the visual and aesthetic character of the site by incorporating Form-Based Code and complete streets design and development standards. These design and development standards were assessed in the SPASP EIR and are located in Chapter 2, Form-Based Code, and Chapter 3, Complete Streets, of the Specific Plan (El Cerrito 2014a, 2014b). The project design incorporates elements of visual interest, including:

- Stepped massing
- Articulation: 50 percent of the façade surface area would be extruded or recessed
- Varied setbacks
- Transparency: 32 percent ground floor transparency, and upper floor transparency ranging from 43 to 61 percent
In addition, the project would incorporate a public art feature, as the access gate to the underground parking garage would be custom designed and fabricated by a recognized metal sculpture artist. See Appendix A for detailed project plans.

The city’s location between I-80 and the East Bay Hills affords views of the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco skyline, and Mount Tamalpais. The primary potentially significant impact to scenic resources identified in the SPASP EIR was the potential for Specific Plan development to obstruct scenic views of Mount Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, the San Francisco skyline, the East Bay Hills, and Albany Hill from public rights-of-way, and areas of lower elevation such as hillside homes in El Cerrito and Richmond (Impact 4-1). This impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable; however, the SPASP 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 El Cerrito zoning administrator determined that a visual analysis was not required from public rights-of-way of east–west streets for the following reasons:

- Due to the orientation of the project site, any potential view impacts would be limited to Kearney Street.
- Due to the relatively low elevation of Kearney Street, the Golden Gate Bridge, Mt. Tamalpais, Albany Hill, and the San Francisco skyline are not generally visible adjacent to the project site.
- The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan limited building lengths to 200 feet in order to preserve intermittent views. The proposed project would be less than 200 feet in length.

The SPASP EIR also found that potentially significant impacts could result from the introduction of new light and glare in the plan area (Impact 4-2), but it concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, which requires the installation of nonreflective building materials and windows, would reduce potential glare impacts of individual development projects to a less than significant level. The project would implement Mitigation Measure 4-2 and would not cause any new light and glare impacts.

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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. No new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, are required.

Conclusion

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR; it is within the allowable height limits, would be consistent with policies related to visual character and design, and would not result in a substantial increase in light and glare. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential aesthetic impacts related to the project, and there would be no new impact on visual and aesthetic resources.
### II AGRICULTURE 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. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</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 nonagricultural 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) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project site area is on an urban parcel that was previously developed and is now vacant, and 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 California Department of Conservation (2014). El Cerrito and the SPASP area do not contain any land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project is also not located on land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract (California Department of Conservation 2013). The project site is not currently used for any type of agricultural or forestry use, and is not zoned for agricultural or forestry use. The project site does not meet the definition of forestland provided in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) due to its location in an intensely developed area, which would preclude the management of any forestry resources. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact on agriculture or forestry resources.
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| III AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No New Impact |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). Air quality and compliance with federal and state standards for the SFBAAB fall under the regulatory authority of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Air quality setting, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 5, Air Quality, of the SPASP EIR.

**Discussion**

*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 nonattainment 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 SPASP EIR stated the SFBAAB was nonattainment for ozone, fine particulate matter (PM2.5), and coarse particulate matter (PM10), and there have been no changes in attainment status for the air basin since certification of the SPASP EIR.

The BAAQMD guidelines were used for the analysis in the SPASP EIR to determine whether the Specific Plan would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. When the SPASP EIR was prepared, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan was the applicable plan. The plan laid out a comprehensive strategy to reduce emissions of ozone precursors, particulate matter, greenhouse gases, and toxic air contaminants (TAC). The plan included 18 Stationary Source Measures (SSMs), 10 Mobile Source Measures (MSMs), 17 Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), 6 Land Use and Local Impact Measures (LUMs), and 4 Energy and Climate Measures (ECMs). The SPASP EIR (page 5-16) concluded that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would increase at a lower rate under the SPASP than population or service population growth, resulting in a less than significant impact related to consistency with the then-applicable clean air plan.

BAAQMD's current clean air plan is the 2017 Clean Air Plan, which was adopted on April 19, 2017 (BAAQMD 2017a). As described in the 2017 plan, all of the 2010 TCMs were carried forward into the 2017 Clean Air Plan, although the measure descriptions and numbering were updated. In
addition, 8 of the 10 MSMs, all 6 LUMs, and all 4 ECMS were carried forward into the 2017 plan. The MSMs primarily address vehicles and their components as they relate to emissions and are not directly applicable to the project. The SSMs are not applicable to the project.

The project’s population and housing units are within the scope of development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, as stated in Section XIII, Population and Housing, of this document. The project would not result in new or more significant population growth impacts than were analyzed and described in the SPASP EIR.

Consistency with the Clean Air Plan is determined by whether the project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts or hinder implementation of control measures (e.g., preclude the extension of a transit lane or bicycle path). As discussed above, project implementation would not substantially increase population, vehicle trips, or VMT. Therefore, the project would support the goals of the 2017 Clean Air Plan 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 EIR.

Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions

The SPASP EIR (page 5-21) identified that construction activities associated with implementation of the SPASP would result in short-term emissions from construction activities such as 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 EIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-1 to reduce construction impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 5-1 requires that the BAAQMD-recommended basic mitigation measures be implemented to control PM emissions during construction and BAAQMD-recommended additional measures to reduce diesel particulate matter (DPM) and PM\textsubscript{2.5} and other construction emissions to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced. Table 3-1 in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provides project screening sizes for different land uses (BAAQMD 2017b). A mid-rise apartment project of fewer than 240 dwelling units (DU) would have construction-related emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) that would be less than significant, providing that project construction does not involve demolition or extensive soil import or export.

The project size of 71 dwelling units would be below the BAAQMD screening criteria; however, project construction would require excavation for a subgrade parking structure and substantial removal of material from the project site may be required. Therefore, project construction emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2. CalEEMod allows for the use of default data (e.g., emission factors, trip lengths, meteorology, source inventory) provided by the various California air districts to account for local requirements and conditions and/or user-defined inputs. The calculation methodology and input data used in CalEEMod can be found in the CalEEMod User’s Guide Appendices A, D, and E (CAPCOA 2017). See Appendix B for the project model output files and site/project-specific assumptions used in the model.

Estimated maximum daily construction-related emissions for the project are summarized in Table 3.3-1. Construction is estimated to commence in spring of 2019 and be complete in approximately 12 months. Architectural coating activities are assumed to occur throughout the last half of the building construction period, as components are completed. Per the project applicant, construction would
require the export of approximately 6,900 cubic yards of material. Implementation of the SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1 is assumed in the emissions estimates presented in Table 3.3-1.

### Table 3.3-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Activities</th>
<th>Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions (pound per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 maximum daily emissions</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 maximum daily emissions</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions of All Years of Construction</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Potentially Significant Impact Threshold</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed BAAQMD Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. See Appendix B for emission model outputs.

Notes: 1. Project construction activities are assumed to occur over a 12-month maximum period. 2. Emissions estimates account for the quantifiable components of the SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1, specifically watering unpaved portions of the construction site twice daily, limiting off-road equipment to speeds of 15 mph, and removing dirt track-out on adjacent public roads with a wet power vacuum once daily.

As shown in Table 3.3-1, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-1, the project would not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds for construction emissions. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or more significant construction-related air quality impacts due to criteria air pollutants than were evaluated in the SPASP EIR. This impact would remain less than significant with mitigation, as identified in the SPASP EIR.

The SPASP EIR evaluated operational emissions and concluded the SPASP would not cause significant increases in VMT compared to service population growth and would not interfere with Clean Air Plan control measures (page 5-23). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in accordance with the BAAQMD significance criteria for plan-level analysis of criteria pollutants and precursors. The project would result in long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors (i.e., ROG and NOx). Project-generated increases in emissions would be predominantly associated with motor vehicle use, energy required for residential building operations, energy used due to water consumption, energy used in solid waste collection and disposal, and area sources such as hearths and use of landscaping equipment. Per Table 3-1 in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, a mid-rise apartment project of fewer than 494 dwelling units would have operational-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that would be less than significant. Therefore, the project would contribute to, but would not exceed, operational emissions impacts identified in the SPASP EIR. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP EIR.

### Other Air Pollutants

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others because of the types of population groups or activities involved. Sensitive population groups include children, the elderly, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill, especially those with cardiorespiratory diseases. Residential areas are considered sensitive receptors to air pollution because residents (including children and
the elderly) tend to be at home for extended periods of time, resulting in sustained exposure to any pollutants present. Recreational land uses are considered moderately sensitive to air pollution.

As a residential development, the project itself is considered a new sensitive receptor. The closest existing sensitive receptors are a single-family home adjacent to the project to the south, and multifamily residential buildings and single-family homes across Kearney Street to the east. The closest school is the Fairmont Elementary School, approximately 920 feet to the south.

**Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots**

Recognizing the relatively low carbon monoxide (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 does not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. As identified in the SPASP EIR (page 16-31), 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 lower 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.

**Toxic Air Contaminants and PM$_{2.5}$**

The SPASP EIR (page 5-24) concluded that construction activities could result in short-term emissions of DPM, which is a TAC. DPM emissions would be generated with the use of off-road diesel equipment required for demolition, excavation, paving, and other construction activities. Although the use of diesel-powered construction equipment would be temporary and episodic, the SPASP EIR concluded this would be a potentially significant impact. The SPASP EIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-2 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. A health risk screening was completed for the project to analyze the potential impacts on the closest sensitive receptors to the project site from the project’s estimated construction emissions using the CARB Hotspots Analysis and Reporting Program, Air Dispersion Modeling and Risk Tool (ADMRT) version 18159, following the OEHHA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program – Risk Assessment Guidelines (OEHHA 2015). The ADMRT incorporates air dispersion modeling from specified pollutant sources using the EPA AERMOD Gaussian model; calculation of local concentrations; and evaluation of the resulting health risks for specified sensitive receptors. The ADMRT output files, model inputs, and assumptions are included in Appendix B. Inputs to the screening model included CARB meteorological data from the Oakland International Airport station, terrain data from the CARB Richmond 30-meter digital elevation model file, and the project’s estimated construction maximum daily and total emissions of exhaust PM$_{10}$ from CalEEMod. DPM comprises a complex mixture of particles, 90 percent of which are less than 1 micron in size. The health risk screening conservatively assumes that 100 percent of the construction exhaust PM$_{10}$ generated on the project site is DPM.

The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines recommend thresholds for assessing community health risks for individual projects of a maximum increased excess cancer risk of 10 in one million, and a maximum chronic health risk index of 1.0. For the closest sensitive receptors to the project site (a single-family home adjacent to the project to the south, and multifamily residential buildings and single-family homes across Kearney Street to the east), the health risk screening estimated the maximum increased excess cancer risk from project-generated construction DPM would be 0.095 in 1 million and the maximum chronic health index would be 0.0001. Therefore, the impact on community health risks resulting from project construction TAC emissions would be less than significant.
The BAAQMD has also determined that localized concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ could pose a health risk. PM$_{2.5}$ has not been designated as a TAC by CARB, and cancer or health risk exposure levels have not been established. The BAAQMD has recommended thresholds for a maximum increase in PM$_{2.5}$ concentration resulting from a project of 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter annual average. Using the maximum daily and total on-site project construction PM$_{2.5}$ emissions (including both exhaust and fugitive dust sources), the health risk screening estimated that the maximum increased annual average concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ at the closest sensitive receptors would be 0.0005 micrograms per cubic meter. Therefore, the impact on community health risks would be less than significant.

Implementation of the SPASP would allow new residential land uses that include sensitive receptors. For long-term operations, the SPASP EIR (page 5-25) concluded that if projects under the SPASP are located within the overlay distances listed in Table 5-7 in the EIR, this would represent a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure 5-3 requires a TAC analysis to determine the location of new sensitive receptors within the overlay distances. The project’s residential uses would not be within the overlay distances of any sources of TACs identified in Table 5-7. Therefore, new sensitive receptor exposure risk due to stationary or mobile source TAC emissions would be less than significant.

**Odors**

The SPASP EIR (page 5-30) identified that the Specific Plan 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. Mitigation Measure 5-4 was adopted to ensure potential land use compatibility impacts due to odors would be appropriately identified and mitigated. Consistent with SPASP policies and Mitigation Measure 5-4, the project would be in an area surrounded by commercial uses and would not be in an area where substantial odors (such as those associated with industrial, manufacturing, processing, or treatment uses) are generated. This would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation would be required.

**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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1, would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is within the scope of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. The project would be required to implement SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1. A construction health risk screening analysis was prepared in conformance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 5-2, and no significant impact was identified. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential air quality impacts of the project, and there would be no new or more severe impacts associated with air quality than previously identified in the SPASP EIR.
**3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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 Wildlife or US 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, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US 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 wetlands, 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>

**Discussion**

The project site is in a highly urbanized area in El Cerrito. The site is vacant land that was previously disturbed for non-extant development.

The SPASP EIR found that implementation of the SPASP would largely result in minimal impacts to biological resources because the Specific Plan area is a highly developed urban area with approximately 90 percent of the land developed, recently disturbed, or ruderal (El Cerrito 2014b). The SPASP EIR 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, nor does the plan area contain any federally protected wetlands (El Cerrito 2014b). No creeks, wetlands, or riparian habitats are near or adjacent to the property; therefore, the project would not result in any significant impacts on these habitats.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The SPASP EIR 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds. The EIR identified Mitigation Measure 6-1 to minimize potentially significant impacts associated with tree removal on nesting birds to less than significant levels. In addition, the City would require two project-specific conditions of approval:

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** In order to avoid impacts to Monarch butterfly, due to the removal of trees, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys during the spring and summer no more than 30 (thirty) days prior to the start of grading or vegetation removal. Pre-construction surveys are not required if construction activities are restricted to the non-larval season (fall and winter).

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** The replacement requirement for trees shall be calculated based upon a 2:1 replacement ratio for all coast live oaks removed. The total of replacement trees shall be required to have a combined diameter of twice the tree diameter removed. Smaller diameter trees shall be replaced with either 15-gallon or 24-inch boxes and larger diameter trees shall be replaced with up to 36-inch box. Replacement trees may be planted on-site or in another area to the satisfaction of the City of El Cerrito Planning Department. Such replanting must not result in the over-planting of the identified site.

The project would result in the removal of existing trees and other vegetation on the project site. However, tree removal would comply with all City requirements, SPASP Mitigation Measure 6-1, and the two project-specific conditions of approval noted above, to minimize impacts on biological resources during removal.

**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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. With the implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measure 6-1 and the project-specific conditions of approval, no new impacts related to biological resources would result.

**Conclusion**

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR and the El Cerrito General Plan. Tree removal activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 6-1 and the project-specific conditions of approval. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential biological impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact on biological resources.
### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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 Section 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 Section 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 geological 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>

### Discussion

#### Historic Resources

The SPASP EIR identified properties or features within the Specific Plan area that may be eligible for listing in a local, state, or federal register of historic resources. The EIR identified Mitigation Measure 7-1 to be applied to any individual discretionary project within the Specific Plan area that the City determines may involve a property that contains a potentially significant historic resource (e.g., a recorded historic resource or an unrecorded building or structure 45 years or older). Mitigation Measure 7-1 requires the resource to be evaluated by City staff, and if warranted, assessed by a qualified professional on the California Historical Resources Information System list of consultants who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards, to determine whether the property is a significant historical resource and whether or not the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the historical resource. The project site is vacant and does not contain any buildings that could be considered a historic resource. Therefore, there would be no potential for new impacts on historic resources and implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1 is not required for the proposed project.

#### Archaeological and Paleontological Resources

The SPASP EIR concluded that the potential impact of development within the Specific Plan area on cultural resources, including archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains, would be less than significant with implementation of recommended mitigation measures (El Cerrito 2014b). 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. The EIR identified Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, which would reduce the potential impacts on known or undisclosed cultural resources to less than significant levels.

This area of El Cerrito has been identified as sensitive for buried prehistoric cultural resources (Koenig 2013). Since there is elevated prehistoric archaeological sensitivity and the potential exists for previously unknown cultural resources to be encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the project site, implementation by the applicant of Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3 would be required. These measures specify compliance with existing codes and regulations applicable to the accidental discovery of archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

during construction activities. As such, with implementation of previously identified mitigation measures, the project would have no new impact on cultural resources.

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 EIR 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, would be required.

Conclusion

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Discussion of potential geology and soils impacts associated with the project are based on the Kearney Street Flats Multi-Family Housing Foundation Investigation and Recommendations report (Karp 2017), presented as Appendix C of this document. The report examines potential impacts resulting from site clearing, constructing an underground parking garage and access ramps, minor grading, tree removal, installing stormwater drainage facilities, landscaping, and associated project improvements. Key information from the report is summarized below:

Geology and Soils

The project site is vacant, relatively flat, and overgrown with vegetation. Slope stability hazards are considered unlikely since there are no significant potentially liquefiable strata and the lot is level. The site is underlain by surficial soils consisting of unclassified older alluvium. Alluvium is composed of unconsolidated sand, silt, clay, and minor gravels in various proportions and densities. The clays in the alluvium are known to be potentially expansive. Surficial clays are critically expansive.
Foundations put in expansive soil generally require special design consideration; however, this consideration generally does not apply to the foundations of larger structures such as the proposed project because of the relatively deep foundation. Surficial clays can be managed if sitework is properly designed and constructed. Damage to surface improvements from expansive soils may be mitigated by engineering foundations and flatwork with the installation and continued maintenance of landscaping and proper drainage. The foundation system for the project recommended in the geotechnical report is a deep stiffened raft which would not be affected by expansive soil.

**Seismic Conditions**

The closest active earthquake faults are the Hayward, San Andreas, and Calaveras faults. The Hayward fault is approximately 1.15 miles northeast of the project site and, of the three, is the closest. Based on U.S. Geological Survey (2014) research, the San Francisco Bay Area will likely experience an earthquake magnitude of 6.7 or greater by 2045. As a result, the project site would be subjected to strong ground shaking from earthquakes generated by the San Andreas and Hayward faults, as well as by any active Bay Area faults. Risk of damage to the project site from fault rupturing, landsliding, compaction, liquefaction, and lateral spreading is relatively low (Karp 2017).

The SPASP EIR 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 area is not located in an Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone, the likelihood of surface fault rupture is minimal. In addition, the SPASP EIR found that slope instability hazards are also minimal due to the absence of appreciable slopes in the SPASP area.

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 EIR determined that impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant with compliance with the latest California Building Standards Code. The project would be designed and constructed in accordance with these requirements. In compliance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 8-1, the project applicant has prepared a geotechnical report for the project site (Karp 2017; Appendix C). The project would also implement project design features and actions discussed in the geotechnical report to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

The SPASP EIR 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 outlined in the geotechnical report would reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level.

As discussed above, near-surface soils are weak and expansive and the project would incorporate appropriate building design and engineering standards, as provided in Appendix C. The project would also comply with California Building Standards Code construction and design standards for seismic safety, demolition, excavation, foundations, erosion control, and associated activities.

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 project or in the Specific Plan area.
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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required. In compliance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 8-1, the project applicant has prepared a geotechnical report for the project site (see Appendix C).

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR and would be required to comply with the California Building Standards Code and City-required erosion control techniques. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential geology and soil impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact associated with geology and soils.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII GREENHOUSE GASES. Would the project:</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). Air quality and compliance with state greenhouse gas (GHG) and climate change goals and policies for the SFBAAB fall under the regulatory authority of the BAAQMD. GHG science, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 9, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change, of the SPASP EIR.

GHG emissions in this discussion are presented in carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e), which weigh each gas by its global warming potential. Expressing GHG emissions in CO₂e takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO₂ were being emitted.

Discussion

GHG Emissions

The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines contain a methodology and thresholds of significance for evaluating GHG emissions. BAAQMD thresholds were developed based on substantial evidence that such thresholds represent quantitative levels of GHG emissions, and compliance with which means that the environmental impact of the GHG emissions would normally not be cumulatively considerable under CEQA (BAAQMD 2009, 2017b).

BAAQMD recommends that lead agencies determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they should include in the administrative record for the project. BAAQMD provides the CEQA Thresholds Options and Justification Report developed by staff in 2009 as a reference for lead agencies when determining appropriate thresholds.

BAAQMD does not have an adopted threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions. The lead agency is encouraged to incorporate best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction, as applicable. Best management practices may include, but are not limited to, using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet, using local building materials of at least 10 percent, and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials (BAAQMD 2017b).

For plan-level operational emissions, BAAQMD recommends applying a specific plan-level GHG efficiency threshold of 6.6 metric tons (MT) CO₂e per year per service population. The SPASP EIR compared plan-level GHG emissions to the more conservative BAAQMD project-level efficiency threshold of 4.6 MTCO₂e per year per service population. Table 3-1 in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provides project screening sizes for different land uses. Per BAAQMD guidance,
a mid-rise apartment project of fewer than 87 DU would have construction-related emissions of ROG that would not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds. The project would consist of a mid-rise apartment building with 71 DU, which is below the BAAQMD screening criterion.

In the SPASP EIR (page 9-7), operational GHG emissions in 2040 were estimated for both traffic scenarios—Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift—using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2.2. Inputs of land use types, sizes, and trip generation rates from the SPASP were used in the modeling. The SPASP EIR found that 2040 full development capacity associated with development under the SPASP would have emissions of 3.9 and 3.7 MTCO$_2$e per year per service population under the Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift cases, respectively, neither of which would exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 4.6 MTCO$_2$e per year per service population. Therefore, the SPASP EIR concluded this impact would be less than significant.

The project’s population and housing units are within the scope of development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, as stated in Section XIII, Population and Housing, of this document. The project would not result in new or more significant population growth than was analyzed and described in the SPASP EIR. In addition, the project size is below the BAAQMD screening criterion for GHG emissions. Therefore, the project would contribute to, but would not exceed, GHG emissions impacts identified in the SPASP EIR. This impact would remain less than significant.

**Consistency with Adopted Plans to Reduce GHG Emissions**

The SPASP EIR analyzed this impact (page 9-9) and concluded that the SPASP would be subject to new requirements under rule making developed at the state and local levels regarding GHG emissions. The plan would also be subject to local and General Plan policies, including the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, that are expected to reduce emissions of GHGs. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

As required by the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (Senate Bill 375), the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) developed a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) plan as a component of Plan Bay Area 2040 (ABAG and MTC 2017). This plan seeks to reduce GHG and other mobile source emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning to reduce VMT. The SPASP furthers these goals locally by supporting higher-density, transit-oriented development that results in a mix of housing types, greater employment density, and community-support services to create a vibrant, walkable Priority Development Area supportive of transportation mode shift and economic development.

The El Cerrito Climate Action Plan outlines the most effective actions to reduce locally produced GHG emissions and to create a safer and more sustainable El Cerrito (El Cerrito 2013). The plan outlines a series of sustainable community strategies, which include encouraging more compact, higher-density infill development to reduce VMT. The Specific Plan supports the goal to create a walkable, bicycle-friendly San Pablo Avenue supported by strong public transportation use, vital commercial activity, a mix of housing types, pedestrian design elements, green infrastructure, and urban green open spaces.

The project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services. The project would develop high-density residential uses on the site, similar to what the SPASP envisioned and in support of land use planning strategies identified in Plan Bay Area 2040 and the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with adopted plans to reduce GHG emissions. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP EIR.
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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is within the scope of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. The project would be required to comply with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential GHG emissions impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact associated with GHG emissions than previously identified in the SPASP EIR.
### VIII  HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

The SPASP EIR concluded that there were no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials within the SPASP plan area. The SPASP EIR did identify the potential to expose construction workers to existing spilled, leaked, or otherwise discharged hazardous materials or wastes during development project construction, due to the large number of auto-related businesses in the SPASP area. However, the SPASP EIR determined that compliance with all applicable requirements for site assessment, remediation, removal, and disposal 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 (El Cerrito 2014b).
Site Conditions

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and a Phase II Subsurface Investigation have been prepared for the project. Information in this section is from a summary of these reports, prepared by Schutze & Associates, which is included as Appendix D of this document (Schutze & Associates 2017).

As described in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, the project site is a vacant 0.31-acre parcel. The site has a street frontage on Kearney Street to the east, and is surrounded in other directions by commercial and residential development and vacant land. The project site was formerly used by a commercial nursery operation for approximately 50 years. Sanborn maps from 1949 to 1970 depicted two greenhouses at the northern portion of the property and a private (non-commercial) auto garage at the eastern side of the property. Aerial photographs from the 1950s and 1960s depicted rows of plants occupying the central and southern portions of the site, indicating that the entire property was used for nursery operations, consistent with information from City directories. Adjacent and nearby properties were historically either residential or were occupied by various retail and service businesses, including Huey’s Laundrette/Huey’s Laundry & Dry Cleaning (10520 San Pablo Avenue), listed at a west-adjacent property from 1995 to 2003.

Schutze & Associates conducted a site reconnaissance at the project site and vicinity on December 15, 2016. At the time of the site reconnaissance, the site was a vacant, grassy lot with mature trees and bushes. No structures were observed at the property. The site boundary was fenced off on the western, northern, and eastern sides with wooden or chain-link fencing, including the access driveway from Kearney Street. The southern site boundary with an adjacent vacant lot was not marked. Evidence of stressed vegetation or dumping of hazardous materials was not observed. Adjacent properties were occupied by single-family homes, apartment buildings, and various small businesses. The Huey’s Laundry facility no longer existed at the west-adjacent property. No issues of environmental concern were observed either at the subject property or at adjacent and nearby properties during the site reconnaissance.

Recognized Environmental Conditions

Recognized environmental conditions (RECs) are defined as "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment" (ASTM 2013). RECs identified for the site include the historical use of the site as a commercial nursery and the historical presence of an adjacent dry-cleaner facility.

Based on these prior findings, Schutze & Associates conducted a Limited Phase II Subsurface Investigation in 2017 to analyze soil samples for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), including chlorinated solvents, to investigate if the former adjacent dry-cleaner facility had impacted groundwater beneath the site. The Limited Phase II also analyzed soil samples for pesticides and metals, including arsenic, lead and mercury, to further investigate potential impacts to shallow soils at the site by pesticides that may have been used by the former on-site nursery.

The laboratory analytical results indicated low or non-detect concentrations for VOCs, total petroleum hydrocarbons, and metals in groundwater. Chlorinated solvents were not detected above laboratory reporting limits in the groundwater samples. Based on these results, there is a low potential that chlorinated solvents potentially originating from the adjacent historical dry-cleaning facility have impacted groundwater beneath the project site (Schutze & Associates 2017).
Pesticides and herbicides were either not detected or were detected at concentrations below or slightly above corresponding environmental screening levels. Lead and arsenic were detected in all analyzed soil samples. Lead in two shallow soil samples exceeded the environmental screening level of 80 mg/kg and arsenic concentrations in several shallow soil samples exceeded the Bay Area’s estimated background level for arsenic of 11 mg/kg. The concentrations of lead and arsenic detected indicate an impact to the shallow soils at the project site, likely caused by activities associated with the former on-site plant nursery. In addition to these identified locations, other “hot spots” where lead and arsenic levels are elevated may potentially exist at the site (Schutze & Associates 2017). No further environmental investigation concerning the former adjacent dry-cleaner facility is warranted (ibid).

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** To address the shallow soil contamination by lead and arsenic from the former nursery operation, the project would incorporate one of the following remediation measures:

- **Option 1:** Excavate and dispose of apparent arsenic/lead-impacted soil from the site areas with the highest detections. The extent of the excavations would be based on the results from the current Limited Phase II and would roughly correspond to the soil excavation areas recommended by a prior Phase II report in 2013. If practicable, additional shallow soil samples could be collected by hand augur at portions of the site not yet sampled to determine if other “hot spots” with elevated lead and arsenic exist. The excavation activities could be coordinated with future redevelopment plans for the site. Based on the currently available data, the excavated soil to be transported for disposal is expected to be nonhazardous.

- **Option 2:** Remove and dispose of soil to a depth of approximately 1 foot across the property in conjunction with anticipated grading and excavation activities during future redevelopment of the site. Removal of potentially impacted soil could be coordinated with construction of the proposed subgrade parking level.

The SPASP EIR determined that the residential, commercial, and open space uses planned for the Specific Plan area 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, paint, and solvents, but would be subject to local, state, and federal regulations. The EIR determined that implementation of these standard regulations would ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

Following these requirements, the project would be required to investigate any potential soil or groundwater contamination at the site and comply with existing regulations. As described above, the applicant has investigated RECs (see Appendix D) and identified measures that the project would include to address the shallow soil contamination by lead and arsenic from the former nursery operation. These measures would be included as a project-specific condition of approval. All remediation and construction activities would comply with applicable regulations to ensure that potential health and safety impacts are less than significant.

**Schools**

There are several private and public schools within 1 mile of the project site, including Fairmont Elementary School, Harding Elementary School, Cameron School, St. John the Baptist School, Balboa School, Korematsu Middle School, and El Cerrito High School. The nearest school is Fairmont Elementary School, which is approximately 920 feet to the south. The project, a residential...
development, would comply with applicable regulations to ensure that potential health and safety impacts are less than significant and would not result in impacts related to handling hazardous materials near a school.

### Airports and Airstrips

The project site is approximately 20 miles northwest of the nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the plan area. Because the project is not located within the Oakland International Airport Influence Area, no safety hazards would be anticipated (El Cerrito 2014b).

### Emergency Response

The El Cerrito Fire Department (ECFD) is responsible for the City's Emergency Operations Center and development of the Emergency Operations Plan in the event of a major disaster affecting El Cerrito and the community of Kensington. The Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond share reciprocal duties for emergency response services. The Richmond Fire Department (RFD) Office of Emergency Services leads the City of Richmond's comprehensive emergency management, including planning and preparedness for, response and recovery from, and mitigation of natural, man-made, and accidental incidents of high consequence. In addition, both the ECFD and the RFD participate in the Community Emergency Response Team program, which provides training for fire safety, hazardous material and terrorist incidents, disaster medical operations, and search and rescue to enable its citizens to be self-sufficient for up to 72 hours and beyond in the event of a major disaster. The SPASP EIR states that all roadways must be engineered and maintained to support emergency response vehicles and equipment. The project would be developed on an infill site that is currently vacant and would therefore not result in significant impacts to an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

### Wildfire Hazards

Areas of Very High Fire Hazard Severity are designated in the El Cerrito General Plan, and a Special Study Map is prepared and maintained by the City's Building Official (El Cerrito 2014b). Such areas are located near East Bay Regional Park District open space and certain City parks, but the Specific Plan area and the project site are not located in the vicinity of a wildfire hazard area. Since the project site is not within or adjacent to a wildland area, the project would not be subject to significant wildland fire risks.

The SPASP EIR concluded that there are no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials within the Specific Plan area. The EIR 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 EIR 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 that potential impacts are less than significant. Specifically, compliance with City of El Cerrito, Water Board, and DTSC requirements would ensure that health and safety impacts associated with implementation of individual development projects are less than significant.

### 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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, no new impacts related to hazards would result.
Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to hazardous soil or groundwater conditions at the site during ground-disturbing activities. As noted above, the project would include a project-specific condition of approval to address the shallow soil contamination by lead and arsenic from the former nursery operation identified on the site. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials at or affecting the proposed project site, and there would be no new impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.
## IX HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

The site is a vacant 13,359-square foot vegetated parcel. The site is flat and the general area surrounding the site gently slopes toward the San Francisco Bay. Sitework for the project would include ramps for the underground parking, minor grading, drainage, pavements, and landscaping. Currently, the site is entirely pervious; with the project, 13,359 square feet of impervious surface would be created, covering the entire site. Residential structures would account for 88 percent site coverage (BFK 2017).

The SPASP EIR determined that long-term water quality impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP could result in contamination of Specific Plan area stormwater runoff with petroleum and other contaminants from motor vehicles. However, compliance with State Water Resources
Control Board (SWRCB) and jurisdictional, City-required, post-construction, non-point-source pollution control measures would ensure that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. In addition, the SPASP EIR determined that compliance with applicable SWRCB and City of El Cerrito water quality protection requirements and conditions would ensure any potential construction period and post-construction water quality impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The project would create or replace more than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface area and would be subject to coverage under Provision C.3 of the Water Board stormwater NPDES permit. Because the site would have less than 0.5 acre of impervious surface area (including residential buildings) and no surface parking, the project qualifies as a Category A Special Project under the Contra Costa County Clean Water Program (BFK 2017). As installing low-impact development (LID) features for stormwater treatment throughout the site would be infeasible, irrigation piping would be installed in the proposed garage and where appropriate to treat ground-level runoff, thus satisfying NPDES C.3 permitting requirements.

The project would comply with NPDES requirements, including a Stormwater Control Plan, consistent with requirements for all projects in the SPASP area (see Figure 2.0-8, Stormwater Control Plan, and detailed project plans in Appendix A). The City will confirm that this plan conforms to all applicable local and state requirements as part of the development review process.

The East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) provides water to the City of El Cerrito. The City does not use local groundwater resources. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on groundwater supplies or recharge rates.

The SPASP EIR identified that portions of the Specific Plan area in Richmond along Central Avenue are located within a 100-year flood zone. However, the project site is not located in this zone and would therefore not result in any impacts related to flooding. The project is not located near a dam or levee. There are no rivers or streams near the project area. Furthermore, the SPASP area is not subject to inundation by seiche or mudflow. The southwest portion of the SPASP along Central Avenue in Richmond is located near a tsunami inundation zone; however, the project is not located near this area.

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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to stormwater discharge. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the hydrology and water quality impacts of the project, and there would be no new impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.
### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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>

**Discussion**

The SPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would provide for the expansion of housing choices by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing and mixed-use (commercial/housing) development in the Specific Plan area, at densities and heights within the limits that were already permitted. Implementation of the SPASP was determined not to result in the division of an established community because the area was primarily developed prior to future buildout under the Specific Plan. The SPASP EIR 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 (El Cerrito 2014b).

The project site is designated TOMIMU (Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use) in the City’s General Plan and SPASP, and zoned as TOMIMU. The intent of the TOMIMU designation is to provide for a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented higher-density area within 1 mile of BART that allows a variety of uses, including retail, commercial, residential, and public uses in the downtown and uptown areas. The TOMIMU designation allows for a 55-foot height limit (a height of 65 feet is permissible for affordable housing projects) and requires a minimum height of three stories for residential uses. The project is consistent with the type, intensity, and scale of development contemplated by the SPASP in this location.

The project would comply with the development and design standards of the Specific Plan and would go to the City’s Design Review Board. The project would not deviate from SPASP development standards related to building height, length of building façades, new shadows, and transparency of ground-floor uses (see detailed project plans in Appendix A). The project would comply with the standards of the TOMIMU designation and would develop the site with a mix of residential uses in close proximity to transit as envisioned in the Specific Plan and analyzed in the SPASP EIR.

No existing habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan would apply to the project vicinity, and there would be no impact.
Applicable Mitigation

No substantial land use 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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP EIR, and required by the City of El Cerrito General Plan. Therefore, the project would not result in new impacts related to land use and planning.
### XI MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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 project does not involve the loss of an available known resource that would be of value to the region. The City of El Cerrito General Plan does not identify mineral resources within the Specific Plan area (El Cerrito 1999). Therefore, the project would have no new impacts on mineral resources.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII NOISE. Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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 of 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 area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a 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>

Noise setting, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 13, Noise, of the SPASP EIR. All noise levels reported in this section are in terms of A-weighted levels (dBA) but may be expressed as dB, unless otherwise noted.

Discussion

This section compares noise impacts from the project with impacts identified in the SPASP EIR. The project would include residential uses in a developed area in 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 result from the project. Stationary source noise includes noise generated on-site by the project’s residential uses.

Traffic on San Pablo Avenue, approximately 165 feet west of the project (measured to the roadway centerline), is the primary contributor to the existing ambient background noise. Other components of the existing noise environment include traffic on Kearney Street, adjacent to the site; traffic on I-80 approximately 0.47 mile to the west; noise from the BART train tracks approximately 400 feet to the east; and operational noise from the adjacent commercial and residential uses (e.g., parking lot activities, building mechanical equipment, people talking).

In order to quantify existing ambient noise levels in the project area, Michael Baker conducted three 15-minute noise measurements (see Appendix E). The measurements were taken with a Larson Davis SoundExpert LxT precision sound level meter, which satisfies the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for general environmental noise measurement instrumentation. Prior to taking measurements, the SoundExpert LxT sound level meter was calibrated according to...
manufacturer specifications with a Larson Davis CAL200 Class I Calibrator. The noise meter output files are included in Appendix E.

The noise measurement sites were representative of typical existing noise exposure within and immediately adjacent to the project site. Peak traffic hours for the project area are expected to occur between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. Tuesday through Thursday. The short-term measurements were taken between 4:00 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 10, 2018. The short-term (Leq) measurements are considered representative of the noisiest hour of the day. Noise measurement location 1 was at the southeast corner of the project site, near Kearney Street. Noise measurement location 2 was at the northeast corner of the project site, near Kearney Street. Noise measurement location 3 was near the northwest corner of the project site, in the parking lot adjacent to the project. During the noise measurements, traffic on San Pablo Avenue and Kearney Street were noted prevalent noise sources as well as multiple BART trains passing on the tracks to the east. The average noise levels and sources of noise measured at each location are listed in Table 3.12-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Primary Noise Sources</th>
<th>Noise Level Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southeast corner of the project site on Kearney Street</td>
<td>May 10, 2018 4:13 PM</td>
<td>Residences, traffic, BART</td>
<td>L_eq: 58.7; L_min: 53.4; L_max: 53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northeast corner of the project site on Kearney Street</td>
<td>May 10, 2018 4:43 PM</td>
<td>Residences, traffic, BART</td>
<td>L_eq: 72.7; L_min: 66.4; L_max: 65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northwest corner of the project site in the adjacent parking lot</td>
<td>May 10, 2018 5:10 PM</td>
<td>Parking lot, traffic, BART</td>
<td>L_eq: 48.6; L_min: 46.6; L_max: 46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples of these include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, child care facilities, and senior housing. As a mixed-use residential/commercial development, the project itself is considered a new sensitive receptor. The closest existing sensitive receptors are a single-family home adjacent to the project to the south, and multifamily residential buildings and single-family homes across Kearney Street to the east. The closest school is the Fairmont Elementary School, approximately 920 feet to the south.

Noise and Land Use Compatibility

The SPASP EIR found that residential land uses facilitated by the SPASP would be exposed to exterior noise levels exceeding 60 dB Ldn from traffic noise and 70 dB Ldn from BART noise. Future noise levels would exceed El Cerrito’s land use compatibility standards. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. The City General Plan Policy H3.9 and the SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 13-1 require a project-specific noise impact analysis if proposed residential development would be in an area exceeding an exterior noise level of 60 dBA Ldn.

---

Table 3.12-1
Existing Noise Measurements

---

Ldn (day-night average sound level) is a time of day weighted measure of average community noise.
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The project site is approximately 165 feet from the roadway centerline of San Pablo Avenue. Traffic noise from this high-volume roadway would be the dominant source of noise on the project site. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108) was used to predict traffic noise levels from San Pablo Avenue at the project site. The model calculates the average noise level at specific locations based on traffic volumes, average speeds, roadway geometry, and site environmental conditions. The average vehicle noise rates (energy rates) used in the FHWA model have been modified to reflect average vehicle noise rates identified for California by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The Caltrans data shows that California automobile noise is 0.8 to 1.0 dBA higher than national levels and that medium and heavy truck noise is 0.3 to 3.0 dBA lower than national levels. The traffic noise model output files are included in Appendix E.

The 921 Kearney Street Traffic Considerations & Consistency Review completed for the project (Appendix F) estimated that the project would generate 415 trips per day (Michael Baker International 2018). Conservatively assuming that 100 percent of the project trips would use San Pablo Avenue (State Route 123) and using the average daily traffic volume of 22,000 vehicles reported by Caltrans, Table 3.12-2 shows the calculated roadway noise levels under existing traffic levels compared to project conditions (Caltrans 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Ldn @ 100 Feet from Roadway Centerline</th>
<th>Distance (feet) from Roadway Centerline to:</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Ldn @ 100 Feet from Roadway Centerline</th>
<th>Distance (feet) from Roadway Centerline to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Avenue to Potrero Avenue</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>22,415</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on project trip generation in the 921 Kearney Street Traffic Considerations & Consistency Review (2018) and 2016 Caltrans Traffic Counts. Traffic noise levels were calculated using the FHWA roadway noise prediction model. Refer to Appendix E for traffic noise modeling output tables.

Notes: ADT = average daily trips; Ldn = Day-night average sound level in A-weighted decibels (dBA).

As shown in Table 3.12-2, traffic noise from San Pablo Avenue at the project property line (approximately 165 feet from the roadway centerline) would not exceed the City exterior noise standard of 60 dBA Ldn. This would be consistent with the peak traffic hour noise measurements taken at the project site, which show a 15-minute average noise level of 53.4 to 58.7 dBA (see Table 3.12-1, above). Therefore, a project-specific noise impact analysis is not required for the project.

Stationary Source Noise Impacts

Implementation of the project would generate noise from various on-site stationary sources, including heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, parking lot activities, and solid waste collection and recycling operations. The nearest off-site sensitive receptor in the project vicinity is the single-family home adjacent to the project site to the south.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

HVAC equipment is often mounted on rooftops, located on the ground, or placed 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 City noise standards.

Precise details of HVAC equipment, including future location, sizing, and any sound enclosures, are unknown at the time of this analysis. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, a conservative level of 80 dB Lmax at 3 feet was assumed to represent HVAC-related noise with a location on the building roof approximately centered. Noise produced near the ground propagates outwards in a hemispherical pattern and diminishes (attenuates) at a rate of approximately 6 dB for every doubling of distance. The closest off-site residences, approximately 75 feet from a center rooftop HVAC system location, would be exposed to a noise level of 52 dB Lmax generated by HVAC equipment. This noise level would not result in an exceedance of the City’s standard acceptable noise level of 60 dB Ldn for residential exterior spaces.

The primary parking for the project would be in an enclosed subgrade parking garage. Typical parking noise includes engine sounds, car doors slamming, car alarms, tire noise, and people conversing. These noises would be substantially reduced by the exterior walls of the parking garage and noise levels at nearby residential buildings, and would not be expected to exceed the City’s residential noise standards.

Therefore, stationary noise impacts due to long-term operation of the project would be less than significant.

Mobile Source Noise Impacts
Motor vehicles are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity. The amount of noise varies according to many factors, such as volume of traffic, vehicle mix (percentage of cars and trucks), average traffic speed, and distance from the observer. The SPASP DEIR (page 13-21) 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 would be less than 1 dB Ldn. 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 would be less than significant.

Implementation of the project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project vicinity. As shown in Table 3.12-2, above, with implementation of the project, traffic noise levels from San Pablo Avenue at 100 feet from the roadway centerline would not measurably increase. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP EIR.

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 earthmoving equipment, such as graders, scrapers, and bulldozers, generate maximum noise levels of 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels are about 80 to 85 dB measured at a distance of 50 feet from the site during busy construction periods.

The SPASP EIR concluded that although construction noise would be localized to the individual site, businesses and residences would be intermittently exposed to high levels of noise throughout.

---

2 Lmax: The maximum instantaneous noise level experienced during a given period of time.
the plan horizon. Construction would elevate noise levels at adjacent businesses and residences by 15 to 20 dB 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 concluded that construction noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The project would be on a small site, which would limit the size and number of construction equipment in use. The project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period noise impacts than were described in the SPASP EIR. The project would require the implementation of the Municipal Code, City of El Cerrito General Plan policies, and Mitigation Measure 13-3, as included in the SPASP EIR. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable, as identified in the SPASP EIR.

Construction-Related Vibration

The SPASP EIR 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 site preparation work, foundation work, pile driving, and new building erection. Demolition for an individual site may last several weeks and at times may produce substantial vibration. Vibratory driven piles or drilled caissons could be used to stabilize 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, groundborne 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 for producing vibration (pile driving and vibratory compacting) would be intermittent and would only occur for short periods of time for any individual project site. With the 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 the 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 EIR found construction-related vibration impacts to be potentially significant and identified Mitigation Measure 13-4 to reduce those impacts to the extent feasible. However, it may not be possible to avoid using pile drivers, jackhammers, and related construction equipment entirely during construction associated with the SPASP. Due to the proximity 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 groundborne vibrations below a level of significance. Therefore, this impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable in the SPASP EIR.

Ground Vibration from BART Operations

The SPASP EIR identified that future development under the Specific Plan would not expose persons to excessive vibration from BART operations. This impact would be less than significant.

Along the entire SPASP area, BART operates on an elevated platform. According to data in the Federal Transportation Agency (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. \(^3\) Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

The project is more than 400 feet from the BART tracks. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to any new or more significant groundborne vibration impacts than were described in the SPASP EIR. This impact would remain less than significant.

**Aircraft Noise**

The SPASP EIR did not address potential aircraft noise impacts for the project. The project is not located within 2 miles of a public or private use airport. Aircraft noise is occasionally audible at the project site. However, no portion of the project site lies within the 65 dB 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. \(^4\) Therefore, the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources, and there would be no impact.

**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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP EIR Mitigation Measures 13-1, 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4, would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is within the scope of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. The project would be required to implement SPASP EIR Mitigation Measures 13-1, 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4. Traffic noise modeling indicates that the project site is not in an area with ambient noise levels above 60 dBA $L_{dn}$ and a site-specific noise impact analysis per SPASP EIR Mitigation Measures 13-1 is not required. An analysis of stationary source noise impacts was completed in this discussion in conformance with SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 13-2, and no significant impact was identified. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential noise and vibration impacts of the project, and there would be no new or more severe impacts associated with noise than previously identified in the SPASP EIR.

---

\(^3\) Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is approximately 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Under conditions where there are a frequent number of events per day, the FTA has established thresholds of 65 VdB for Category 1 buildings, 72 VdB for Category 2 buildings, and 75 VdB for Category 3 buildings.

\(^4\) CNEL: a weighted average of community noise level over time.
### XII POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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 (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., 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>

#### Discussion

The SPASP EIR evaluated potential environmental impacts that could occur with approximately 243,112 net new square feet of commercial space, 1,706 residential units, and 3,840 new residents. The project would include 71 residential units in 44,236 square feet of residential space. The 2017 population in El Cerrito was estimated to be 25,515, and there are approximately 10,554 housing units in El Cerrito (U.S. Census 2018). ABAG expects the number of housing units to increase by about 11.9 percent between 2010 and 2040, to a projected total of 12,000 housing units (ABAG and MTC 2017).

The SPASP EIR concluded that the population growth associated with the Specific Plan would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth beyond the SPASP boundaries. SPASP implementation would facilitate the projected residential and commercial growth in a transit-rich, mixed-use plan area identified for such growth in both local and regional plans and forecasts.

Table 3.13-1 shows the housing and population assumptions evaluated in the SPASP EIR as well as existing and proposed housing development within the SPASP area. Because the population and housing units proposed by the project fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with population and housing.

#### Table 3.13-1

**Existing and Proposed Housing Units and Population within the Project Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluated in the SPASP EIR</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Remaining Development Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,706&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,840&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,055&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>168&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> El Cerrito 2014b, 2015.

<sup>b</sup> Estimated population was calculated using the City of El Cerrito’s 2014 average household size of 2.36 (City of El Cerrito 2015).
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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project in and of itself would not substantially contribute to significant population growth in El Cerrito. The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR and would be within the growth projections evaluated in the EIR. Therefore, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the population and housing impacts of the project, and no new impacts would result.
XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

The closest fire station is at 10900 San Pablo Avenue, approximately 2,300 feet from the project site.

The ECFD has automatic aid response agreements with the RFD, the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, and the Albany Fire Department. For the 2013-2014 fiscal year, the ECFD had 37 personnel; two paramedic assignments were authorized for each responding engine to provide advanced life support services during emergency medical responses. The El Cerrito General Plan states a goal to maintain an average emergency response time for the first fire engine of less than 6 minutes for 95 percent of all emergency calls for service, provided adequate financial resources are available. The RFD has a total of 97 positions: 93 sworn personnel plus 3 administrative staff and an emergency services manager. The RFD has seven fire stations, seven engine companies, one truck company, two rescue units, one HazMat unit, and one breathing support unit. All RFD personnel are trained to the level of EMT-D and HazMat First Responder Operational.

The ECFD is responsible for the City's Emergency Operations Center and development of the Emergency Operations Plan in the event of a major disaster affecting El Cerrito and the community of Kensington. In addition, the ECFD participates in the Community Emergency Response Team program, which provides training for fire safety, hazardous material and terrorist incidents, disaster medical operations, and search and rescue to enable its citizens to be self-sufficient for up to 72 hours and beyond in the event of a major disaster.

Project implementation would not require the ECFD to expand fire protection facilities and personnel to accommodate additional demand. Specifically, the SPASP EIR identified that any demand for additional fire protection personnel would be funded by annual budget review and allocation. Given these factors, impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. Because the population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with fire services.

Police Protection

The El Cerrito Police Department (ECPD) provides community police services through three divisions: Field Operations, Administrative and Support, and Special Operations. The ECPD operates out of the Public Safety Building at 10900 San Pablo Avenue, which is approximately
2,300 feet from the project site. The City contracts with state and other local agencies to provide and support police services. Police dispatching is contracted with the Richmond Police Department (RPD); criminalist services and animal control services are contracted with Contra Costa County.

ECPD staffing for 2012 included 46 sworn officers and 10.55 equivalent professional staff. Four teams patrol the city 24 hours a day year-round.

Increased demand associated with project implementation would be negligible and would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities. The SPASP identified police department–required approvals that would ensure the department is equipped and has the ability to maintain acceptable levels of service. In addition, the project falls within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR and would not result in new impacts associated with police services.

Public Schools

The project site is located in the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD). The following public schools serve students in the SPASP area: Fairmont Elementary School (K–5), Harding Elementary School (K–5), Madera Elementary School (K–5), Fred T. Korematsu Middle School (6–8), and El Cerrito Senior High School (9–12). None of the schools are in the SPASP area. Table 3.14-1 shows school district student yield factors for 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Unit Type</th>
<th>Grades K–6 Students</th>
<th>Grades 7–8 Students</th>
<th>Grades 9–12 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached Units</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Attached Units</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Attached Units</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: El Cerrito 2014b
Note: Yield factors represent students generated per household across the school district.

The SPASP EIR evaluated the impact that the Specific Plan’s anticipated 1,706 new residences and the associated increase in expected student population would have on the services provided and facilities operated by the WCCUSD. The SPASP EIR concluded that the new residences would generate approximately 1,147 new students in district schools over the 25-year horizon of SPASP implementation. The EIR 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. The proposed project would add 71 new housing units and increase the population of El Cerrito by approximately 168 residents. These numbers would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR (refer to Section XIII); the project would also generate students within the assumptions of the SPASP EIR. As such, existing school facilities would accommodate students from the project.

In addition, the project would be required to pay state-authorized school impact fees to the extent approved by the school district. Pursuant to Section 65995(3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), the payment of statutory fees is considered to be full and complete CEQA mitigation for impacts on schools due to increased utilization.
Parks and Recreational Facilities

The City of El Cerrito Recreation Department offers a variety of family activities and programs, including visual arts, sports, tutoring, performing arts, swimming, child care, martial arts, and special events. The department also schedules activities and rentals of buildings, picnic areas, sports fields, and tennis courts. Public parks in the project vicinity include Fairmont Park, Cerrito Vista Park, and the Hillside Natural Area.

The SPASP EIR concluded that the City’s parks and recreation facilities would satisfy the expected park requirements for the SPASP area; even with the anticipated population associated with implementation of the SPASP, the City’s level of service would be above the level adopted in the City’s General Plan (El Cerrito 2014b). Additionally, the SPASP EIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would not facilitate the need for new or physically altered government facilities. The proposed project would include a total of 2,722 square feet of private open space area in the form of outdoor balconies and a 5,963-square-foot roof deck for residents. The project would also pay in-lieu fees instead of providing public open space. Because the project’s population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, the project would result in no new impacts on parks and recreational facilities.

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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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>
<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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The project would increase the local population by 168 residents, which would be negligible compared to the total population (City of El Cerrito 2015). Open space levels of service per 1,000 residents are 5 acres for El Cerrito. Project implementation would not increase demand for parks and recreational facilities compared to the EIR analysis, and the service levels of 5.85 acres per 1,000 residents as found in the SPASP would not be substantially diminished.

The proposed project would include a total of 2,722 square feet of private open space area in the form of balconies and a 5,963-square-foot roof deck for residents. The project would pay in-lieu fees instead of providing public open space. Because the population and housing units fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, the project would conform to SPASP and General Plan open space standards for El Cerrito. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial impacts on parks and recreational facilities.

**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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP, including parks and recreations impacts. Development of the project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP EIR and General Plan policies. Therefore, the project would have no new impacts on parks and recreation.
XVI TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</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 that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

This section compares traffic impacts from the project with impacts identified in the SPASP EIR. Michael Baker International (2018) prepared a traffic considerations and consistency review for the project, which is provided as Appendix F of this report.

Trip Generation

The SPASP EIR evaluated developments at six “high priority opportunity sites” as well as six additional developments that had been planned/entitled prior to the EIR. The SPASP EIR anticipated a total of 523 AM peak hour trips and 1,374 PM peak hour trips for both the high priority sites and the planned/entitled projects combined. To estimate trips that are expected to be generated by current cumulative projects and the proposed project, rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 9th Edition Trip Generation Manual were used. Consistent with the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology, a reduction of 12 percent was applied to the trip generation rates. This reduction is used to account for the project’s setting in a dense urban environment as well as multimodal functionality (i.e., pedestrian, bicycle, transit). As shown in Table 3.16-1, the proposed project is anticipated to generated 415 daily trips with 19 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 24 trips occurring during the PM peak hour.
### Table 3.16-1
#### Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Sizea</th>
<th>ADTb</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments (#223)c</td>
<td>71 DU</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a. DU = dwelling unit

b. ADT = average daily traffic
c. ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 223 (mid-rise apartments), adjusted by 12 percent based on the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology.

Using the same trip generation methodology, trips forecast to be generated by other proposed projects, developments currently under construction, and recently completed projects were estimated and are provided in Appendix F. This list includes 18 projects in the SPASP area that are currently in some state of review/approval as well as 3 projects located outside of the Specific Plan boundary.

As described in detail in Appendix F, a total of 11,860 daily trips with 506 AM peak hour trips and 790 PM peak hour trips are anticipated to be generated by the cumulative projects within the Specific Plan boundary. A total of 12,177 daily trips with 532 AM peak hour trips and 820 PM peak hour trips are anticipated to be generated by the complete cumulative project list, including the three projects outside of the SPASP boundary. Both totals include the trips expected to be generated by the proposed project.

When compared to the SPASP EIR, the current cumulative proposed development list is anticipated to exceed the EIR trip generation by 1.7 percent (an excess of nine trips) in the AM peak hour. When the three projects located outside of the Specific Plan boundary are removed from the cumulative trip calculation, the trip generation is 3.3 percent less than what is shown in the EIR (difference of 17 trips). This comparison is summarized in Table 3.16-2.

Although the trip generation analysis shows that the total cumulative projects are anticipated to exceed the EIR trip generation in the AM peak hour, the SPASP EIR shows that all intersections located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project operate at acceptable levels of service through cumulative conditions (El Cerrito 2014b). Therefore, the excess nine trips that would be generated by the current cumulative project list would most likely not cause any operational deficiencies within the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. Furthermore, the evaluation of cumulative project trips is conservatively high since it includes three projects located outside of the SPASP boundary. Therefore, the project would not result in significant traffic impacts.
### Table 3.16-2
**Project Trip Generation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SPASP EIR Trip Generation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SPASP Area Trip Generation</td>
<td>11,860</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of SPASP EIR</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SPASP Cumulative Developmenta</td>
<td>12,177</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of SPASP EIR</td>
<td></td>
<td>101.7%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


ADT = Average Daily Traffic

a. Includes three projects outside of SPASP boundary.

---

**Vehicle Access and On-Site Circulation**

The project would include an underground parking garage with 51 garage parking spaces reserved for residents, including 2 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) spaces, 5 electric vehicle (EV) charging stations to accommodate electric vehicles, and 1 car share space. Vehicles would access the site via a single driveway on Kearney Street that would lead to the underground garage.

It should be noted that Kearney Street, within the vicinity of the project site, is a one-way street with traffic traveling in the southbound direction. On-street parking is provided on both sides of the street.

**Project Driveway Site Distance**

The driveway on Kearney Street would provide adequate sight distance for approaching drivers as well as drivers exiting the driveway and turning right onto Kearney Street. Vehicles parked to the north of the driveway could block the sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and vehicles on Kearney Street. Therefore, the transportation analysis recommended that a minimum of 10 feet of red curb be provided on the north side of the driveway. Additionally, because landscaping planted on the north side of the driveway could also potentially limit visibility, the transportation analysis recommended that the tree canopy be maintained no lower than 6 feet from the ground and shrubbery not exceed 3.5 feet above the roadway—or approximately 3 feet above the curb. (Michael Baker International 2018).

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval**: Ensure that 10 feet of red curb be provided on Kearney Street on the north side of the project driveway. Ensure that the tree canopy be maintained no lower than 6 feet from the ground and shrubbery not exceed 3.5 feet above the roadway—or approximately 3 feet above the curb.

**Bicycle Parking, Access, and On-Site Circulation**

Section 2.05.07.04 of the SPASP Form-Based Code requires bicycle parking for residential uses at a rate of 1.5 spaces per unit for long-term bike parking and 1 space per 10 units for short-term bike parking. As shown in Table 3.16-3, the project would meet or exceed these requirements. The long-term spaces would be available for residents in the underground garage and the short-term spaces would be provided on Kearney Street.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Table 3.16-3  
Bicycle Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Storage</th>
<th>Required(^a)</th>
<th>Proposed Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>1.5/DU</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>10/DU</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bicycle Parking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DU = Dwelling Unit  
\(^a\) Based on SPASP Form-Based Code Section 2.05.07.04

Pedestrian Access and On-Site Circulation

Pedestrians would access the building through an entrance on Kearney Street. The SPASP Form-Based Code (Section 2.04.02) requires a minimum clear space of 6 feet in neighborhood zones. As shown in Figure 2.0-5, the project would provide a new sidewalk built to City standards, with a 6-foot-wide pedestrian zone and a 5-foot-wide sidewalk amenity zone.

Transit Access

Alameda-Contra Costa Transit provides bus service nearby to the project site, with multiple bus services running on San Pablo Avenue. The closest bus stop is at the southwest corner of the intersection of Moeser Lane and San Pablo Avenue, approximately 0.2 miles from the project site. In addition, the El Cerrito Plaza BART station is approximately 0.7 miles to the south, and the El Cerrito del Norte BART station is approximately 1.1 miles to the north.

Vehicle Parking and TDM Requirements

The SPASP Form-Based Code requirements for the TOMIMU zoning district apply to the project site, requiring a maximum of 1.5 vehicle parking spaces per dwelling unit and a basic Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan (El Cerrito 2014a). For projects proposing a residential parking ratio between zero and one space per unit, the Form-Based Code states that additional TDM measures may be required. The project would provide 51 parking spaces in an underground garage, or approximately 0.72 spaces per unit, in compliance with regulations.

Fehr and Peers (2018) prepared a TDM plan for the project, which would be implemented by the applicant and is included in this document as Appendix G. As described in greater detail in Appendix G, the project proposes the following TDM strategies that would reduce automobile trips and parking demand generated by the project:

- Unbundled parking, meaning that parking is rented or sold separately than the residential unit, rather than automatically included in the rent or cost.

- Provide long-term and short-term bicycle parking, slightly exceeding code requirements. The project would also offer $20 BikeLink membership cards to all residents, providing additional access to secure bicycle parking throughout the Bay Area region.

- Provide free or subsidized transit fares (such as funding Clipper Cards for residents).

- Provide one on-site carshare parking space available to both project residents and the public.
• Building management would designate a “Building TDM coordinator” to coordinate, monitor, and publicize TDM activities.

• Transit, ridesharing, and carpooling information would be publicized and posted in the lobby.

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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, no new impacts related to transportation would result.

Conclusion

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact 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 tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, features, 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:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) A listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(k). or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

As previously discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, of this document, Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the project. This mitigation measure would protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

In addition, subsequent to certification of the SPASP EIR, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which provides for consultation between lead agencies and Native American tribal organizations during the CEQA process. At the time the SPASP EIR was certified, AB 52 had not been enacted. AB 52 was enacted on July 1, 2015, and requires agencies to consult with Native American tribes for projects (as defined by CEQA) that submit a Notice of Preparation or Intent to Adopt a Negative or Mitigated Negative Declaration on or after July 1, 2015. AB 52 consultation was not required at the time of the EIR; therefore, tribal cultural resource identification efforts are not required for this project. In addition, AB 52 does not apply to exemptions from CEQA, as it is assumed that such projects would not result in significant impacts. Similarly, consistency analyses are only used when there is no new or substantially more severe impact, and are therefore not subject to AB 52.

While the City is not required to conduct formal consultation under AB 52 for the project, as stated above, SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the project and would protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.
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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resources impacts (and by extension, impacts on tribal cultural resources) of the project, and no new impacts would result.
### XVIII UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a) | ☐                             | ☐                                           | ☐                           | ☒             |
b) | ☐                             | ☐                                           | ☐                           | ☒             |
c) | ☐                             | ☐                                           | ☐                           | ☒             |
d) | ☐                             | ☐                                           | ☐                           | ☒             |
e) | ☐                             | ☐                                           | ☐                           | ☒             |
f) | ☐                             | ☐                                           | ☐                           | ☒             |
g) | ☐                             | ☐                                           | ☐                           | ☒             |

#### Discussion

**Water Supply**

The SPASP EIR determined that there would be an increase in water demand as a result of buildout of the SPASP; average daily demand was estimated to be 882,720 gallons gpd, which represents less than 1 percent of the planning level water demand forecast in the EBMUD Urban Water Management Plan (El Cerrito 2014b). The SPASP EIR concluded that this represents a small increase and would be a less than significant impact on water supply. The SPASP EIR also noted that development within the SPASP area would incorporate the City’s requirements for 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 Urban Water Management Plan); and the requirement that new development pay its share of the costs associated with provision of water facilities through project-specific mitigation required as conditions of approval. The SPASP EIR concluded that since future development facilitated by the SPASP, including the project, would require less than 1 percent of EBMUD’s forecast 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 would be less than significant. The project would be consistent with SPASP requirements and would not therefore not result in a significant impact related to water supply.

**Utility Infrastructure**

---
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The project site is located in a developed urban setting and existing water utility infrastructure is present adjacent to the site. Since the project site is vacant, there is currently no domestic water consumption or wastewater generation associated with the site.

The SPASP EIR concluded that development associated with the SPASP would result in less than significant impacts on utilities and service systems, including wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, and solid waste disposal. However, the SPASP EIR determined that the wastewater and storm drainage infrastructure systems would require improvements, including the upgrading of existing deficiencies, to accommodate new development facilitated by the SPASP. The SPASP EIR included recommendations and design considerations for proposed infrastructure improvements. As noted in the SPASP EIR, construction of the SPASP-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 project would rely on potable and nonpotable water for both domestic use and fire protection from existing major facilities, including reservoirs and pumping plants which are serviced by EBMUD. Service would be granted subject to EBMUD regulations governing water services, which may include water main extensions and/or off-site pipeline improvements. With adherence to these requirements, the project would not result in any impacts.

Wastewater

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service in this area. Per Section 7.3 of the SSD Ordinance Code, a district-wide per fixture sewer connection/capacity charge and a SPASP-specific sewer connection/capacity charge is required to be paid by new development to the district. The connection/capacity charge funds sewer capacity improvements needed to serve projected growth within the SPASP area.

Currently the SSD imposes a sewer connection charge on all development projects within its service territory. The purpose of the charge is to have new development buy into a fair share of the district’s existing sanitary sewer system. The SSD uses these funds to acquire, construct, install, and replace existing capital facilities and other assets.

This project applicant will participate in the San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program.

Project-Specific Condition of Approval: Applicant shall participate in the Stege Sanitary District’s San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program.

Solid Waste

The increase in commercial and residential density under the SPASP would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste generated in the SPASP area. The SPASP EIR concluded that the increase in solid waste generation would be incremental but would not exceed acceptable rates established by plans, policies, and regulations. 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 project. The project would be consistent with SPASP requirements and other applicable regulations. As such, solid waste impacts would remain less than significant.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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 EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and with implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, no new impacts related to utilities and service systems would result.

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP EIR. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, the project would not result in new impacts related to utilities and service systems. Therefore, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the utilities and service systems impacts of the project, and no new impacts would result.
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APPENDICES

The appendices for this Initial Study can be found at:

http://www.el-cerrito.org/DocumentCenter/View/10285