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#### CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND INITIAL STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Title:</strong></th>
<th>10300 San Pablo Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead agency name and address:</strong></td>
<td>City of El Cerrito Planning Division 10890 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, CA 94530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact person and phone number:</strong></td>
<td>Sean Moss (510) 215-4359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Location:</strong></td>
<td>City of El Cerrito – San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>File Number:</strong></td>
<td>PL16-0139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project sponsor's name and address:</strong></td>
<td>Mike Branagh Winfield Development L.L.C. 3800 Mount Diablo Blvd., Suite 200 Lafayette, CA 94549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Owner:</strong></td>
<td>Stanley Zimmerman Revocable Trust 6363 Christie Ave, Apt 2517 Emeryville, CA 94608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Plan Designation:</strong></td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning:</strong></td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of project:</strong></td>
<td>The project site is located in the southern portion of the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California at the northeast corner of the San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue intersection on a 24,958 square-foot lot. Although the general topography around the site slopes upwards towards the east, the site is largely flat. The project site includes a vacant 12,000 square foot single-story building and parking lot. The building was originally constructed as a Safeway supermarket, and served as such until 1971. The proposed project would demolish the existing building and parking lot and construct two new four-story, 54-foot tall multi-family residential buildings - a 21,114 square-foot and a 25,681 square-foot building – with a total of 32 dwelling units. Access to the proposed residential units is provided at two entrances along San Pablo Avenue, three entrances along Eureka Avenue, and five entrances from the parking lot at the rear of the project site. The proposed residential units include a combination of two-story, 2-bedroom and live-work units and 3-bedroom flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings:</strong></td>
<td>North of the project site are commercial properties. East of the project site is Fairmont Elementary School. South of the project site, across Eureka Avenue, are existing commercial properties that are the site of the proposed residential development at 10290 San Pablo Avenue. West of the project site across San Pablo Avenue are commercial properties within the City of Richmond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

This checklist and attached supporting documentation have been prepared to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the 10300 San Pablo Avenue development (project or proposed project) in relationship to the prior environmental review conducted for the site in the City of El Cerrito San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR. The analysis considers whether the environmental impacts of the project have already been analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code (PRC), Section 21000, et seq.).

This document is an Environmental Compliance Checklist to examine the environmental effects of the proposed 10300 San Pablo Avenue 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. As supported by the analysis in this document, the 10300 San Pablo Avenue Project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than what was analyzed in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

1.1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PRIOR CEQA DOCUMENTATION

In 2014, the City of El Cerrito adopted the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (“SPASP FEIR”) and certified the accompanying EIR (State Clearinghouse #2014042025). The Specific Plan represents a planning effort to identify a vision for the future of San Pablo Avenue, identify improvement needs, and adopt implementing regulations that can be applied consistently in the planning area. A major goal of the planning effort is to achieve a coordinated, cohesive environment and character in the Specific Plan area through (1) a Form-Based Code (FBC); (2) multimodal transportation goals and policies, recommended streetscape design improvements, and design standards as part of the Complete Streets Plan; and (3) infrastructure improvements.

The former El Cerrito Redevelopment Agency undertook development of the Specific Plan beginning in 2007 to develop a vision for the future of San Pablo Avenue. On April 2, 2013, City Council received an update on the Specific Plan, including a staff recommendation to add a Complete Streets Element and Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Community Development and Public Works Staff worked with consultants to update and complete the draft Specific Plan in response to Council comments and to develop a more implementation-focused, market-driven Specific Plan that better incorporates contemporary land use planning and transportation strategies. Additionally, the Specific Plan included incorporation of recent Council adopted policies, including the 2013-2017 Strategic Plan (adopted April 2, 2013), the Climate Action Plan (adopted May 21, 2013) and Plan Bay Area (adopted by MTC and ABAG on July 18, 2013). The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan was adopted and the Final Environmental Impact Report was certified by the City in December 2014.

1.2. CEQA REQUIREMENTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This checklist confirms that the proposed 10300 San Pablo Avenue Project is within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Final 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 FEIR and, as such, the City of El Cerrito (City) can approve the 10300 San Pablo Avenue 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 10300 San Pablo Avenue Project does not require any further review under CEQA.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1. PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING
The project site (APN 503-392-028) is located in the southern portion of the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California (See Figure 1: Regional Map) at the northeast corner of the San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue intersection (See Figure 2: Site Vicinity Map) on a 24,958 square-foot lot. Although the general topography around the site slopes upwards towards the east, the site is largely flat. The project site includes an existing vacant 12,000 square foot single-story building and parking lot. The building was originally constructed as a Safeway supermarket, and served as such until 1971 when a fabric outlet moved in. It was last used by Guitar Center, a music equipment vendor until 2012 following the store's relocation to Emeryville. (See Figure 3: Project Site Map).

The project site has General Plan Land Use designation of Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use through the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (See Figure 4: General Plan Land Use Designation Map) – and is located within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area (See Figure 5: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Map). The San Pablo Specific Plan zoning designates this property as within the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) zoning district. San Pablo Avenue, north of Eureka Avenue, is designated as a San Pablo Avenue (SPA) Commercial Street and Eureka Avenue and Kearney Street are designated as Neighborhood Streets. The proposed project would be compliant with all zoning requirements for the TOMIMU district, SPA Commercial Street classification and Neighborhood Street. North of the project site are commercial properties. East of the project site is Fairmont Elementary School. South of the project site, across Eureka Avenue, are commercial buildings that are the site of the proposed residential development at 10290 San Pablo Avenue. West of the project site across San Pablo Avenue are commercial properties within the City of Richmond.

2.2. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS
The proposed project would demolish the existing building and parking lot and construct two new four-story, 54-foot tall multi-family residential buildings – a 21,114 square foot and a 25,681 square foot building – with a total of 32 dwelling units (See Figure 6: Project Site Plan). Access to the proposed residential units is provided at two entrances along San Pablo Avenue, three entrances along Eureka Avenue, and five entrances in the parking lot at the rear of the project site. The proposed residential units include a combination of two-story, 2-bedroom and live-work units and 3-bedroom flats as summarized in Table 1 below (See Figures 7, 8, 9 & 10: Floor Plans).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Unit Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/1.5 Bath</td>
<td>967 Square Feet</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1 Story Unit – 3 bedroom/2 Bath</td>
<td>1,262 Square Feet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/1.5 Bath</td>
<td>926 Square Feet</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/1.5 Bath + Office</td>
<td>1,253 Square Feet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/1.5 Bath</td>
<td>1,253 Square Feet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2 Story Unit – Live-Work</td>
<td>967 Square Feet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project is designed to front onto San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue with a driveway entrance to the unit garages and parking lot off Kearney Street. The front of the building along San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue have front doors for the first-floor units, these units are designed to appear as storefronts with large glazing areas. The upper floor units are accessed off a common staircase within the building that can be accessed from the San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue entrances and the entrances located at the rear of the property in the parking lot.

The project is accessible by auto, public transit, bicycle and walking. A bus stop is located at the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue. The El Cerrito Plaza Bart station is located approximately 0.5 miles away from the project. Long term bicycle storage for 47 bicycles will be provided either within the proposed garages or within the common entryway to the building. Two (2) short-term bicycle parking spaces will be provided for the project along San Pablo Avenue. Because of the close proximity to transit, the project parking spaces have been reduced to just one space per unit. The project would provide 15 surface parking spaces, 16 individual garage parking spaces, and one ADA accessible space for a total of 32 parking spaces. Vehicles would access the site through a full-access driveway on Kearney Street.

Landscaping will be provided along San Pablo Avenue, Eureka Avenue, and within the surface parking lot. The streetscape along San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue will comply with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan streetscape designs for a SPA Community Street and a Neighborhood Street. San Pablo Avenue will have a seven-foot-wide "amenity zone" which will include landscaping and street trees. There will be an eight-foot wide pedestrian walkway space and a four-foot wide activity zone.

The proposed project is designed to be a sustainable community. The site plan has been designed to integrate the architecture into the natural topography of the site, and the buildings are oriented to take advantage of solar. The community will enhance pedestrian access to the surrounding community by updating the sidewalks surrounding the project site. The proximity to downtown as well as the pedestrian and bicycle access to and from the site will help reduce vehicle trips. The project has been designed to meet all required stormwater quality standards and best management practices. As proposed, the project will reduce impervious surfaces relative to the existing condition. As such, the project would result in an overall decrease in stormwater runoff from what currently exists on the project site today. As well as integrating stormwater runoff treatment into the overall landscape design. Landscaping for the proposed project has been designed with drought-tolerant and mostly native Californian plants to reduce the water demand. Construction of the proposed project is expected to last approximately 12 months.
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3. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The following discussion addresses the potential level of impact relating to each aspect of the environment.

3.1. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR; Sean Moss, City of El Cerrito Planning Division, Email Communication, May 4, 2017.

As noted in the SPASP FEIR, implementation of the SPASP would enhance the visual and aesthetic character of the planning area by incorporating Form-Based Code (FBC) and Complete Streets design and development standards that support and maintain a strong sense of place and visual identity on San Pablo Avenue. These design and development standards are included in Chapter 2, Form Based Code and Chapter 3, Complete Streets of the SPASP.

The primary potentially significant impact to scenic resources identified in the SPASP FEIR was the potential for implementation of the SPASP to obstruct scenic views of Mt. Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco skyline, East Bay Hills, and Albany Hill from public rights-of-way including roadways and sidewalks, BART station platforms, and areas of lower elevation hillside homes in El Cerrito and Richmond (Impact 4-1). This impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable; however, it was determined that the individual development projects would be subject to further evaluation to determine if they meet the standards and guidelines set forth in the SPASP related to visual resources (Mitigation Measure 4-1). The mitigation measure requires preparation of a viewshed analysis to determine if the proposed building meets the standards set forth in the SPASP. However, the El Cerrito Zoning Administrator determined that a visual analysis was not required for the proposed project 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 and the San Francisco skyline are not generally visible adjacent to the project site.
• Albany Hill is visible from Kearney Street. However, from the public street, existing buildings block much of the view and only intermittent views of Albany Hill are present along Kearney Street.
• Kearney Street and the properties that face it are at a higher elevation than properties on San Pablo Avenue, including the project site. The grade difference will limit any visual impact of the project from adjacent properties and from Kearney Street.
• 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 FEIR also found that potentially significant impacts could result from the introduction of new light and glare in the plan area (Impact 4-2), but concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, which requires the installation of non-reflective building materials and windows, would reduce potential glare impacts of individual development projects to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would not cause any new light and glare impacts.

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

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

**3.2. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR

There are no agricultural or forestry resources located within or near the project site. The SPASP area is predominantly urbanized and is classified as “Urban and Built-Up Land” by the State Department of Conservation. The City of El Cerrito, and the SPASP area, does not contain any land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The proposed project is also not located on land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract. In addition, the City does not contain woodland or forestland cover, nor land zoned for timberland production. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to agriculture or forestry resources.
3.3. AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR; Sean Moss, City of El Cerrito Planning Division, Email Communication, May 4, 2017; Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2017. Final 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan.

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 non-attainment area. The main purpose of an air quality plan is to bring an area into compliance with the requirements of federal and State air quality standards.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ambient Air Quality Impacts
The SPASP FEIR identified that monitoring data from all ambient air quality monitoring stations in the Bay Area indicate that existing carbon monoxide levels are currently below national and California ambient air quality standards. Monitored carbon monoxide (CO) levels have decreased substantially since 1990 as newer vehicles with greatly improved exhaust emission control systems have replaced older vehicles. The Bay Area has been designated as an attainment area for the CO standards. At the time that the SPASP FEIR was certified, the highest measured levels in San Pablo (the closest monitoring station to the plan area) during the past three years were 1.3 ppm (parts per million) for eight-hour averaging periods, compared with state and federal criteria of 9.0 ppm.
Even though CO levels in the Bay Area are well below ambient air quality standards, and there have been no exceedances of CO standards in the Bay Area since 1991, elevated levels of CO still warrant analysis. CO hotspots (occurrences of localized high CO concentrations) could still occur near busy congested intersections. Recognizing the relatively low CO concentrations experienced in the Bay Area, the BAAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines state that a project would have a less-than-significant impact if it would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. As identified in the SPASP, peak hour traffic volumes attributed to implementation of the SPASP would be far below this threshold. Since intersections affected by the project would have volumes less than the threshold of 44,000 vehicles per hour, the impact of the project related to localized CO concentrations would therefore be less than significant.

The proposed project would generate fewer vehicle trips than the uses assumed for this project site in the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, impacts related to CO hotspots would remain less-than-significant.

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

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

According to the BAAQMD, a project would result in a significant impact if it would: individually expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (TACs) resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 10.0 in one million, increased non-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), or an annual average ambient PM2.5 increase greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m3). A significant cumulative impact would occur if the project in combination with other projects located within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site would expose sensitive receptors to TACs resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 100.0 in one million, an increased non-cancer risk of greater than 10.0 on the hazard index (chronic), or an ambient PM2.5 increase greater than 0.8 µg/m3 on an annual average basis. Impacts from substantial pollutant concentrations are discussed below.

The SPASP FEIR determined that construction activities could result in short-term emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM), a known TAC. Construction could result in the generation of DPM emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading and excavation, paving, and other construction activities. The amount to which the receptors are exposed (a function of concentration and duration of exposure) is the primary factor used to determine health risk (i.e., potential exposure to TAC emission levels that exceed applicable standards). Health-related risks associated with diesel-exhaust emissions are primarily linked to long-term exposure and the associated risk of contracting cancer. The calculation of cancer risk associated with exposure to TACs is typically based on a 70-year period of exposure. The use of diesel-powered construction equipment, however, would be temporary and episodic and would occur over a relatively large area. The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-2 would be required to reduce potential impacts associated with TAC exposure. Mitigation Measure 5-2 requires individual projects to undergo individual assessment for construction health risks, either through screening or refined modeling.

Sensitive receptors are located adjacent to the project site. Construction of the proposed project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (i.e., usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, construction contractors would be required to implement the best management practices during construction, as required by Mitigation Measure 5-1. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-1, project construction emissions
Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants

Implementation of the SPASP would allow new residential land uses that could include sensitive receptors, as well as new non-residential land uses that would be potential new emissions sources. The roadway screening analysis tables from the SPASP FEIR indicate that health risk from high volume surface streets such as Central Avenue, Carlson Boulevard, and Potrero Avenue would be less-than-significant at average daily traffic volumes (ADT) of 40,000 vehicles or less at a distance of 10 feet. The SPASP FEIR determined that if projects under the SPASP are located within close proximity to surface streets with daily traffic volumes higher than 40,000 ADT, this would represent a potentially significant impact; however, the project site is not located within close proximity to any of these roadways (Carlson Boulevard is the closest to the project site, at a distance of approximately 500 feet). The proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to long term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the TASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.

Odors

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

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

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

CONCLUSION

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

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) 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 (Formerly Fish and Game) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (formerly Fish and Game) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

DISCUSSION

The SPASP FEIR found that implementation of the SPASP would largely result in minimal impacts to biological resources because the SPASP area is a highly developed urban area with approximately 90 percent of the land developed, recently disturbed, or ruderal. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the plan area does not contain any plant or animal species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), nor does the plan area contain any federally protected wetlands. The only
identified riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community in the plan area is riparian habitat adjacent to Cerrito Creek (near the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center parking lot and Ohlone Greenway) and Baxter Creek. However, the project is not located within the vicinity of either of these resources and therefore would not result in any impacts to these habitats.

The SPASP FEIR identified potential impacts associated with the removal of existing trees with implementation of the SPASP. Removal of existing trees containing nests or eggs of migratory birds, raptors, or bird species during the nesting season could be considered an "unlawful take" under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and USFW provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds. The proposed project would result in the removal of existing trees and shrubs on the project site. However, tree removal would comply with all City requirements to minimize impacts on biological resources during removal. The FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 6-1 to minimize potentially significant impacts associated with tree removal on nesting birds to less-than-significant levels.

**APPLICABLE MITIGATION**

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

**CONCLUSION**

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

### 3.5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The SPASP FEIR identified properties or features within the SPASP area that may be eligible for listing in a local, State, or Federal register of historic resources (Impact 7-1). The SPASP FEIR 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), the resource shall be evaluated by City staff, and if warranted, shall be assessed by a qualified professional on the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) 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 one-story former commercial building at 10300 San Pablo Avenue was constructed in 1948. The Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) conducted for the proposed project concluded that the building does not appear eligible for inclusion in the California Registry of Historic Resources under any significance criteria. The building is not a notable example of Vernacular architecture, and background research did not identify any persons associated with the building important to the past. For these reasons, this building does not appear to qualify as a “historical resource” for the purposes of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21084.1).

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the potential impact of development within the plan area on cultural resources, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains would be less than significant with implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Specifically, disturbance of previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources, including human remains, could occur during grading and development of individual project sites within the SPASP area, and there is a reasonable possibility that archaeological and paleontological resources could be uncovered during these activities (Impacts 7-2 and 7-3). The SPASP FEIR identifies Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3 that would reduce the potential impacts on known or undisclosed cultural resources to less-than-significant levels.

In compliance with SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 7-2, a records search was undertaken at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at Sonoma State University in Rohnert Park for the project site and vicinity. Based on the records search, there are no known historic or archeological resources located within the immediate project site or vicinity. Nevertheless, the potential exists for previously unknown cultural resources to be encountered during ground disturbing activities at the site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, which specify compliance with existing codes and regulations applicable to the accidental discovery of archeological and paleontological resources and human remains during construction activities, would be required to be implemented.

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

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

CONCLUSION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong Seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR; Friar and Associates, Inc., Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Multi-Purpose Development 10300 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California, November 2016.

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

The Hayward Fault is the nearest active fault to the plan area and is approximately 1 mile to the east. The SPASP area is susceptible to ground shaking from the Hayward Fault or one of the other active faults in the region. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant with compliance with the latest California Building Standards Code. The proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with these requirements.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that grading and construction activities within the SPASP area may result in minor erosion or the minor loss of some topsoil. However, implementation of City-required grading and construction-period erosion control techniques would mitigate the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would have potentially significant impacts related to earthquake-induced on-site liquefaction, differential settlement, lateral spreading, and subsidence, and associated damage to project buildings and other improvements within the SPASP area. However, potential impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-1, which requires preparation and implementation of the recommended measures of a site-specific design-level geotechnical study for individual development projects.

The proposed project's incorporation of the recommended mitigations outlined in the Friar and Associates Geotechnical Investigation report would ensure that potential impacts related geological conditions are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts related to geology and soils that were not identified in the SPASP FEIR.

**APPLICABLE MITIGATION**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measure 8-1, are required.

**CONCLUSION**

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with the California Building Code, City-required erosion control techniques, and SPASP Mitigation Measure 8-1. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential geology and soil impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact associated with geology and soils.
### 3.7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR; El Cerrito Climate Action Plan May 21, 2013.

### DISCUSSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONCLUSION
The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential GHG emissions impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact associated with GHG emissions.

3.8. **HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport of public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR; AEI Consultants, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment at 10300 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California 94530, March 30, 2016.

DISCUSSION

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

Based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the project, the subject property consisted of a gas station and a residence from 1926 and through 1950. According to a review of historical sources, the subject property was developed with a gas station by 1926 and through 1950, when it was redeveloped with the current commercial building for occupancy as a grocery store. The assessment did not identify regulatory or historical details pertaining to gas station operation or UST removal during this ESA. However, the current building, which includes a full basement, covers the historical footprint of the gas station. Thus it is likely that subsurface features and surrounding soil associated with this historical use were removed to construct the basement. Based on the length of time since the excavation occurred, it is likely that residual fuel related constituents, if any, would not be present in the subsurface at concentrations exceeding regulatory action levels at this time. Therefore, historical use of the subject property as a gasoline station prior to 1950 is considered to be an Historical Recognized Environmental Condition (HREC).

According to the Water Board, the nearest UST cleanup site is located at 10392 San Pablo Avenue. The removal of the former UST site has been completed, and the case is closed.

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

The nearest school to the project site is Fairmont Elementary School located 0.1 miles east of the project site. Although the school is within 0.25 miles of the project site, the project is a residential use and no impacts related to handling hazardous materials near a school would occur. The project site is located approximately 30 miles northwest of the nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport. As the project

is not located within the Oakland International Airport Influence Area,\(^2,3\) no safety hazards would be anticipated. No private airstrips are located in the project vicinity. In addition, the SPASP area, including the project site, is not within or adjacent to wildland area and would not be subject to wildland fire risks.

**APPLICABLE MITIGATION**

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

**CONCLUSION**

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

### 3.9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^2\) Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission, 2010. *Oakland International Airport, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Figure3-2.* September.

DISCUSSION

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

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

The proposed increase in population and traffic associated with the project could increase discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff beyond current levels after partial or full build-out of the SPASP. However, the proposed project would increase the amount of pervious surface on the site by replacing existing impervious surfaces on the site with 15,682 square feet of impervious and 7,152 square feet of pervious surfaces. In addition, full compliance with the Contra Costa County NPDES permit guidelines for stormwater discharge would ensure impacts would be less than significant.
The SPASP FEIR identified that portions of the plan area in Richmond along Central Avenue are located within a 100-year flood zone. However, the proposed project site is not located within this zone and would therefore not result in any impacts related to flooding. Furthermore, the SPASP area is also not subject to inundation by seiche or mudflow. The southwest portion of the SPASP along Central Avenue in the City of Richmond is located near a Tsunami Inundation Zone; however, the proposed project is not located near this area.

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

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

3.10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

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

The project site is designated TOMIMU in the City’s General Plan and SPASP. In addition, the site is also zoned as TOMIMU. The intent of the TOMIMU designation is to provide a walkable and bikeable, transit-friendly medium intensity area that allows a wide variety of uses including residential, civic and public uses along with commercial and retail uses around Stockton and Moeser nodes. The TOMIMU designation allows for a 55-foot height limit (65 feet is permissible for affordable housing projects) and requires a minimum height limit of three stories for residential uses. The proposed project is consistent with the mix, intensity, and scale of development contemplated by the SPASP in this location.

The City’s Planning Commission will consider the proposed project site plan and make findings related to any project design elements that do not specifically conform to SPASP development standards, as contemplated by the form based code guidelines articulated in the SPASP. The proposed project would comply with the standards of the TOMIMU designation and would develop the site with high density residential uses in close proximity to transit as envisioned in the SPASP FEIR.

**APPLICABLE MITIGATION**

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

**CONCLUSION**

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

### 3.11. MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) 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>

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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

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

The primary existing noise sources in the project area are transportation facilities. Traffic on Central Avenue and San Pablo Avenue contribute to the ambient noise environment. Train related activities associated with BART, including the El Cerrito Plaza BART Station, located 0.4 mile southeast of the project site, also contributes to the existing noise environment in the project vicinity. In addition, operational noise from the adjacent commercials uses (e.g., parking lot activities and people talking) is audible on the project site.

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

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

In the project-specific noise study conducted for the proposed project, traffic from San Pablo Avenue is predicted to be 71 dBA Ldn at the building façade of the proposed project. Based upon a typical 25 dB exterior-to-interior noise level reduction achieved by modern building construction, an interior noise level of 46 dBA Ldn would be expected. This would exceed the City's 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. Additionally, the City applies an interior maximum noise level standard of 50 dBA Lmax to bedrooms and 55 dBA Lmax to other occupied rooms. Based upon a typical 25 dB noise level reduction and the predicted exterior noise level range of 81-85 dBA Lmax, maximum interior noise levels are predicted to range between 56-60 dBA Lmax. Therefore, interior noise control measures would be required to achieve compliance with the City's interior noise level standards.

Based on the EPA's Protective Noise Levels, with a combination of walls, doors, and windows, standard construction for Northern California residential buildings (STC-24 to STC-28) would provide more than 25 dBA in exterior-to-interior noise reduction with windows closed and 15 dBA or more with windows open. With windows open, residents would not meet the City's normally acceptable residential interior noise standard of 45 dBA Ldn (i.e., 72.5 dBA – 15 dBA = 57.5 dBA). Therefore, an alternate form of ventilation, such as an air-conditioning system, would be required to ensure that windows can remain closed for a prolonged period of time for all units at the proposed project. A ventilation system would reduce traffic noise levels for residents with windows closed; however, interior noise levels would still remain above the City’s normally acceptable interior noise level criterion of 45 dBA (i.e., 72.5 dBA – 25 dBA = 47.5 dBA). Implementation of the following noise reduction measure, consistent with the recommendations of SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 13-1, would be required to reduce interior noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** Consistent with SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-1, the project design shall implement the following measures for all west facing (facing San Pablo Avenue) units to reduce interior noise impacts in compliance with City noise standards:

---

• Interior Noise Control Measures:
  o Living room and bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 38.
  o Exterior finish shall be three-coat stucco or system with equivalent weight per square foot;
  o Interior gypsum at exterior walls shall be 5/8” Type X or Type C hung on resilient channel (RC);
  o Ceiling gypsum shall be 5/8” type X or Type C;
  o Mechanical ventilation shall be installed in all residential uses to allow residents to keep doors and windows closed, as desired for acoustical isolation.

• As an alternative to the above-listed interior noise control measures, the applicant may provide a detailed analysis of interior noise control measures once building plans become available. The analysis should be prepared by a qualified noise control engineer and shall outline the specific measures required to meet the City's 45 dB Ldn and 50-55 dBA Lmax, interior noise level standards.

Stationary Source Noise Impacts
The SPASP FEIR identified that implementation of the SPASP would introduce commercial uses adjacent to residential land uses. New commercial development proposed adjacent to residential development could result in noise levels exceeding City standards. Typical noise levels generated by loading and unloading would be similar to noise levels generated by truck movements on local roadways. Mechanical equipment would also have the potential to generate noise and would be a potential noise impact. The SPASP FEIR identified this as a potentially significant impact and identified Mitigation Measure 13-2, which requires site-specific analysis for proposed commercial uses to reduce long-term noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would not introduce new commercial uses as part of the project.

Implementation of the proposed project would generate various on-site stationary noise sources, including heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, and parking lot activities. HVAC equipment could be a primary noise source associated with residential uses. HVAC equipment is often mounted on rooftops, located on the ground, or located within mechanical rooms. The noise sources could take the form of fans, pumps, air compressors, chillers, or cooling towers. HVAC operations would be required to meet all noise standards.

Precise details of HVAC equipment, including future location and sizing, are unknown at this time; therefore, for purposes of this analysis, 75 dBA at 3 feet was assumed to represent HVAC-related noise. Some off-site noise-sensitive receptors would be within 100 feet of proposed multi-family residential building. Adjusted for distance to the nearest off-site sensitive receptors, the off-site residences would be exposed to a noise level of 49 dBA Lmax generated by HVAC equipment. This noise level is lower than the City's maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 Lmax during the day and 60 dBA Lmax during the night. Therefore, operations associated with the HVAC equipment would be in compliance with the City's exterior daytime and nighttime noise standards for residential uses.

Parking lot noise, including engine sounds, car doors slamming, car alarms, loud music, and people conversing, would occur as a result of the proposed project at the project site and on nearby streets. Typical parking lot activities, such as people conversing or doors slamming, generates approximately 60 dBA to 70 dBA Lmax at 50 feet. Existing sensitive receptors are located approximately 50 feet from the proposed parking lot. Adjusted for distance, the nearest off-site residences would be exposed to a noise level of 60 to 70 dBA Lmax generated by parking lot activities. This noise level would not exceed the City's maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 Lmax during the day and 60 dBA Lmax during the night.

---

Additional on-site stationary noise sources would include delivery trucks and loading noise. Of the on-site stationary noise sources, noise generated by delivery truck activity would generate the highest maximum noise levels. Delivery truck loading and unloading activities would result in maximum noise levels from 75 dBA to 85 dBA Lmax at 50 feet.

There are generally two types of loading that would occur on the site: small deliveries like parcels and packages. The former are typically made via passenger car, van, or single-unit truck. These activities are potential noise sources that could affect noise-sensitive receptors in the project site vicinity. Precise details of loading areas, are unknown at this time; therefore, this analysis assumes a worst case scenario of noise levels from 73 to 83 dBA Lmax at the closest off-site receptor, which is above the City’s maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 Lmax during the day. However, because there would be no nighttime activity, the nighttime maximum noise level standard is not expected to be violated. In addition, peak noise levels from loading and unloading would be intermittent and when averaged over a one hour period would be much lower than the peak noise levels. In accordance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 13-2, as identified in the SPASP FEIR, to reduce loading and delivery noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors, design considerations and shielding must be implemented to ensure that the loading and delivery activities are located in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between loading- and delivery-related noise sources and nearest off-site sensitive receptors. In addition, noise-generating activities, such as maintenance activities and loading and unloading activities, are required to be reduced to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

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

The SPASP FEIR found that cumulative traffic noise levels, with or without implementation of the SPASP, are not anticipated to increase substantially along the roadways serving the Specific Plan area, and the project’s contribution to cumulative traffic noise level increases is calculated to be less than 1 dBA 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 is considered less-than-significant.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project site vicinity. It should be noted that the traffic generated by the proposed project was considered along with the traffic generated by the 10192 San Pablo and 10290 San Pablo development projects which are currently in the permitting process. Based on the traffic study prepared for the project, traffic generated from all three projects would result in 19 AM and 29 PM peak hour trips, which is less than what was identified for this project site in the SPASP FEIR. Project daily trips would not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any roadway segment in the project vicinity, and therefore would not result in a perceptible increase in traffic noise levels at receptors in the project vicinity. This impact would remain less-than-significant.

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

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

The noise analysis assumed a typical maximum noise level of 76 to 90 dBA Lmax at 50 feet during the noisiest construction phases. Project construction would result in short-term noise impacts on these adjacent uses. At 60 feet, there would be a decrease of approximately 2 dBA from the increased distance from the active construction area. Therefore, the closest off-site sensitive receptors may be subject to short-term construction noise reaching 90 dBA Lmax when construction is occurring at the project site boundary. Construction is permitted by the City when activities occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. No construction activity is allowed on Sundays and holidays.

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

**Construction-Related Vibration**

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

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

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

The SPASP FEIR found construction-related vibration impacts to be potentially significant. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-4. However, it may not be possible to avoid using pile drivers, vibratory
rollers, and tampers entirely during construction associated with the SPASP. Due to the density of development in the area, some of these activities may take place near sensitive areas. In these cases, Mitigation Measure 13-4 may not be sufficient to reduce ground-borne vibrations below a level of significance. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Common sources of ground-borne vibration and noise include trains and construction activities such as blasting, pile driving and operating heavy earthmoving equipment. Construction of the proposed project would involve grading, site preparation, and construction activities but would not involve the use of construction equipment that would result in substantial ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise on properties near to the project site. No existing structures are located directly adjacent to the project site. No pile driving, blasting, or significant grading activities are proposed.

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

**Aircraft Noise**
The SPASP FEIR did not address potential aircraft noise impacts for the proposed project. The proposed project is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport. Oakland International Airport is the closest airport and is located approximately 20 miles southeast of the project site. Aircraft noise is occasionally audible at the project site; however, no portion of the project site lies within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contours of any public airport nor does any portion of the project site lie within 2 miles of any private airfield or heliport. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to the excessive noise levels form aircraft noise sources.

**APPLICABLE MITIGATION**
Implementation of measures detailed in project-specific condition of approval, would reduce potential operational noise impacts on future sensitive receptors to less-than-significant levels. With implementation of this measure, SPASP Mitigation Measure 13-1 is satisfied, and no further analysis is required. Implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4 are also applicable to the proposed project.

**CONCLUSION**
The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval and SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4, the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in noise levels. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the noise impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts related to noise would result.
### 3.13. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

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

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

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

The project would introduce 32 dwelling units and have a population size of 72 people, which is consistent with what was anticipated by the Specific Plan and analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to population and housing that were not identified in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

**APPLICABLE MITIGATIONS**

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

**CONCLUSION**

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

### 3.14. PUBLIC SERVICES
Mitigation

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

b) Police protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

c) Schools? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

d) Parks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

e) Other public facilities? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

DISCUSSION

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

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

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

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the combination of parks and recreation facilities meets the expected park requirements for the SPASP area given the anticipated population associated with implementation of the SPASP. The SPASP FEIR concludes that the impacts to parks and recreation would be less than significant with compliance with plan provisions for new open spaces. In addition, the SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would not facilitate the need for new or physically altered government 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 FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) 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>

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

**DISCUSSION**

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

As the population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, and the project would conform to SPASP open space standards, the project would result in no new impacts associated with 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 FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

**CONCLUSION**

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

### 3.16. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

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?

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?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR; Fehr and Peers, 10300 San Pablo Avenue Preliminary Transportation Analysis, February 8, 2017.

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

Trip Generation
Using the same trip generation methodology used in the SPASP FEIR, the transportation analysis conducted for the proposed project estimated that the proposed project would generate about 9 AM peak-hour and 14 PM peak-hour trips. Thus, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to project trip generation beyond those identified in the SPASP EIR.

Vehicle Access
The Project would provide 15 surface parking spaces, 16 individual garage spaces, and one accessible space, for a total of 32 parking spaces. Vehicles would access the site through a right-in/right-out driveway on Kearney Street, about 150 feet north of Eureka Avenue.
Project Driveway Site Distance
The project-specific transportation analysis conducted for the proposed project included recommendations to improve project site circulation. The driveway on Kearney Street would provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk. Vehicles parked just north of the driveway may block sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and vehicles traveling southbound on Kearney Street. Trees planted north of the driveway may also affect visibility of exiting vehicles if the tree canopy is lower than six feet from the ground. Therefore, the transportation analysis recommendation would be applied to the project as a condition of approval to ensure adequate sight distance for vehicles to avoid impacts with pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk.

Project Specific Condition of Approval: Ensure that on-street parking directly north of the Project driveway on Kearney Street would not restrict sight distance for exiting vehicles by providing at least 10 feet of red curb.

Bicycle Parking, Access and On-Site Circulation
Section 2.05.07.04 of the SPASP Form-Based Code requires bicycle parking for residential and commercial uses. The Project would consist of 32 residential units, requiring 46 long-term bicycle parking spaces and two short-term bicycle parking spaces. The Project would provide 47 covered long-term bicycle parking spaces, 24 of which would be located inside the bike storage room and 23 that would located inside the entrance lobbies and garages as vertical racks. The Project would also provide two short-term spaces along the building frontage on San Pablo Avenue, meeting City requirements.

Pedestrian Access and On-Site Circulation
Pedestrians can access the building via multiple lobby entrances along San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue. The lobby entrances provide direct access to units on the first floor, as well as stair access to units on the second, third, and fourth floors. Pedestrian access between the parking lot and the building would be provided via multiple lobby entrances in the rear of the building, adjacent to the parking lot. Individual garages also provide pedestrian access to the lobbies.

The SPASP Form-Based Code (2.04.02) requires a minimum clear space of eight feet on all sidewalks in commercial zones and six feet clear space in neighborhood zones. The Project will provide eight feet of clear sidewalk space for pedestrians along San Pablo Avenue and six feet of clear sidewalk space along Eureka Avenue, meeting City requirements. The site plan does not address the proposed sidewalk frontage along Kearney Street.

Project Specific Condition of Approval: Ensure that six feet of clear sidewalk is provided along Kearney Street to meet minimum neighborhood street zone requirements.

Transit Access
AC Transit (as well as WestCAT, Soltrans, and FAST Transit) provides bus service to the project site with bus stops at the El Cerrito del Norte BART Station and on northbound and southbound San Pablo Avenue, south of the Cutting Boulevard intersection. The bus stops at the BART station provide bus shelters and benches, as well as BART station amenities such as bicycle parking. Both bus stops on San Pablo Avenue provide a bench but do not include a bus shelter.

AC Transit provides nearby transit service to the Project site with a bus stop on northbound San Pablo Avenue, directly in front of the project site at Eureka Avenue. Currently, the bus stop provides a bench and no shelter.
Project Specific Condition of Approval: Consider providing a bus shelter at the AC Transit bus stop on northbound San Pablo Avenue directly adjacent to the Project.

Parking and TDM Requirements
The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Form-Based Code requirements for the TOMIMU zoning district apply to the project site. TOMIMU zoning requires a maximum of 1.5 automobile parking spaces per dwelling unit and a basic Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan. For projects proposing a parking ratio between zero and 1.0 spaces per unit, a parking study and additional TDM measures may be required.

The project would require a maximum of 47 off-street residential parking spaces. Based on the project site plan, the project would provide 32 parking spaces, 15 fewer spaces than the maximum and more than one space per dwelling unit, meeting Code requirements.

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

CONCLUSION
No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and with implementation of the project-specific condition of approvals, no new impacts related to transportation would result.

3.17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR

DISCUSSION
As previously discussed in the Cultural Resources section of this checklist, Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the proposed project; this mitigation will protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

In addition, subsequent to certification of the SPASP FEIR, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which provides for consultation between lead agencies and Native American tribal organizations during the CEQA process. Effective July 1, 2015, AB 52 states that prior to the release of an environmental impact report or negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration for public review, a lead agency must provide the opportunity to consult with local tribes. However, the SPASP FEIR was certified prior to July 1, 2015, and because (a) this Program EIR Checklist supports the findings that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, (b) no new or substantially more severe significant effects could occur under the proposed project, (c) no new mitigation measures would be required, (d) the project is within the scope of the environmental review of the SPASP FEIR, and (e) no further review under CEQA is required, then the City is not required to conduct formal consultation under AB 52 for this project. However, as stated above, SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the project, and will 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 FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

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

3.18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable San Francisco Bay Regional Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

DISCUSSION:

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

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

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along San Pablo Avenue, including the proposed project site. This project has agreed to participate in the San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program. This fee is intended to satisfy the requirement for a Sewer Capacity Study.

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** Participate in the implementation of San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program. This fee is intended to satisfy the requirement for a Sewer Capacity Study.

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

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

**CONCLUSION**
No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and with implementation of the project-specific mitigation measure, no new impacts related to utilities and service systems would result.
4. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Technical Appendices

The following resources were prepared in order to further identify project specific parameters. Copies of these technical documents are incorporated herein by reference and are available for review during normal business hours at the City of El Cerrito.
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