

- Causes transit demand above the levels able to be adequately provided by local transit operators or agencies.

The project would add a small amount of transit riders to the area's BART and bus services. This analysis was based on an approximately 75 percent and 25 percent split of motorists and transit users; therefore, the project is expected to generate five total transit trips (one inbound/four outbound) in the AM and 10 total transit trips (five inbound/outbound) in the PM peak hours. The trips are assumed to be spread evenly across all available transit routes serving the regional transportation hub at the El Cerrito del Norte BART Station. These transit riders would be a negligible addition due to the wide range of available transit options, and would not exceed available capacities.

Therefore, there would be no significant adverse impact to the area transit service as a result of the project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Less-than-Significant Impact)*

The proposed project would be located on an urban infill site that is already served by utilities and public service systems; however, the change in uses on the site from a parking lot and small commercial structure to residential units and retail space would result in an increased demand for services and utilities. As part of the building permit review process, all departments and agencies responsible for providing utilities and public services are consulted to determine their ability to provide services to the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.²⁸

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? (Less-than-Significant Impact)*

Water supply and treatment are provided to the City by East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). Stege Sanitary District provides the City with wastewater collection services. Both water and sewer impact fees are collected and levied by EBMUD. The 2003 Housing Element of the General Plan analyzed the development of vacant and underutilized parcels throughout the City and concluded that there is sufficient infrastructure available, including water and sewer infrastructure, to allow development to occur as outlined in the plan.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the need for provision of water and wastewater service to approximately 131 residents and 11,000 square feet of retail space. Water service standards set by the General Plan allocate 250 gallons per day for residential households with up to 4 persons and an additional 62 gallons per day for each additional person. The General Plan EIR identifies a commercial use consumption rate of one gallon per day per 55 square feet. Based on these water demand rates, the proposed project would require approximately 14,500 gallons per day for the residential component and 200 gallons per day for the retail component. EBMUD has projected that water demand for 2005 will be 38 million gallons per day (MGD) for multi-family use and 19 MGD for commercial use. The increased demand that would result from this project is less than 0.05 percent of the current demand.

Wastewater generated by proposed uses would be approximately 90 percent of water demand, or 13,230 gallons per day.²⁹ EBMUD's Wastewater Treatment Plant in Oakland has an average annual

²⁸ King, Bruce, 2006. Maintenance and Engineering Manager, El Cerrito Public Works Department. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. March 3.

²⁹ Wastewater generation rate from El Cerrito Plaza Mixed-Use Development Project Draft Subsequent EIR, November 1, 2004.

daily flow of approximately 80 MGD. The project would generate less than 0.02 percent of this average annual daily flow. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision, need, or construction of water and wastewater service systems.

- 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? (Less-than-Significant Impact)*

At the time of the drafting of the General Plan, the City had completed the first phase of storm drain rehabilitation, which addressed the most critical drainage concerns. This \$6.3 million bond issued in 1993 reduced system overflows and the occurrence of localized flood events during heavy rainstorms and dramatically improved the capacity of the system. The City is also placing greater emphasis on creek restoration and use as part of the storm drain system. The City's management guidelines were adopted in order to comply with the Clean Water Program and National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. The project would be required to comply with these regulations and must detain and treat 75 percent of a major storm event on-site. No off-site facilities would be required to accommodate stormwater drainage.³⁰ Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the construction or expansion of storm water drainage 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? (Less-than-Significant Impact)*

See XVI b above.

- 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? (Less-than-Significant Impact)*

See XVI b above.

- f) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Less-than-Significant Impact)*

The City of El Cerrito is within the jurisdiction boundaries of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority (WCCIWMA). WCCIWMA sends waste to two landfills. In 2000, the latest date for which good data is available, the authority sent 180,257 tons per year to the West Contra Costa Landfill and sent 11,117 tons per year to the Keller Canyon Landfill.³¹ The City also contracts with East Bay Sanitary Company for garbage collection. East Bay Sanitary Company hauls waste to the West Contra Costa Landfill. Although the West Contra Costa Landfill had a scheduled closure

³⁰ King, Bruce, 2006. Maintenance and Engineering Manager, El Cerrito Public Works Department. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. March 3.

³¹ California Integrated Waste Management Board, 2006. Jurisdiction Landfill Operations, Active Landfill Profiles. <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/profiles/default.asp>.

date of January 2006, it has not reached capacity and will operate for a few more years.³² Data from 2000 indicate the Keller Canyon Landfill has a remaining capacity of 91 percent (68,279,670 cubic yards) and is scheduled to remain open through December 2030. Existing landfills have 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? (Less-than-Significant Impact)*

The City must divert 50 percent of its solid waste through reduction, recycling, composting, and other activities. In order to achieve this aim, the City offers recycling services through its franchise East Bay Sanitary Company, and requires new development projects to comply with Zoning Ordinance provisions regarding recycling area design. The City will not issue a building permit until the recycling area is approved by the design review board. The proposed project would provide recycling receptacles in compliance with statues and regulations relating to solid waste.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of*

³² King, Bruce, 2006. Maintenance and Engineering Manager, El Cerrito Public Works Department. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. March 3.

the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated)

The proposed project site is located in an area that has been previously developed. This infill site is within an urbanized area having little biological value. Despite the absence of biological resources on the site, the project would potentially contribute to the degradation of water quality through storm water runoff, which may adversely affect riparian wildlife species. No known important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory are located on the site. However, significant impacts could result if archaeological materials are discovered during excavation and related construction activities.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce impacts to natural and historic resources to a less-than-significant level: Mitigation Measures BIO-1, CULT-1, CULT-2, CULT-3, CULT-4, CULT-5, HYD-1a, HYD-1b, and HYD-2.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)? (Less-than-Significant Impact)*

The proposed project would replace a parking lot and small commercial building on an underutilized City block with 58 residential units and 11,000 square feet of retail space. The project’s close proximity to BART and its location in a central urban area with existing infrastructure reduces the possible cumulative effects the project may have in combination with other planned development in El Cerrito and surrounding communities. The impacts of the proposed project are individually limited and not cumulatively considerable.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated)*

The project could have substantial adverse effects on human beings through: air quality degradation during the construction period; placing people at risk to seismic and soils hazards; creating substantial noise during the construction period; and placing new residents close to noise sources. However, these potential impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the following mitigation measures: Mitigation Measures AIR-1, AIR-2, AIR-3, GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-3, NOISE-1, NOISE-2, NOISE-3, NOISE-4, NOISE-5, and NOISE-6.

C. REPORT PREPARERS

LSA Associates, Inc.

2215 Fifth Street
Berkeley, CA 94710

Lynette Dias, AICP, Principal In Charge
Adam Weinstein, Project Manager/Senior Planner
Hannah Young, Assistant Planner
Sue Smith, Word Processing
Skip Shimmin, Graphics Manager

157 Park Place

Point Richmond, CA 94801

Christian Gerike, Principal
Randy Groza, Cultural Resources Manager
John W. Kelley, Cultural Resources Manager
Benjamin Matzen, Cultural Resources Analyst

Andrew McNichol: Visual Simulations

2918 Florence Street, Unit 1
Berkeley, CA 94705

Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc.: *Noise Study*

130 Sutter Street

San Francisco, CA 94104

Eric L. Broadhurst, PE, Vice President
Peter K. Holst, Senior Consultant

Korve Engineering: *Transportation, Circulation and Parking.*

155 Grand Avenue, Suite 400

Oakland, CA 94612

Bill Burton, Senior Traffic Engineer

Secor International Incorporated: *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*

25864-F Business Center Drive

Redlands, CA 92374

Kyle D. Emerson, CED-1271, Senior Vice President
Justin Hone, Staff Geologist

TerraSearch, Inc.: *Geotechnical Investigation*

6840 Via Del Oro, Suite 110

San Jose, CA 95119

Simon Makedessi, PE, GE, Senior Engineer
Aziza Tarin, Staff Engineer

D. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association, 1999. *Start at the Source, Design Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Protection*.
- California Air Resources Board, 2000. *Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles*. October.
- California Department of Finance, 2005. *E-5 City/ County Population and Housing Estimates, 2005, Revised 2001-2004, with 2000 DRU Benchmark*. www.dof.ca.gov. May.
- California Department of Transportation, 2006. California Scenic Highway Program. Website: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html. February 23.
- California Integrated Waste Management Board, 2006. *Jurisdiction Landfill Operations, Active Landfill Profiles*. <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/profiles/default.asp>.
- Capps, Bill, 2006. Fire Marshall, City of El Cerrito Fire Department. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. March 17.
- Charles Salter Associates, Inc., 2006. *El Cerrito Condominiums Environmental Noise Study*. April.
- Delizo, Rex, 2006. Associate Civil Engineer, Stege Sanitary District. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. March 7.
- EIP Associates, 2004. *El Cerrito Plaza Mixed-Use Development Project Draft Subsequent EIR*. November 1.
- El Cerrito, City of, 1999. *General Plan*. August.
- El Cerrito, City of. 2006. *Municipal Code, Title 19, Zoning*.
- Harris, C. (editor), 1991. *Handbook of Acoustical Measurement and Noise Control*.
- Kilmartin, Vince, 2006. Associate Superintendent for Operations, West Contra Costa Unified School District. Personal communication with LSA, Associates, Inc. March 7.
- King, Bruce, 2006. Maintenance and Engineering Manager, City of El Cerrito Public Works Department. Personal Communication with LSA Associates, Inc. March 3.
- Kirkland, Scott, 2006. Police Chief for El Cerrito Police Department. Personal communication with LSA, Associates, Inc. April 12.
- Korve Engineering, 2006. *Mayfair Block Traffic Study*. June 27.
- LSA Associates, Inc., 2006. *A Cultural and Paleontological Resources Study for the El Cerrito del Norte Mixed Use Project, El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California*. March.
- Maples, Lance, 2006. Battalion Chief, City of El Cerrito Fire Department. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. March 3.

Natelson Compoany, 2002. *Notes-An Economic Development Resource of the Natelson Company, Inc. (TCNI)*, Spring.

Prasifka, D.W., 1994. *Water Supply Planning. Malabar, Florida: Krieger Publishing Company.* Krieger Publishing Co: Malabar, Florida. Table 1-6 Summary of Commercial and Institutional Water Use.

San Francisco Air Quality Management District, 2006. *Ambient Air Quality Standards and Bay Area Attainment Status.* http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm. February 24.

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, 1995. *Water Quality Control Plan*, June 21.

SECOR International, Inc., 2006. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report: San Pablo Avenue and Cutting Avenue, El Cerrito, CA.* March.

Terrasearch, Inc., 2005. *Geotechnical Investigation on Proposed Residential Development, Corner of Knott Avenue and San Pablo, El Cerrito, California for the Olson Company.* August.

