AGENDA

SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7:30 p.m.
Thursday, January 24, 2019
El Cerrito City Hall
Council Chambers
10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito

This Meeting Place Is Wheelchair Accessible

Roll Call: Chair: Carl Groch; Board Members: Ben Chuaqui, Wenlin Li, Patrick Riley, and John Thompson.

1. Comments from the Public
   (Each speaker is limited to a maximum of 3 minutes)

2. Approval of Minutes
   Approval of the minutes of the December 5, 2018 meeting.

3. Board Member Communication/Conflict of Interest Disclosure
   This time on the agenda is reserved for Board Members to disclose communications from individuals regarding specific agenda items or to state a potential conflict of interest in relation to a specific agenda item.

   Application: PL17-0028
   Applicant: Charles Oewel, 11965 San Pablo, LLC
   Location: 11965 San Pablo Ave
   APN: 513-340-059
   Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
   General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
   Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for a new 8-story building containing 144 residential units pursuant to the California Density Bonus Law (Government Code Sections 65915 – 65918).
5. Continued Public Hearing: 10192 San Pablo Avenue – Tier II Design Review
   Application: PL18-0068
   Applicant: Lisa Vilhauer, Branagh Land, Inc.
   Location: 10192 San Pablo Avenue
   APN: 504-012-036 and -037
   Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
   General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
   Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for the revised design review of a new 5-story building containing 26 residential units.
   CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.

6. Public Hearing: Tier IV Design Review - Griffin on San Pablo Avenue
   Application: PL17-0134
   Applicant: Bavak El Cerrito LLC
   Location: 11048/11060 San Pablo Ave
   APN: 502-411-021
   Zoning: Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)
   General Plan: Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)
   Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier IV Design Review for two 6-story buildings, including a total of 173 residential units.
   CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182.

7. Public Hearing: Tier I Design Review – 10300 San Pablo Avenue Revision
   Application: PL18-0176
   Applicant: Lisa Vilhauer, The Little Hill LLC
   Location: 10300 San Pablo Avenue
   APN: 503-392-028
   Zoning: Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)
   General Plan: Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)
   Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier I Design Review of proposed material and color changes to a previous Design Review Board approval of Tier IV Design Review (PL16-0139) of two new residential buildings containing a total of 30 residential units and 2 live-work and containing a total of 32 parking spaces in a combination of surface parking and garages.
   CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.
8. Staff Communications

9. Adjournment

Appeals:
A decision of the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Planning Commission, by the applicant or any El Cerrito resident or property owner, through the filing of a written statement and the payment of the applicable appeal fee with the City Clerk within ten calendar days after the decision date. (The applicant may file an appeal for the cost of half the original permit fee.)

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Design Review Board regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Division office located at 10890 San Pablo Avenue during normal business hours.
COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION
To request a meeting agenda in large print, Braille, or on cassette, or to request a sign language interpreter for the meeting, call Sean Moss, Staff Liaison at (510) 215-4330 (voice) at least FIVE (5) WORKING DAYS NOTICE PRIOR TO THE MEETING to ensure availability.

10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA 94530 Tel: (510) 215-4330
E-mail: smoss@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7:30 p.m.  
Wednesday, December 5, 2018  
El Cerrito City Hall  
Council Chambers  
10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito

This Meeting Place Is Wheelchair Accessible

Roll Call: Chair: Carl Groch; Board Members: Ben Chuaqui, Patrick Riley, and John Thompson.

1. Comments from the Public
   No comments were received.

2. Approval of Minutes
   Motion to approve the minutes of the November 7, 2018 meeting: Riley; second: Thompson.
   Vote:
   Ayes: Chuaqui, Groch, Riley, Thompson
   Noes: None
   Abstain: None
   Absent: None

3. Board Member Communication/Conflict of Interest Disclosure
   Nothing was reported.

   Application: PL17-0028
   Applicant: Charles Oewel, 11965 San Pablo, LLC
   Location: 11965 San Pablo Ave
   APN: 513-340-059
   Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
   General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.

Acting Planning Manager, Sean Moss presented the staff report and answered questions from the Board.

Mark Rhoades and Joe DeCredico, of the project team, presented the project and answered questions from the Board.

The public hearing was opened.

The following speakers addressed the Board:
Howdy Goudey

The public hearing was closed.

Motion to continue the item to January 24, 2019: Riley; second: Thompson.
Vote:
Ayes: Chuaqui, Groch, Riley, Thompson
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

5. Public Hearing: 10192 San Pablo Avenue – Tier II Design Review
Application: PL18-0068
Applicant: Lisa Vilhauer, Branagh Land, Inc.
Location: 10192 San Pablo Avenue
APN: 504-012-036 and -037
Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for the revised design review of a new 5-story building containing 26 residential units.

CEQA: The project is within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area, for which a Programmatic Environmental Impact Report was certified. The project is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Government Code Section 65457(a), CEQA Guidelines Section 15182, and Public Resources Code Section 21155.4.

Consulting Planner, Carla Violet presented the staff report and answered questions from the Board.

Lisa Vilhauer and Scott Thomsen, of the project team, presented the project and answered questions from the Board.

The public hearing was opened.

The following speakers addressed the Board:
Howdy Goudey
The applicant, Lisa Vilhauer, responded to comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Motion to continue the item to January 24, 2019: Riley; second: Thompson.
Vote:
Ayes: Chuaqui, Groch, Riley, Thompson
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

6. **Staff Communications**
   Staff updated the Board on a new appointment to the Board and upcoming meeting scheduling.

7. **Adjournment**
   9:54 p.m.
Memorandum

Date: January 24, 2019
To: Design Review Board
From: Sean Moss, Zoning Administrator
Subject: 11965 San Pablo Avenue (Polaris Apartments)

On December 5, 2018, the Design Review Board considered Tier II Design Review for this project. The Board continued the item to January 24, 2019.

The applicant was not able make revisions to the project and submit the materials with sufficient time for staff to prepare the necessary materials, including environmental review documents, for the January 24, 2019 meeting.

Therefore, staff recommends continuance of this item to a future meeting.
Details

Application Number: PL18-0068

Applicant: Lisa Vilhauer, Branagh Land, Inc.

Location: 10192 San Pablo Avenue

APNs: 504-012-036 and -037

Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)

General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)

Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for a new 5-story building containing 26 residential units.

CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.

Executive Summary

The requested entitlement for Design Review Board review consists of a Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The proposed project includes 26 new residential units in one 5-story building, with parking located behind the building.

The project requires Tier II Design Review approval from the Design Review Board. This review includes authority over the following elements only:

- Exterior building colors, materials, and textures
- Landscaping
- Site Plan
- Building facades and articulation
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way
- Signs
- Locations and footprints of bioretention facilities as required for stormwater management

The project was originally considered by the Design Review Board on July 5, 2017 and then approved on August 2, 2017. In May 2018, the applicant submitted a revised project with an increased height of 5 stories and 5 additional units. The design was also revised to include new colors and materials. The revised project was considered by the Design Review Board on December 5, 2018 and continued to January 24, 2019. In January 2019, the applicant submitted new plans with revisions to the ground floor, including a main entrance and lobby now proposed at the center of the building, and slight changes to colors and materials.

Based on the information in this report, which supports the required findings, staff recommends approval of the project.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The project site is located at the southeast corner of San Pablo Avenue and Lincoln Avenue. The site is comprised of two parcels (APNs 504-012-036 and 504-012-037). The combined site is a total of 18,400 square feet (0.42 acres). The site is 100 feet deep, extending halfway through the block that extends back to Kearney Street. The site slopes up gently from San Pablo Avenue. The adjacent properties on Kearney Street sit at a slightly higher elevation than the site. The project site is within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area.

Vicinity Map

Existing Public Right-of-Way

The site has 184 feet of street frontage along San Pablo Avenue and 100 feet of street frontage along Lincoln Avenue. The street frontage on San Pablo Avenue features an existing AC Transit bus stop (Lines 72 and 72M). This stop is planned to be relocated to the north side of the intersection in the Complete Streets Chapter of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The existing right-of-way improvements feature one bike rack, two granite blocks and a bench at the bus stop, which were installed as part of the San Pablo Avenue streetscape project. In addition, a historical paver, adjacent to the site, commemorates the location and history of Violet’s Dining Room near the project site.

The existing public right-of-way on Lincoln Avenue contains a sidewalk which appears to be about 5.5 feet wide and a landscape strip between the sidewalk and the curb which appears to be about 7.5 feet wide.

Existing/Previous Land Use

The site has been utilized as an auto repair shop (Rob’s Auto) for the last several years. The site is currently vacant.
Adjacent Land Uses

North: Lincoln Avenue. (Across Lincoln Avenue sits an automotive sales business.) (TOHIMU)

East: Single-family residences on Kearney Street. (TOHIMU)

South: Commercial uses (Peppermint Tree Plaza shopping center) (TOHIMU)

West: San Pablo Avenue. (Across San Pablo Avenue sits an automotive service business.) (TOHIMU)

Analysis

Project Description

The proposed project consists of a 39,052 square foot building containing 26 residential units. The building would front onto San Pablo Avenue with three entries onto the street. Behind the building would be a parking area consisting of 10 surface parking spaces and 13 parking spaces in garages at the back of the proposed building. The parking area would be accessed from Lincoln Avenue. One building entry would also be present on the backside of the building from the parking area.

The building would feature a combination of flats and two-story units. The project contains ten three-bedroom units and sixteen two-bedroom units. The two-story units would be located on the ground floor, while the flats would be located on the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th floors. There are two stairways and one elevator to serve the residents of this building.

19 long term bicycle parking spaces would be accommodated with vertical racks in the in the garages. An additional 20 bike parking spaces would be accommodated in the covered bicycle parking area at the rear of the site.

A trash enclosure accommodating the required bins would be located near the entrance to the parking area and would be accessed from Lincoln Avenue.
Prior Approval

The project was originally considered by the Design Review Board on July 5, 2017 and approved by the Board on August 2, 2017. This previously approved project included a 4-story residential building containing 21 dwelling units. In May 2018, the applicant submitted a revised project with an increased height of 5 stories and 5 additional units. The design was also revised to include new colors and materials. In January 2019, the applicant submitted new plans with revisions to the ground floor, including a main entrance and lobby now proposed at the center of the building, and slight changes to colors and materials. These changes were made to address the Design Review Board’s December 5, 2018 comments, as detailed further below.

Compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

Chapter Two of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan establishes the land use regulations and development standards of the Specific Plan Area.

Some development standards apply throughout the Plan area. These include:
- Regulation by Street Type – which includes building placement, building form, and shadow analysis.
- Open Space Requirements – which include private, common and public types of open space.

Other development standards vary by transect zone. The development standards that are related to the transect zone include:
- Use-Types of land use permitted, conditionally permitted or prohibited.
- Building Height- the minimums and maximums heights allowed.
- Parking of vehicles – the minimum and maximum number of spaces allowed.
- Parking of bicycles- the minimum number of spaces allowed.

This project is located in the Transit-Oriented High Intensity Mixed-Use (TOHIMU) Transect and meets all of the relevant development standards specified for its location in the Plan Area.

The tables below show the relevant Specific Plan standards and the compliance of the project with those standards.

The project is located on the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Lincoln Avenue. This section of San Pablo Avenue is designated a Community Street. Lincoln Avenue is a Neighborhood Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation by Street Type: SPA Community Street</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</td>
<td>6 ft. min</td>
<td>7 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</td>
<td>8 ft. min</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Activity Zone</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Front Setback</td>
<td>Min: distance needed to accommodate required zones Max: 10 ft. for non-residential uses, 15 ft. for residential uses</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>9 ft. min on Lincoln Ave side,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Setback</strong></td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>5 ft. on interior side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Access</strong></td>
<td>Entries on front or side streets</td>
<td>50 ft. (Meets shadow standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicular Access</strong></td>
<td>Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways. Side access on corner lots</td>
<td>3 building entries on San Pablo Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Building Form** |
| **Upper Floor Setbacks** | See Shadows | Building is setback in compliance with required shadow standards. |
| **Ground Floor Ceiling Height** | 14 ft. min clear | 14 ft. min |
| **Upper Floor Ceiling Height** | 9 ft. min clear | 9 ft. min |
| **Building Length** | 200 ft. max | 170 ft. |
| **Ground Floor Transparency** | Non-residential 75% min, Residential 40% min. | 40% |
| **Upper Floor Transparency** | 30% min | 32% |
| **Front Encroachments** | 4 ft. max | 1 ft. 10 in. max |
| **Rear Encroachments** | 4 ft. max | 0 ft. |
| **Allowed Frontage Types** | Min: 50% Flex Max: 50% Forecourt Max: 100% Shop Front, Arcade | Flex Front (100%) |

| **Neighborhood Street** |
| **Building Placement** |
| **Sidewalk Amenity Zone** | 5 ft. min | 5 ft. min |
| **Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone** | 6 ft. min adjacent to commercial uses, 5 ft. min adjacent to residential uses | 6 ft. |
| **Sidewalk Activity Zone** | 0 ft. min | 3.8 ft. |
| **Ground Floor Front Setback** | Min: distance needed to accommodate required zones Max: 10 ft. for non-residential uses, 15 ft. for residential uses | 9 ft. min |
| **Pedestrian Access** | Entries on front or side streets | 3 building entries on San Pablo Avenue |
| **Vehicular Access** | Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways. Side access on corner lots | (0) 20 ft. driveway (side access) |

| **Building Form** |
| **Upper Floor Setbacks** | See Shadows | Building is setback in compliance with required daylight plane. |
| **Ground Floor Ceiling Height** | 14 ft. min clear | 14 ft. min |
| **Upper Floor Ceiling Height** | 9 ft. min clear | 9 ft. min |
| **Building Length** | 200 ft. max | 49 ft. 6 in. |
| **Ground Floor Transparency** | Non-residential 50% min, Residential 30% min. | 30% |
| Upper Floor Transparency | 25% min | 25% |
| Front Encroachments | 4 ft. max | 0 ft. |
| Rear Encroachments | 4 ft. max | 0 ft. |
| Allowed Frontage Types | Front Yard, Forecourt (NE side), Flex (commercial), Shop Front (commercial) | Front Yard |

Note: For the purposes of administering the development standards detailed above, the Zoning Administrator has determined that San Pablo Avenue is the front of the project site, and in the event of a conflict, the San Pablo Avenue Community Street standards prevail.

### Open Space Requirements

| Private/Common Open Space | 80 sq. ft./unit min | Min 80 sq. ft. deck/unit |
| Public Open Space | 25 sq. ft./1,000 sq. ft. of building for buildings >25,000 sq. ft. May pay fee in-lieu of providing public open space on site. | In-lieu fee for 976 sq. ft. of public open space |

### Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use Zone

| Parking | Up to 1 space/unit (Reductions and increases allowed with Zoning Administrator approval) | 0.85 space per unit plus one accessible space (total of 23 spaces) |
| Bicycle Parking | Min 1 short-term space/10 units Min 1.5 long-term spaces/unit | 4 short-term spaces 39 long-term spaces |
| Building Height | 65 ft. max | 64.5 ft. |
| Minimum Height | 3 stories residential, 2 stories commercial | 5 residential stories |

In addition, the project will implement the following strategies of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan:

**Strategy A.3:** Optimize Placemaking in all developments.

The project addresses San Pablo Avenue with entries onto the street and improvements within the public-right-of-way. The project will enhance San Pablo Avenue, as a place, in conformance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

**Strategy B.1:** Maximize TOD potential (BART and AC Transit).

The project will provide 26 new housing units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines and the El Cerrito Plaza BART station. The project includes bike parking as required by the San Pablo
Avenue Specific Plan and will face San Pablo Avenue, providing a pleasant pedestrian environment along the street.

**Strategy B.2:** Stimulate investment in vacant/underutilized sites at key focus areas.

The project utilizes an underutilized site. The site is currently vacant. Previously, the site contained one business located in a small building, with most of the site devoted to surface parking and auto circulation. The proposed project will provide 26 new housing units in close proximity to public transit.

**Strategy C.3:** Allow ground floor residential development to provide flexibility and expand the Specific Plan Area’s residential base.

The project proposes ground floor residential units and will expand the residential base within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area.

**Strategy E.1:** Promote infill development through increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure.

The project will provide 26 new housing units on an underutilized site, in close proximity to existing public transit infrastructure.

**Design Review Process**

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.B of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, Tier II Design Review is the entitlement process for new projects that have been designed in full-compliance with the design standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The Design Review Board is the body of decision for Tier II Design Review. The discretionary scope of Tier II Design Review includes the following components:

- Exterior building colors, materials, and textures
- Landscaping
- Site Plan
- Building facades and articulation
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way
- Signs
- Locations and footprints of bioretention facilities as required for stormwater management

**Design Review Board Comments**

The Design Review Board reviewed the project on December 5, 2018 and gave comments to the applicant. The Board then continued the item to the January 24, 2019 meeting.

Clarifications and comments from the Board at the December 5, 2018 meeting and the applicant’s response to those comments are summarized below:

Clarification: Correct cardinal directions on Elevation drawings.

_**Response:** Cardinal directions corrected._

Clarification: Add location of vehicular gate to Site Plan at Lincoln entrance.
Response: The site plan and elevations now indicate the location of pedestrian and vehicular gates

Comment: Create a lobby in the center that is open to San Pablo Avenue (instead of blank stucco wall) by moving the elevator off center. Open up the central element as a 5-story storefront or window wall (instead of stucco wall).

Response: The ground floor has changed to include one central entrance with a lobby that includes mailboxes and windows were added up the central element to provide more transparency at the front entrance.

Comment: Add more transparency for the front entrance or a double-sided elevator pushed back to allow the lobby to be at grade with San Pablo Avenue. The centerpiece would look better with corten (as opposed to stucco). Otherwise create some texture with louvers.

Response: A double-sided elevator is being proposed. The exterior material of the building centerpiece is now corten steel.

Comment: Move stair enclosure back so units do not open directly into the stairwell.

Response: The Building Official has reviewed and determined this complies with the building code (assuming fire door requirements are met).

Comment: Add some color/lighten up the back of the building.

Response: The color scheme at the rear of the building is lightened with more of the light gray (‘San Francisco Fog’) stucco.

Comment: Add a better approach on Lincoln to show people where to go for Uber/Lyft and parking.

Response: There is currently no parking on the south side of Lincoln Avenue. The applicant has offered to work with Public Works to add one street space on San Pablo Avenue by removing the curb cut and making this a 10 to 20-minute parking space for loading/unloading (if feasible).
Revised January 24, 2018 Project Rendering

Previous December 5, 2018 Project Rendering
Landscape Design

The landscape design remains the same as previously approved. All proposed trees are 24” box. The stormwater planter areas contain only *Muhlenbergia Rigens* (Deer Grass) and *Frangula California ‘Eve Castle’* (Coffeeberry).

The plant selection along the front of the building adjacent to the entries include *Rhaphilolepis ‘Elenor Tabor’* (Indian Hawthorn) near the building entries.

Art in Public Places

The project is required to comply with Chapter 13.50: Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. Provision of public art onsite has not been included as part of the project submittal. The applicant will, therefore, be required to pay an in-lieu fee of one percent of the development costs to a public art fund for the commission of public art throughout the city.

Required Monetary Contributions to the Community

To understand the direct and indirect contributions to the community, staff has created a list illustrating the financial contributions that are required as part of the development of the project. Some are directly submitted to the City of El Cerrito. Others are submitted to community agencies such as the West Contra Costa Unified School District and West County Transportation Advisory Committee. These contributions are over and above what is required for their fair share of impacts to: the Complete Streets component of the Specific Plan referenced below, any fees paid to the Stege Sanitary District and any building and planning user fees needed for processing the entitlement, plan review and inspection of the project during the construction phase.
1. Estimated* West Contra Costa Unified School District fee of $5.02 per square foot are assessed on gross square footage of the project. (39,052 sq. ft. x 5.02= $196,041.04) This money is collected by the School District to help fund both modernization and new construction of school facilities.

2. Estimated* West County Sub Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP Fee) of $1,648 per multi-family dwelling unit. (26 du x $1,648= $42,848). This is collected by the City and transferred to West County Transportation Advisory Committee to assure that new development in West County pays its fair-share toward regional circulation and transit improvements that are proportional to the traffic impact the new development will generate. The local fees collected in West County provide congestion relief to mitigate traffic on regional routes and through improved transit service.

Total community contribution of this project is estimated to be $238,889.04

*Denotes that these fees change on a periodic basis and are due at building permit. As construction plans typically take 12 to 18 months to complete, these fees may have changed by the time payment is due.

Complete Streets Plan

The project will be required to make a fair-share contribution toward the improvements contained in the Complete Streets chapter of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. These improvements will be made as funds become available. For the section of San Pablo Avenue south of Lincoln Avenue, the improvements include pedestrian bulb-outs at intersections, bulb-outs at bus stops, and a ‘Super Sharrow’ in the right-most travel lane. Street parking will be preserved. At Lincoln Avenue, the existing AC Transit bus stop is planned to be relocated to the north side of Lincoln Avenue to allow more efficient transit operation.

Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times, posted on the site on November 13, 2018, and mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site on November 14, 2018.

Staff received a letter from Margrit Cavenecia, a neighbor of the project, expressing concern about adding a 5th floor to the building and requesting that the applicant add creative landscaping at the rear of the building to help buffer the view from the level of her home on December 2, 2018 (Attachment 5).

*Staff Response: The applicant continues to be in communication with Ms. Cavenecia to come up with landscaping ideas that will help buffer the view of the project from the level of her home. Staff anticipates an update from the applicant during the January 24, 2019 meeting.*

Staff received a letter from Yohance Edwards, a neighbor of the project, expressing concerns about the addition of a 5th story without adding corresponding parking spaces, a lack of public open space and public art in the plans, and construction impacts on the environment on December 5, 2018 (Attachment 6).

*Staff Response: According to the Table 32 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP), up to 1 auto space is permitted in the TOHIMU Zoning District. This project complies by providing 0.85 space per unit. Per Table 28 of the SPASP, applicants are permitted to pay an in-lieu fee if no public open space is provided by the project. Similarly, per Section 2.05.05.04 of the SPASP, applicants are permitted to pay an in-lieu contribution to the City’s Public Art Fund if no public art is provided. Lastly, environmental documentation was prepared for this project which determined that no new mitigation measures were*
Environmental Review

A Program Environmental Impact Report (program EIR) was certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in 2014. This type of environmental documentation is authorized by section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for use in documenting the environmental impacts of specific plans, and other planning "programs." As explained in the CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR is useful in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of a project that involves a series of interrelated actions that can reasonably be characterized as a single project. Subsequent activities that fall within the scope of the program may not be subject to further environmental review if the environmental effects of the subsequent activity have been adequately addressed in the program EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR.

An Initial Study Checklist has been prepared for this project (Attachment 3). The responses contained in the checklist confirm that the project is considered within the scope of the evaluation completed for the program EIR. No new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required.

Several conditions of approval have been included in the draft resolution to ensure that key mitigation measures of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR are implemented with regard to this project. The inclusion of these conditions ensure that the project will not have environmental effects which have not previously been addressed in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

Compliance with the General Plan

The project is consistent with and will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

**LU1.5: Suitable Housing.** Promote suitably located housing and services for all age groups within the city. Within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area, allow ground floor residential development and increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure to promote residential infill development and catalyze mode shift.

*The project will provide 26 new housing units on San Pablo Avenue, with close proximity to public transportation and commercial uses. The infill project contains ground-floor residential units in a location adjacent to an existing bus stop.*

**LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area.** Promote retail, office, and mixed uses within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area to provide more tax revenues to the city.

*In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the proposed project will add housing units to San Pablo Avenue which will promote a balanced mixture of land uses in the corridor. The new residents of the project will support new and existing businesses along San Pablo Avenue.*

**LU4.1: Mixture of Uses.** Encourage a mix of uses that promotes such community values as convenience, economic vitality, fiscal stability, public safety, a healthy environment, and a pleasant quality of life.

*The proposed project will enhance the mixture of uses along San Pablo Avenue. The location of the project will provide the residents with convenient access to businesses, parks, schools, public transit and the Ohlone Greenway. The design of the project will allow for surveillance of the street, enhancing public safety.*
LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives. To the extent possible, encourage alternatives to the use of private automobiles. Encourage a full range of transportation options – driving, transit, walking and biking – without allowing any one to preclude the others. On San Pablo Avenue, in many constrained right-of-ways, it is not possible to provide optimum facilities for all user groups and in the event that trade-offs are necessary, transit users and pedestrians are the highest priority.

The location of the project provides convenient access to frequent public transit along San Pablo Avenue as well as the El Cerrito Plaza BART station. The location also provides convenient walking access to local businesses.

CD1.9: Building Design. A variety of attractive images will be achieved by encouraging a variety of building styles and designs, within a unifying context of consistent “pedestrian” scale along streets and compatibility among neighboring land uses.

The proposed project is designed at a pedestrian scale and addresses San Pablo Avenue with building entries and windows along the street.

CD2.1: Street Frontages. Encourage street frontages that are safe, by allowing for surveillance of the street by people inside buildings and elsewhere, and are interesting for pedestrians. Require buildings in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area to be directly abutting sidewalks, with window openings, entries and high levels of transparency along the pedestrian frontage.

The building will abut the sidewalk on San Pablo Avenue and features ample window openings, decks, and doors along the street. These windows and decks will allow surveillance of the street from the units within the project. The project meets or exceeds the transparency standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements. Maintain an active program of street tree planting and improved roadway landscaping through both public and private means. Design guidelines shall describe appropriate types of trees for commercial areas – to enhance the shopping experience rather than detract from it.

The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan implemented standards and requirements for public right-of-way improvements. The project is consistent with the standards and will enhance the adjacent public rights of way in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

CD3.2: Usable Open Space. Require the provision of usable open space in the form of ground-floor patios, upper-floor decks, and balconies, as well as common recreational facilities and amenities.

The project features decks on both ground floor and upper floor units.

CD3.3: Site Landscaping. Improve the appearance of the community by requiring aesthetically designed screening and landscaping on public and private sites. Ensure that public landscaping includes entry areas, street medians, parks, and schools. Require landscaping for all private sites, yard spaces, parking lots, plazas, courtyards, and recreational areas.

The project has provided landscaping in conformance with the standards in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. Landscaping will be provided to soften the building edge along San Pablo Avenue, and landscaping is provided as a buffer between the parking area and adjacent properties.

CD3.12: Landscape Species. Indigenous and drought-tolerant species that reduce water usage and are compatible with El Cerrito’s climate are encouraged.
The proposed plant palette includes native, drought-tolerance plants such as Manzanita, Coffeeberry, Deer Grass, and Gray Rush.

**CD4.2: Building Articulation.** Ensure that buildings are well articulated. Avoid large unarticulated shapes in building design. Ensure that building designs include varied building facades, rooflines, and building heights to create more interesting and differentiated building forms and shapes. Encourage human scale detail in architectural design. Do not allow unarticulated blank walls or unbroken series of garage doors on the facades of buildings facing the street or the Ohlone Greenway.

*The proposed building is articulated in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building includes a varied roofline and interesting building form. The project meets or exceeds the transparency standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building is designed at a human scale with building entries along San Pablo Avenue.*

**CD5.1: Design Review Process.** Continue design review and approval process for all new development, changes, additions, and modifications of existing buildings (except for single-family homes on existing lots).

*The proposed project requires Tier II Design Review approval from the Design Review Board in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.*

**T2.1: Land Use Patterns.** Recognize the link between land use and transportation. Promote land use and development patterns that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use. Emphasize high-density and mixed land use patterns that promote transit and pedestrian travel. Where feasible, emphasize the following land use measures:

1. Promote conveniently located neighborhood complexes that provide housing and commercial services near employment centers and within transit corridors.
2. Promote land use patterns that maximize trip-linking opportunities by assembling uses that allow people to take care of a variety of daily needs.
3. Encourage pedestrian-oriented land use and urban design that can have a demonstrable effect on transportation choices.
4. Direct growth to occur along transit corridors.
5. Encourage retail, commercial, and office uses in ground floor space in combination with upper-floor housing along San Pablo Avenue.

*The project will provide 26 new residences in close proximity to public transportation and local businesses. In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the project will add housing units along San Pablo Avenue, a major transit corridor.*

**T2.2: Project Design.** Projects should be designed to include features that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.

*The project will have building entries directly onto San Pablo Avenue that provide convenient access to the adjacent bus stop.*

**H2.2:** Encourage the construction of transit-oriented developments (TODs) that seek to maximize opportunities for the use of public transit and transportation corridors through high-density residential and mixed-use projects along those corridors in accordance with the San
Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and the City’s Incentives Program (Chapter 19.23 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance.)

The project provides high-density housing along a transit corridor consistent with the Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use Transect Zone in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

H2.3: Continue to enforce the sections of the Zoning Ordinance that increase density, reduce parking requirements, and establish design and development standards to create inviting, mixed-use neighborhoods around transit, and enforce the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan reduced parking requirements and eliminated maximum density in the plan area. This project will enhance the mix of uses in the corridor adjacent to public transit. The project complies fully with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Required Findings

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.B.3 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, in acting to approve or conditionally approve an application for the Design Component of a Tier II Site Plan and Design Review, the Design Review Board shall make the following findings:

a. That the project complies with all applicable Specific Plan design standards; and

   As discussed in this report, the project complies with all standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

b. That the project implements applicable goals and policies of the El Cerrito General Plan.


Staff Recommendation

Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends approval of Planning Application No. PL18-0068, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.

Proposed Motion

Move adoption of Design Review Board Resolution DRB19-01 granting Tier II Design Review approval to Planning Application No. PL18-0068: a project that includes a 5-story residential building containing 26 dwelling units located at 10192 San Pablo Avenue.

Appeal Period
Within ten (10) working days after the date of the decision, the Design Review Board action may be appealed to the Planning Commission.

Attachments

1. Draft Resolution
2. Project Plans, dated January 9, 2019
3. Initial Study Checklist and appendices
4. Letter from Margrit Cavenecia, dated December 2, 2018
5. Letter from Yohance Edwards, dated December 5, 2018
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO DESIGN REVIEW BOARD GRANTING TIER II DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING CONTAINING 26 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AT 10192 SAN PABLO AVENUE.

WHEREAS, the site is located within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area;

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use and the project is located on the San Pablo Avenue Community Street and Neighborhood Street designations;

WHEREAS, the project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182;

WHEREAS, the site is located at 10192 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Numbers of the site are 504-012-036 and 504-012-037;

WHEREAS, on May 15, 2018, the applicant submitted an application for Tier II Design Review;

WHEREAS, on June 8, 2018, the application was determined to be complete; and

WHEREAS, on December 5, 2018, the Design Review Board held a public hearing, considered the project, and continued the item to January 24, 2019; and

WHEREAS, on January 24, 2019, the Design Review Board, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review does find and determine the following:

1. The project is consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182 and is subject to the Program Environmental Impact Report mitigation measures listed below.

2. The project complies with all applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The project complies with the standards for the San Pablo Avenue Community Street type and Neighborhood Street type, the standards for the Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use district, and all other applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Design Review Board hereby approves Application No. PL18-0068, subject to the following conditions:
Planning Division:

1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans dated November 28, 2018. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Once constructed or installed, all improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If Applicant constructs buildings or makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for nonissuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.

4. If not used, this design review approval shall expire two years from the date of this action.

5. The applicant shall share the conditions of approval with their general contractor for the project. The general contractor shall sign a copy of the conditions of approval to acknowledge that he/she is aware of all these conditions of approval and will comply as directed. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, this signed copy shall be returned to the planning and building division and kept as part of the project file. The conditions of approval shall be reviewed at the mandatory pre-construction meeting held between the City and the General Contractor. A copy of the conditions of approval shall be maintained on the project site at all times during construction.

6. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Chapter 13.50: Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The project shall be fully compliant with Chapter 13.50 prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

7. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall pay the required fee ($99,552) in-lieu of providing public open space on the project site.

8. In compliance with Chapter 16.34 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, the applicant shall submit plans for undergrounding of utilities adjacent to the project to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permit.

9. The cost of all automobile parking shall be separate from the sale or rental price of all residential units. All renters and/or buyers of residential units shall be free to not rent and/or purchase parking.

Conditions based on applicable mitigation measures from the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR:

10. Aesthetics and Visual Resources. (Mitigation 4.2): The project shall install landscaping and incorporate other measures into and around parking structure(s) (light source shielding, etc.) as necessary to ensure that potential light and glare from vehicles would be avoided toward the Ohlone Greenway, residential uses, and other sensitive uses, consistent with El Cerrito City Resolution 82-9 and the El Cerrito design review process.

Regarding reflective building materials, for all future development in the Specific Plan area, facades shall be of non-reflective materials, and windows shall incorporate non-reflective coating.
11. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.1): Implement the following BAAQMD-recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction. City staff will spot check that these measures are being implemented throughout the construction phase of the project. These measures reduce diesel particulate matter $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10}$ created from construction to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced:

Dust ($PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10}$) Control Measures:

a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp at all times.
b. Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
c. Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.
d. Hydrosed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., previously graded areas that are inactive for 10 days or more).
e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.
f. Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph.
g. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
h. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site.
i. Post a publically visible sign(s) with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Particulate Matter and other construction emissions:

j. The developer or contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City or BAAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average for the year 2011.
k. Clear signage at all construction sites shall be posted indicating that diesel and gasoline equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site or adjacent to the construction site.
l. The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).
m. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.

12. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.2): Prior to issuance of building permit the applicant shall require project-level construction health risk assessment shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. This assessment shall be completed either through screening or refined modeling to identify impacts and, if necessary, include performance standards and industry-recognized measures to be accomplished through, though is not limited to, the following measures:

a. Construction equipment selection.
b. Use of alternative fuels and engine retrofits temporary line power or electric equipment.

c. Modified construction schedule; and

d. Implementation of BAAQMD Basic and/or Additional Construction Mitigation Measures for control of fugitive dust.

13. Biological Impacts (Mitigation Measure 6.1): Removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation between February 1 and August 31 shall require a survey for nesting birds by a qualified wildlife biologist to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The survey shall be conducted no sooner than 14 days prior to the start of removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation. Survey results shall be valid for 21 days following the survey. Any removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation more than 21 days after a survey shall require a new survey. The area surveyed shall include all construction sites, access roads, and staging areas, as well as areas within 150 feet outside the boundaries of the areas to be cleared or as otherwise determined by the biologist.

In the event that an active nest is discovered in the areas to be cleared, or in other habitats within 150 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction shall be postponed for at least two weeks or until a wildlife biologist has determined that the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts.

A qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for bats and suitable bat roosting habitat at work sites where culverts, structures and/or trees would be removed or otherwise disturbed prior to the initiation of construction. If bats or suitable bat roosting habitat is detected, CDFW shall be notified immediately for consultation and possible on-site monitoring.

The survey for nesting birds, bats and suitable bat roosting habitat may be conducted simultaneously.

14. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall implement a program that includes the following elements:
   a. Archeological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Procedures for reporting archeological discoveries

15. Historic and Cultural Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.2): If subsurface archeological or cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described in Mitigation Measure 7-3 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) shall apply, and there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the Contra Costa County Coroner has been notified of the remains and has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

16. Paleontological Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.3): The applicant shall implement a program that includes the following elements:
   c. Paleontological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   d. Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitor of all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface
e. Procedures for reporting paleontological discoveries and their geologic context

If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered, excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources, and the project paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and its stratigraphic context. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts to paleontological resources. During monitoring, if potentially significant paleontological resources are found, “standard” samples shall be collected and processed by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils. If significant fossils are found and collected, they shall be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix shall be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of material collected and identified shall be provided to a local museum repository with the specimens. Significant fossils collected during this work, along with the itemized inventory of these specimens, shall be deposited in a local museum repository for permanent curatorship and storage. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities, and the significance of the fossils, if any, shall be prepared and submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

17. Geology and Soils (Mitigation Measure 8.1): As required by the Building Official, subject to City review and approval, the applicant shall complete and implement the geotechnical mitigation recommendations identified in the required site-specific geotechnical investigations and engineering studies, in coordination with City grading permit and building permit performance standards.

18. Noise (Mitigation 13.2): New commercial development proposed in the same building as or adjacent to residential development could result in noise levels exceeding City standards.

   a. Noise levels at residential property lines from commercial development shall be maintained not in excess of the General Plan and municipal code limits for the Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond. The approval of the commercial development shall require a noise study demonstrating how the business—including loading docks, refuse areas, and ventilation systems—would meet these requirements and would be consistent with the respective City’s noise standards.

   b. Ensure that noise-generating activities, such as maintenance and loading and unloading, are limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM.

19. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/ Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.3): Construction equipment shall be well-maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical. The following measures shall be implemented to reduce noise from construction activities:

   a. Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

   b. Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

   c. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as feasible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction area.

   d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

   e. Pre-drill foundation pile holes to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile.

   f. Construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to operational business, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses.

   g. If noise conflicts occur which are not irresolvable by proper scheduling, a temporary noise control blanket barrier shall be erected, as determined to be necessary by the Zoning Administrator, along building facades facing construction sites.

   h. Route construction-related traffic along major roadways and as far as feasible from sensitive receptors.
i. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) and excavating, grading, and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and to the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Work shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays.

j. Businesses, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to construction sites shall be notified of the construction schedule in writing.

k. Designate a “construction liaison” who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The liaison would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the liaison at the construction site.

20. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation 13-4): The following measures are recommended to reduce vibration from construction activities:
   a. Avoid impact pile driving where possible. Drilled piles causes lower vibration levels where geological conditions permit their use.
   b. Avoid using vibratory rollers and tampers near sensitive areas.
   c. In areas where project construction is anticipated to include vibration-generating activities, such as pile driving, in close proximity to existing structures, site-specific vibration studies shall be conducted to determine the area of impact and to present appropriate mitigation measures that may include the following:
      1. Identify sites that would include vibration compaction activities (such as pile driving) and have the potential to generate ground-borne vibration, and the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 200 feet of the project. A qualified structural engineer should conduct this task.
      2. Develop a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, define structure-specific vibration limits, and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions.
      3. Design construction contingencies that would be implemented when vibration levels approached the limits.
      4. At a minimum, conduct vibration monitoring during initial demolition activities and during pile driving activities. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements.
      5. When vibration levels approach limits, suspend construction and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.
      6. Conduct post-survey on structures under either of these circumstances: (a) when construction monitoring has indicated high vibration levels or (b) when complaints of damage have been made due to construction activities. Make appropriate repairs or compensation when damage has resulted from construction activities.

Project Specific Conditions of Approval:

21. The following interior noise reduction measures shall be included for all west facing (facing San Pablo Avenue) units:
   a. Living room and bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 38.
   b. Exterior finish shall be three-coat stucco or system with equivalent weight per square foot;
   c. Interior gypsum at exterior walls shall be 5/8” Type X or Type C hung on resilient channel (RC);
   d. Ceiling gypsum shall be 5/8” type X or Type C;
e. 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 shall 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. The Zoning Administrator shall approve any substitute measures or alternatives to the measures detailed above.

22. Prior to issuance of building permit, the project applicant shall revise Civil and Landscape sheets in the plan set to reflect the new central location of the elevator. Also Sheet A0.2 shall be corrected with correct cardinal directions on the glazing diagrams.

23. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall include on the plans a trellis or covering located at the bus stop adjacent to the project (subject to approval by the Public Works Director and any other applicable agencies). The intent of the trellis or covering shall be to cover the bus stop or provide a covered waiting area for bus riders.

Public Works Department:

24. Storm water control plan and all C.3 measures shall be re-submitted with the Building Plan set to confirm that the plans dated November 28, 2018 comply with most recently adopted Municipal Regional Permit. Applicant shall use the updated version of the storm water control report as the last submittal was using the old template. See the following links for reference: http://www.cccleanwater.org/new-development-c-3/.

25. Prior to issuance of building permit the applicant shall submit a request to the Public Works Department for at least 10 feet of red curb on both sides of the project driveway on Lincoln Avenue.

26. The existing granite blocks and street furniture along the project frontage shall remain in place or shall be relocated consistent with the public right-of-way improvement standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

27. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a detailed grading plan, obtain a Grading & Transportation Permit, and pay all associated fees for earthwork and grading operations in excess of 50 cubic yards.

28. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall provide a drainage plan for new roof and any rain leaders. All drainage shall stay on-site, draining away from the foundations, 10 feet from property lines, and shall not cause a nuisance to neighboring properties.

29. The building plans shall note that all sidewalk, curb and gutter along the development’s public right-of-way frontages shall be replaced to meet current City and ADA standards to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

30. Prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall replace the existing flashing crossing signs at the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and San Pablo Avenue with standard Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons on both sides of San Pablo Avenue in both the northbound and southbound approaches.
31. All improvements on the property frontage shall comply with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, including the Complete Streets chapter to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

32. Before any work commences related to any street tree, sidewalk and driveway, applicant shall obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.

33. New street trees must be from the City Master Tree List and approved by the City Arborist before issuance of the building permit. Any new street trees are required to have irrigation and an establishment period of 3 years prior to acceptance by the City.

34. Prior to issuance of building permit, the project Applicant shall pay a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal Complete Streets improvements identified by the Specific Plan as determined by the Public Works Director.

35. Bike racks to be installed shall meet the current standards and details to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

36. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.

Building Department:

37. Compliance with the Building Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required.

Fire Department:

38. Compliance with the Fire Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required. The following list is provided to assist the Applicant/Development Team with the preparation of the building plans:

a. Emergency Vehicle Access
   1. Provide code analysis and show on plans how “Emergency Vehicle Access” requirements are met to get within 150 feet of all portions of exterior walls of the first story.

b. Fire Flow Requirements
   1. Provide code analysis of required total firefighting water.
   2. Based on required fire flow, show on plans the number of fire hydrants required and locations based on maximum spacing requirements.
   3. If required, plans for fire service underground shall be submitted for review, approval and permit under separate cover.

c. Fire Riser Locations
   1. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable to the fire department for emergency operations.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected between the two buildings.

d. Gates
   1. All gates shall be operable by the use of a Knox Key.
   2. A “KNOX BOX” shall be installed with keys for all common areas at all gates and doors.

e. Premises Identification
   1. Approved numbers or address shall be provided in such a position to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property.
   2. Address shall be either internally or externally illuminated.

f. Automatic Fire Sprinklers
1. Automatic Fire Sprinklers shall be installed throughout the Complex.
2. Fire sprinkler plans shall be submitted for review, approval and permit.

g. Emergency Egress
1. Every sleeping room shall have at least one operable window or door approved for emergency escape or rescue in accordance with CBC 310.4.
2. Escape or rescue windows shall be installed in accordance with CBC 310.4.

h. Fire Sprinkler / Underground
1. Fire riser and FDC locations shall be submitted for review and approval.
2. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable for fire department for emergency operations.
3. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected with fire sprinklers and standpipes.
4. Fire Sprinkler Plans shall be submitted for review and approval.
5. Fire system underground pipe plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

i. Standpipes
1. Standpipes shall be wet.
2. Standpipes shall extend to the roof where required.
3. Fire Department valve connections shall be in the intermediate landings of stairwells.

j. Smoke & Heat Vents
1. Smoke & heat vents shall be installed on roof above each stairwell.
2. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with fusible link.
3. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with manual release for emergency operations.

k. Fire alarm System
1. Fire alarm plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

l. Smoke Detection
1. Smoke detection shall be installed in each bedroom, in hallways adjacent to bedrooms, and one detector per floor level (top and bottom of stairs).
2. Smoke detectors shall be 120v powered with battery backup.
3. Smoke detectors shall be interconnected.

m. Carbon Monoxide Detectors
1. Carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of and adjacent to sleeping areas where fuel-burning appliances are installed; and in dwelling units that have attached garages.
2. Carbon Monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 720.
3. Carbon Monoxide alarms shall be 120v powered with battery backup and be interconnected with the smoke detectors.

Police Department
39. Prior to issuance of building permit, the Applicant/Developer shall submit a plan for construction site security to the satisfaction of the Police Chief.

Stege Sanitary District:
40. This applicant shall participate in the San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program, and pay all applicable fees. This fee is intended to satisfy the requirement for a Sewer Capacity Study.
CERTIFICATION

I certify that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Design Review Board at a regular meeting held on January 24, 2019, upon motion of Boardmember ________, second by Boardmember ________:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

_________________________
Sean Moss, AICP
Acting Planning Manager
10192 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito
### Project Information

**Project Directory**

- **Architect:** Branagan Architecture, Inc.
- **Engineer:** Carlson, Barbee, & Gibson, Inc.
- **Landscape:** Right Coast Architects

**Project Information**

- **Site Location:** 10192 San Pablo Ave, City of El Cerrito, CA
- **Contact:** Lisa Vilhuauer, Phone: (925) 743-9500

**Site Zoning Information**

- **Allowed Use:** Multi-Family
- **Proposed Area Per Floor:** 8,400 +/- SF
- **Proposed Story:** 5

**Project Schedule**

- **1st Level:**
  - **Unit Type A1:** 3-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath 867 SF
  - **Unit Type A2:** 3-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath 946 SF
  - **Unit Type A3:** 3-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath 948 SF
- **2nd Level:**
  - **Unit Type B1:** 2-story unit - 3 bedroom/2 bath 1,097 SF
  - **Unit Type B2:** 1-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath 924 SF
- **3rd Level:**
  - **Unit Type C1:** 1-story unit - 3 bedroom/2 bath 1,102 SF
  - **Unit Type C2:** 1-story unit - 2 bedroom/2 bath 991 SF
  - **Unit Type C3:** 1-story unit - 2 bedroom/2 bath 1,047 SF
- **4th Level:**
  - **Unit Type D1:** 2-story unit - 3 bedroom/2 bath 1,119 SF
  - **Unit Type D2:** 1-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath 800 SF
  - **Unit Type D3:** 1-story unit - 2 bedroom/2 bath 924 SF
- **5th Level:**
  - **Unit Type E:** 1-story unit - 3 bedroom/2 bath 1,120 SF

**Unit Type Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST UND</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>3-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath</td>
<td>867 SF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ST UND</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>3-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath</td>
<td>946 SF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ST UND</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>3-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath</td>
<td>948 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND UND</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>2-story unit - 3 bedroom/2 bath</td>
<td>1,097 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND UND</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>1-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath</td>
<td>918 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD UND</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1-story unit - 3 bedroom/2 bath</td>
<td>1,102 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD UND</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1-story unit - 2 bedroom/2 bath</td>
<td>991 SF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD UND</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1-story unit - 2 bedroom/2 bath</td>
<td>1,047 SF</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH UND</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>2-story unit - 3 bedroom/2 bath</td>
<td>1,119 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH UND</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1-story unit - 2 bedroom/1 bath</td>
<td>800 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH UND</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>1-story unit - 2 bedroom/2 bath</td>
<td>924 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5TH UND</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1-story unit - 3 bedroom/2 bath</td>
<td>1,120 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Information**

- **Proposed Multi-Family Buildings have 26 units with flex space on the ground level.
- **18,423 SF (0.42 acres +/-)**
- **Street Type(s):**
  - **Lot Area:**
  - **Existing Proposed**
  - **10192 San Pablo Avenue - City of El Cerrito, CA**
- **Lot Coverage (per 19.03.110):**
  - **16 feet & 1 story 64.5 feet & 5 stories**
  - **78% 52.4%**
- **Existing Proposed**
  - **1ST/2ND A2 2 STORY UNIT - 2 BEDROOM/1.5 BATH 942 SF**
  - **2ND B1 1 STORY UNIT - 3 BEDROOM/2 BATH 1,102 SF**
  - **2ND B2 1 STORY UNIT - 3 BEDROOM/2 BATH 1,119 SF**
  - **3RD/4TH C1 1 STORY UNIT - 2 BEDROOM/2 BATH 1,047 SF**
  - **3RD/4TH C2 1 STORY UNIT - 2 BEDROOM/2 BATH 1,047 SF**
  - **3RD/4TH D1 1 STORY UNIT - 3 BEDROOM/2 BATH 1,210 SF**
  - **3RD/4TH D2 1 STORY UNIT - 2 BEDROOM/1 BATH 798 SF**
  - **3RD/4TH D3 1 STORY UNIT - 2 BEDROOM/2 BATH 924 SF**
  - **4TH D2 1 STORY UNIT - 2 BEDROOM/1 BATH 798 SF**
  - **4TH D3 1 STORY UNIT - 2 BEDROOM/2 BATH 924 SF**
  - **5TH D3 1 STORY UNIT - 2 BEDROOM/2 BATH 924 SF**

**Separate Permits or Deferred Approvals**

1. The above and additional sections are subject to separate review.

---
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### Lincoln Ave. Street Zones (Neighborhood):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Req'd</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>5'-0&quot; Min.</td>
<td>5'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>6'-0&quot; Clear/5' Res.</td>
<td>6'-0&quot; Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>0'-0&quot; 12'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Pablo Ave. Street Zones (Community):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Req'd</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>6'-0&quot; Min.</td>
<td>7'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>8'-0&quot; Clear</td>
<td>8'-0&quot; Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>0'-0&quot; 5'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Property Line

- **A**: 5'-0"
- **B**: 6'-0"
- **C**: 12'-0"

### Ground Floor Glazing
- 979sf

### Ground Floor Facade
- 2,419sf

### Upper Floors Glazing
- 1,794sf

### Upper Floors Facade
- 5,544sf

### Facade Transparency Calcs. (SPA Community Zone):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Req'd</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td>40% Min. (Res.)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floors</td>
<td>30% Min.</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facade Transparency Calcs. (Neighborhood Zone):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Req'd</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td>30% Min.</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor</td>
<td>25% Min.</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GLAZING DIAGRAM - SOUTH ELEVATION

- **A**: 5'-0"
- **B**: 8'-0"
- **C**: 7'-0"

### GLAZING DIAGRAM - WEST ELEVATION

- **A**: 442sf
- **B**: 1,357sf

### Sheet Title

- Planning Dept. Submittal
- 10192 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito
- 10192 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito Planning Dept. Submittal
- Leftcoast Architecture
- Branagh
- A0.2

### ZONING INFORMATION

- May 17, 2018
- 26 Units
- Ground Floor Glazing = 979sf
- Ground Floor Facade = 2,419sf
- Upper Floors Glazing = 1,794sf
- Upper Floors Facade = 5,544sf
- FACADE TRANSPARENCY CALCS. (SPA COMMUNITY ZONE):
  - Ground Floor 40% Min. (Res.) 40%
  - Upper Floors 30% Min. 32%
- FACADE TRANSPARENCY CALCS. (NEIGHBORHOOD ZONE):
  - Ground Floor 30% Min. 30%
  - Upper Floor 25% Min. 25%

### JANUARY 09, 2019 DRB UPDATES
TREATMENT AREA SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMA</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA (SF)</th>
<th>IMPERVIOUS AREA (SF)</th>
<th>PERVIOUS PAVER AREA (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4% REQUIRED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10192 SAN PABLO AVE

PRELIMINARY STORMWATER CONTROL PLAN

CITY OF EL CERRITO         CONTRA COSTA COUNTY          CALIFORNIA

LEGEND

NOTE:

DATE: MAY 15, 2018
HYDROZONE / PLANTING DESCRIPTION
PLANT FACTOR (PF)
IRRIGATION METHOD
IRRIGATION EFFICIENCY (IE)
ETAF (PF / IE)
LANDSCAPE AREA (sq. ft.) ETAF x AREA
ESTIMATED TOTAL WATER USE (ETWU)

LOW WATER USE
- 0.3 DRIP
- 0.81
- 0.3703703
- 3719
- 1377.407146
- 38344.3

MEDIUM WATER USE
- 0.5 DRIP
- 0.81
- 0.6172839
- 470
- 290.123433
- 0.0

- 0.5 BUBBLER
- 0.81
- 0.6172839
- 117
- 72.2222163
- 2010.5

TOTALS:
- 4306
- 1740

REC. AREA:
- 00
- 0

WATER FEATURE 1:
- 00
- 0

WATER FEATURE 2:
- 00
- 0

TOTALS:
- 00
- 40,355

1,740
4,306
0.40
1,740
4,306
0.40

WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE WORKSHEET

REFERENCE EVAPOTRANSPIRATION (ETo):

REGULAR LANDSCAPE AREAS:

SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS:

MAXIMUM ALLOWED WATER ALLOWANCE (MAWA):

ETWU TOTAL:

TOTAL ETAF x AREA
TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA
SITEWIDE ETAF

NOTE: AVERAGE ETAF FOR REGULAR LANDSCAPE AREAS MUST BE 0.55 OR BELOW FOR RESIDENTIAL AREAS, AND 0.45 OR BELOW FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL AREAS.

ETAF CALCULATIONS:

REGULAR LANDSCAPE AREAS:

TOTAL ETAF x AREA
TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA
AVERAGE ETAF

ALL LANDSCAPE AREAS:

TOTAL ETAF x AREA
TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA
AVERAGE ETAF

GENERAL NOTES:

HYDROZONE DEFINITIONS:

LOW WATER USE; DRIP IRRIGATION APPLICATION
MEDIUM WATER USE; DRIP IRRIGATION APPLICATION
MEDIUM WATER USE; TREE BUBBLER
Unit Breakdown
26 Units:
(10) 3-bedroom Flat (+/-1,042sf - 1,210sf)
(10) 2-bedroom Flat (+/-798sf - 1,047sf)
(6) 2-bedroom 2-Story (+/-942sf - 1,064sf)

Vehicle Parking Count
23 Parking Spaces:
(9 Covered Regular Spaces + 13 Garage Spaces + 1 Covered ADA Space)
(3 Spaces Pre-wired for Electric Vehicles)

Bicycle Parking Count
39 Covered Long-term Bike Parking:
(20 Outside Bike Corral + 19 Inside Vertical Racks at Garages)

4 Short-term Bike Parking
(see landscape drawings for location)
10192 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito
Planning Dept. Submittal

SITE PLAN - Shadow Study - Neighbor

SHADOW STUDY MEASURED ON WINTER SOLSTICE (DECEMBER 21) AT 1:30PM
10192 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito
Planning Dept. Submittal

SHADOW STUDY MEASURED ON WINTER SOLSTICE (DECEMBER 21) AT 4:00PM
SHADOW STUDY MEASURED ON WINTER SOLSTICE (DECEMBER 21) AT 10:00AM
SHADOW ENTRANCEMENT OVER CURB @ 10AM FROM OCTOBER - FEBRUARY

10192 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito
Planning Dept. Submittal
**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

MAY 17, 2018

**VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM CORNER OF SAN PABLO AVE. AND LINCOLN AVE.**

**VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM SAN PABLO AVE.**

**VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM LINCOLN AVE.**

**VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM LINCOLN AVE.**

**VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM UNICO OH AVE.**

**VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM UNICO OH AVE.**

**VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM UNICO OH AVE.**

**PHOTO KEY**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIALS &amp; COLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDING Material: 7/8&quot; Cement Plaster System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color: KM - San Francisco Fog (5822)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDING Material: 7/8&quot; Cement Plaster System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color: KM - Volcanic Rock (5826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDING Material: 7/8&quot; Cement Plaster System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color: KM - Iron Corten, Suede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDING Material: 7/8&quot; Cement Plaster System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color: KM - Iron Corten, Suede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCLIOIN TILE Material: Neolith Color: Iron Corten, Suede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCLIOIN TILE Material: Neolith Color: Iron Corten, Suede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCLIOIN TILE Material: Neolith Color: Iron Corten, Suede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCLIOIN TILE Material: Neolith Color: Iron Corten, Suede</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WINDOWS &amp; DOORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material: Vinyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture: VPI Quality Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color: Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material: Perforated Corten AZP Roofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture: Western States Metal Roofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color: Raw Flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material: Thermo-plyolite (TPO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture: TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color: White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10192 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito
Planning Dept. Submittal
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10192 San Pablo Avenue

PREPARED BY:

METROPOLITAN PLANNING GROUP
22561 MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
HAYWARD, CALIFORNIA 94541
510.634.8443

October 2018
### 10192 SAN PABLO AVENUE
CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND INITIAL STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Title:</strong></th>
<th>10192 San Pablo Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Lead agency name and address:** | City of El Cerrito Planning Division  
10890 San Pablo Avenue  
El Cerrito, CA 94530 |
| **Contact person and phone number:** | Sean Moss (510) 215-4359 |
| **Project Location:** | City of El Cerrito – San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area |
| **File Number:** | PL16-0137 |
| **Project sponsor's name and address:** | Lisa Vilhauer  
Winfield Development L.L.C.  
3800 Mount Diablo Blvd., Suite 200  
Lafayette, CA 94549 |
| **Property Owner:** | The Botto Trust  
PO Box 20067  
Piedmont, CA 94620 |
| **General Plan Designation:** | Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) |
| **Zoning:** | Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) |
| **Description of project:** | The project site is located in the southern portion of the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California at the southeast corner of the San Pablo Avenue and Lincoln Avenue intersection on an 18,423 square-foot site (0.42 acres). The site is mostly flat from San Pablo Avenue, gently sloping upward to the east and north portions of the project site. The project site includes a vacant 1,765 square foot single-story building and parking lot. The building was originally constructed in 1951 by the Union Oil and Gas Company for use as an automotive repair facility and gasoline filling station. The existing building was previously used as an auto body shop. The proposed project would demolish the existing building and parking lot and construct a new 39,052 square-foot, five-story, 64.5-foot tall multi-family residential building with a total of 26 dwelling units. Pedestrian access would be provided at three entrances along San Pablo Avenue and three entrances from the parking lot at the rear of the project site. Vehicle access would be provided via a full-access driveway on Lincoln Avenue leading to surface parking stalls and garages. The proposed residential units include a combination of two-story, 2-bedroom units and 2- to 3-bedroom flats. |
| **Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings:** | North of the project site and across Lincoln Avenue there is an existing used car lot. East of the project site are single-family residences. South of the project site is a commercial property, and west of the project site across San Pablo Avenue are commercial properties within the City of Richmond. |
| **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):** | None |
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1. INTRODUCTION

This checklist and attached supporting documentation have been prepared to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the 10192 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 10192 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 10192 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 10192 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 10192 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 10192 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 504-012-037 & 504-012-036) is located in the southern portion of the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California (See Figure 1: Regional Map) at the southeast corner of the San Pablo Avenue and Lincoln Avenue intersection (See Figure 2: Site Vicinity Map) on an 18,423 square-foot site. The site is mostly flat from San Pablo Avenue gently sloping upward to the east and north portions of the project site. The project site includes a vacant 1,765 square foot single-story building and parking lot. The building was originally constructed in 1951 by the Union Oil and Gas Company for use as an automotive repair facility and gasoline filling station. The existing building was previously used as an auto body shop (See Figure 3: Project Site Map).

The project site has General Plan Land Use designation of Transit Oriented Higher-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 designates this property as within the Transit Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) zoning district. San Pablo Avenue is designated as a San Pablo Avenue (SPA) Community Street and Lincoln Avenue is designated as a Neighborhood Street. The proposed project would be compliant with all zoning requirements for the TOHIMU district, SPA Community Street classification and Neighborhood Street. North of the project site and across Lincoln Avenue there is an existing used car lot. East of the project site are single-family residences. South of the project site is a commercial property, and 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 a new 39,052 square-foot, five-story, 64.5-foot tall multi-family residential building with a total of 26 dwelling units, and parking (See Figure 6: Project Site Plan). Pedestrian access to the proposed residential units is provided at three entrances along San Pablo Avenue and three entrances from the parking lot at the rear of the project site. The proposed residential units include a combination of two-story, 2-bedroom units and 2- and 3-bedroom flats as summarized in Table 1 below (See Figures 7 through 9: Floor Plans).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Unit Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>2 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/2.5 Bath</td>
<td>1,064 Square Feet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>2 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/1.5 Bath</td>
<td>942 Square Feet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1 Story Unit – 3 bedroom/2 Bath</td>
<td>1,102 Square Feet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1 Story Unit – 3 bedroom/2 Bath</td>
<td>1,119 Square Feet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd/4th/5th</td>
<td>1 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/2 Bath</td>
<td>966 Square Feet</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd/4th</td>
<td>1 Story Unit – 3 bedroom/2 Bath</td>
<td>1,042 Square Feet</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/1 Bath</td>
<td>798 Square Feet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/2 Bath</td>
<td>924 Square Feet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd/4th</td>
<td>1 Story Unit – 3 bedroom/2 Bath</td>
<td>1,210 Square Feet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1 Story Unit – 2 bedroom/2 Bath</td>
<td>938 Square Feet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Plans, prepared by Left Coast Architecture and Branagh, May 17, 2018.
The project is designed to front onto San Pablo Avenue with a driveway entrance to the unit garages and parking lot off Lincoln Avenue. The front of the building along San Pablo Avenue has front doors for the first-floor units; these units are designed to appear as storefronts with large glazing areas. They upper floor units are accessed from common staircases within the building that can be accessed from the San Pablo 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 Lincoln Avenue. The El Cerrito Plaza Bart station is located approximately 0.5 miles away from the project site. Long term bicycle storage for 39 bicycles will be provided either within the proposed garages or within the common entryway to the building. Four (4) 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 nine (9) surface parking spaces, 13 individual garage parking spaces, and one ADA accessible space, for a total of 23 parking spaces, which is consistent with the Specific Plan. Three parking spaces would be pre-wired for electric vehicles. Vehicles would access the site through a full-access driveway on Lincoln Avenue.

Landscaping onsite will be provided along San Pablo Avenue, Lincoln Avenue, and within the surface parking lot. The streetscape along San Pablo Avenue and Lincoln 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 7-foot wide “amenity zone” which will include landscaping and street trees. There will be an 8-foot wide pedestrian walkway space and a 5-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 exposure and shading. The proposed project will enhance pedestrian access to the surrounding community by updating the sidewalks fronting 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 generated by the project. 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.
FIGURE 1: REGIONAL LOCATION MAP
FIGURE 2: SITE VICINITY MAP
FIGURE 4: GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION MAP
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FIGURE 7: 1ST & 2ND FLOOR PLANS
Source: Project Plans
FIGURE 8: 3RD & 4TH FLOOR PLANS
Source: Project Plans
FIGURE 9: 5TH FLOOR PLAN
Source: Project Plans
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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; and Visibility Study, prepared by Left Coast Architecture and Branagh, May 17, 2018.

DISCUSSION

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.

A visibility study was prepared by Left Coast Architecture and Branagh. As shown in the visibility study, views of Mount Tamalpais (as viewed from the BART station platform) and Albany Hill (as viewed from Lincoln and Kearney) would not be obscured by the proposed building. Therefore, impacts to scenic resources would be less than significant.

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>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? □ □ □ □ ✗

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>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? □ □ □ ☒
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? □ □ □ ☒

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 would be below the BAAQMD's significance thresholds as described above. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be expected to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during project construction. The proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to short term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the TASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.

**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

<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, 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>
</tbody>
</table>
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
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 filling station/auto repair garage at 10192 San Pablo Avenue was constructed in 1951. 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 archaeological 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 archaeological 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. ENERGY

<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 a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</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 discussed in the SPASP FEIR, implementation of the SPASP would generally change the Plan Area from an auto-oriented corridor to a multi-modal (auto, transit, bicycle, pedestrian) oriented community, with related energy conservation resulting from the more efficient use of transportation, circulation, and infrastructure systems.

The SPASP FEIR refers to the Form-Based Code (2.05.05.01), which contains topics to reduce energy usage such as passive heating and cooling techniques, Zero-Net Energy buildings, solar power, wind power, and other related topics.
Last, the SPASP FEIR found that the SPASP would also be subject to local and General Plan policies, including the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, that are expected to reduce energy consumption. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR concluded that implementation of the SPASP would not cause inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy.

The proposed project adheres to the building guidelines of the SPASP, is consistent with the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, and promotes energy conservation through mixed-use development in close proximity to transit. The project will also enhance pedestrian and bicycle access to the surrounding community to help reduce vehicle trips generated by the project. The proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to Energy than analyzed in the SPASP 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 Energy in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix F for the proposed project, and there would be no new impact associated with Energy.

### 3.7. 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>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

□ □ □ ☒

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?

□ □ □ ☒

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?

□ □ □ ☒

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR; Friar and Associates, Inc., Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Multi-Purpose Development 10192 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California, December 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.

3.8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</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>
</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.

### 3.9. 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>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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 of a Commercial Property at 10192 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California 94530, September 29, 2015; AEI Consultants, Limited Phase II Subsurface Investigation at 10192 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California 94530, June 10, 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 has been used as a gas station since 1933. There has been multiple underground storage tanks (USTs) removed and installed at the property since 1933. According to available information reviewed, there have been at least 11 USTs on the property: two diesel tanks to the north, four fuel (assumed gasoline) USTs on the western border (on or near the sidewalk), and four gasoline USTs to the south, and one waste oil tank adjacent to the southwest corner of the building. There are building permits for the installation four of the tanks (both diesel tanks and the larger tanks to the south) and removal permits for 7 (both diesel tanks and all tanks to the south).
Information in the El Cerrito Fire Department records includes a map showing the building plans related to the 1977 installation of the 10,000 gallon UST, shows the removal of the four USTs on the western border. No other information was available. In addition, according to the site operator, a small diesel UST was removed from property in 1979. None of these USTs have information related to condition or sampling upon removal. Additional information concerning the date of installation of the tanks removed in 1995 was inconsistent between city and County files. According to the Water Board, the cleanup has been completed, and the case is now closed.¹

The Phase II subsurface investigation was conducted to evaluate baseline conditions relative to former and current operations at the subject property. During this investigation, five (5) exploratory borings were advanced for the collection and analyses of soil and soil gas samples. The soil gas samples were analyzed for VOCs, TPH-g, CO2, and O2. The soil samples were analyzed for CAM 17 metals. Analytical results for soil vapor did not show VOC or TPH-g concentrations above their established RWQCB Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs). In addition, analytical results for soil did not show metal concentrations above their established RWQCB ESLs except for arsenic. Based upon our review of available literature, the range of arsenic concentrations detected in soil beneath the subject property appears to be representative of naturally-occurring background conditions throughout the Bay Area.

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 0.3 miles east of the project site. Since there are no schools within 0.25 mile from the project site, 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.

² Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission, 2010. Oakland International Airport, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Figure 3-2. September.
### 3.10. 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>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 (14,449 square feet) with 10,229 square feet of impervious and 5,362 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.
### 3.11. 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 TOHIMU in the City's General Plan and SPASP. In addition, the site is also zoned as TOHIMU. The intent of the TOHIMU designation is to provide for a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented higher density area within ½ mile of BART that allows a variety of uses including retail, commercial, residential, and public uses in the Downtown and Uptown areas. The TOHIMU designation allows for a 65-foot height limit (85 feet is permissible for affordable housing projects) and requires a minimum height limit of three stories for residential uses. The proposed project is consistent with the mix, intensity, and scale of development contemplated by the SPASP in this location.

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 TOHIMU 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.

### 3.12. 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.

### 3.13. 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>
</tbody>
</table>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR; Saxelby Acoustics, Environmental Noise Assessment 10192 San Pablo Avenue Residential, September 6, 2018.

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.

An Environmental Noise Assessment was conducted for the proposed project and is referenced in this section. The Noise Assessment is intended to satisfy the City’s requirement for a project-specific noise impact analysis, per SPASP Mitigation Measure 13-1, to reduce potential noise and land use compatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The existing noise environment in the project area is defined primarily by the local roadway network, existing residential uses, and pedestrian activity. The Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) tracks are located approximately 700 feet east of the project site and influences the ambient noise environment in the project vicinity. Traffic on Central Avenue and San Pablo Avenue contribute to the ambient noise environment. In addition, operational noise from the adjacent commercials uses (e.g., parking lot activities and people talking) is part of the existing noise environment at 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. In the vicinity of the project site, sensitive land uses include single-family residential uses to the east, along Kearney Street.

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.

As described in the Environmental Noise Assessment prepared, traffic noise from San Pablo Avenue is predicted to be 70 dBA Ldn at the façade of the proposed building. Based upon a typical 25 dB exterior-to-interior noise level reduction achieved by modern building construction, an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn would be expected. This would meet the City’s 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. The City also 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 78-79 dBA Lmax, maximum interior noise levels are predicted to range between 53-54 dBA Lmax. Therefore, interior noise control measures would be required to achieve compliance with the City’s interior noise level standards for bedrooms only.

Implementation of the following interior noise reduction measure for all units facing San Pablo Avenue, 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:**
  - Bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 36.
  - Exterior finish shall be three-coat stucco or system with equivalent weight per square foot;
  - Interior gypsum at exterior walls shall be 5/8” Type X or Type C hung on resilient channel (RC);
  - Ceiling gypsum shall be 5/8” type X or Type C;
  - 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.

The proposed building will include rooftop mechanical equipment consisting of 26 individual condensers located in the proposed rooftop mechanical well, one for each proposed unit. Typical rooftop condensers for residential use would be expected to have a sound power rating of approximately 75 dBA. The total sound power level assuming simultaneous operation of all 26 units would be 89 dBA.

Based upon the project site plan, the center of the mechanical rooftop well would be located approximately 70 feet from the nearest residential property line to the east. Based upon this distance and screening due to the proposed rooftop well, HVAC noise levels are predicted to be 39 dBA Leq, or less, at the nearest sensitive receptor. These noise levels would comply with the City of El Cerrito 45 dBA Leq nighttime exterior noise level standard. 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 Area Noise Impacts
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 noise sources associated with the parking area would include delivery trucks and loading. 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.

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, as a residential use, nighttime loading activity will not be routine, a deliveries predominantly occur during daytime hours. As such, 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 limited 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 was not predicted to result in an appreciable increase in traffic noise levels. 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, resulting in an increase in noise levels from traffic sources along affected segments. The Environmental Noise Assessment modeled traffic noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors along each roadway segment in the project area, and concluded that the proposed project is not predicted to result in an appreciable increase in traffic noise levels. Therefore, this impact is considered 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 Environmental Noise Assessment assumed a typical maximum noise level of 76 to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The nearest residential receptors would be located 50 feet or further from typical construction activities. Project construction would result in short-term noise impacts on these adjacent uses. Therefore, the closest off-site sensitive receptors may be subject to short-term construction noise reaching 90 dBA 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 to reduce vibration from construction activities. 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 pile driving, blasting, or significant grading activities are proposed.

The Environmental Noise Assessment indicates that construction vibration levels anticipated for the project are less than the 0.2 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) threshold of damage to buildings and less than the 0.1 in/sec PPV threshold of annoyance criteria at distances of 50 feet. Sensitive receptors, which could be impacted by construction-related vibrations, especially vibratory compactors/rollers, are located approximately 50 feet, or further, from construction activities associated with the project. At these distances, construction vibrations are not predicted to exceed acceptable levels. 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.

### 3.14. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

<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) 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 26 dwelling units and have a population size of 64 people,\(^4\) 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.

\(^4\) Assumes 2.46 persons per household per U.S. Census Bureau, [https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/elcerritocitycalifornia/PST045217](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/elcerritocitycalifornia/PST045217), accessed August 8, 2018.
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.

3.15. PUBLIC SERVICES

<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>
</table>

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.

### 3.16. 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</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

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? □ □ □ ☒

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.

3.17. 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 establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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, 10192 San Pablo Avenue Preliminary Transportation Analysis, September 3, 2018.

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 seven AM peak-hour and 11 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 nine surface parking spaces, 13 individual garage spaces, and one accessible space, for a total of 23 parking spaces. Vehicles would access the site through a full-access driveway on Lincoln 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 Lincoln Avenue would provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk. Vehicles parked on both sides of the driveway may block sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and vehicles on Lincoln Avenue. Trees planted on both sides 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 on both sides of the Project driveway on Lincoln Avenue would not restrict sight distance for exiting vehicles by providing at least 10 feet of red curb on both sides of the driveway.

**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 26 residential units, requiring 39 long-term bicycle parking spaces and two short-term bicycle parking spaces. The Project would provide 39 covered long-term bicycle parking spaces, 20 would be located in the outside covered bicycle corral just south of the project driveway and 19 would be located inside individual 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. The lobby entrances would provide direct access to units on the first floor, as well as stair access to the second and third floor units. 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 would 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 would provide eight feet of clear sidewalk space for pedestrians along San Pablo Avenue and six feet of clear sidewalk space along Lincoln Avenue, meeting City 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 Lincoln 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 TOHIMU zoning district apply to the project site. TOHIMU zoning requires a maximum of 1.0 automobile parking spaces per dwelling unit and a basic Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan. For projects proposing a parking ratio between zero and 0.5 spaces per unit, a parking study and additional TDM measures may be required.

The project would provide nine surface parking spaces, 13 individual garage spaces, and one accessible space, for a total of 23 parking spaces. The project would not exceed the maximum of 26 off-street residential parking spaces and proposes a parking ratio of approximately 0.9 spaces per unit. As such, the project is in compliance with the Specific Plan parking standards related to the number of automobile parking spaces.
In order to meet parking requirements described in the Code, the project must also provide the basic TDM measures required in the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. Therefore, the following condition of approval has been included in the project's design.

**Project Specific Condition of Approval:** Implement a basic Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan to encourage residents to use other travel modes, as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

**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 approvals, 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.

### 3.18. 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>
</table>

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:

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

- ☐ ☐ ☑ ☑

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

- ☑ ☐ ☑ ☑
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.

3.19. 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>
<tr>
<td></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?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

1) Site Plans, prepared by Left Coast Architecture and Branagh, May 17, 2018.

2) LSA, Historical Resource Evaluation of 10192 San Pablo Avenue/State Route 123, El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California, January 26, 2017.


4) AEI Consultants, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of a Commercial Property at 10192 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California 94530, June 8, 2016.

5) AEI Consultants, Limited Phase II Subsurface Investigation at 10192 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California 94530, June 10, 2016.


http://www.el-cerrito.org/1017/10192-San-Pablo-Avenue
December 2, 2018

Margrit Cavenecia  
557 Kearny Street  
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Attn: El Cerrito Design Review Board

RE: Public Hearing - 10192 San Pablo Avenue

I was informed in your recent letter that there will be a meeting on December 5th regarding the request from Branagh to amend the plans for the apartment building at 10192 San Pablo Avenue to include a 5th floor. Due to previously scheduled travel to Austin, TX, I will not have the chance to participate in this meeting. Please accept this letter in my absence, for the Design Review Board’s consideration, outlining my concerns.

My experience with the Design Review Board in previous meetings and letters submitted regarding this build have left me with the impression that there isn’t any consideration for the home owners living in direct proximity of the building. An 11th hour request to add a 5th floor to the building in the name of profit shows no concern for those impacted by the addition of the 5th floor. The nearby residents, who have invested many years of their lives in this community, are left bearing the true long-term impact of this project, while the builder profits.

One of the highlights of my home is the beautiful natural light that comes in. Simply put, the benefits are immeasurable. Beyond the physical benefits of natural light, it is widely known that natural light has a substantial impact to a house value. A reduction in natural light can impact a home’s value as much as 20% or even more and that’s not taking into account the increase in electrical expense.

This natural light has brought me joy for many years and the thought of losing that is devastating. With the possible addition of a 5th floor, the shadow effect created on my house will be magnified. Stepping the building on the north is not going to minimize additional shadow impact as the sun is coming from the south. As a result I lose, while the builder profits. We should all have a problem with that equation when considering development within our community.

Natural light notwithstanding, the rear view of this building also presents a negative impact from my home’s field of vision, as I am directly behind the build. At the minimum, the builders should incorporate creative landscaping to mitigate from this outcome. Some type of terrace with planting at the level of my garage to buffer the impact of the rear view from my home. Landscaping at the lower level of the incline will not mitigate the negative view from the level of my home.
In addition, there is no provision in the plans for the additional parking required for these units, thus adding to the amount of cars parking on Lincoln, Kearney and adjacent streets. The nearby residents, who have invested many years of their lives in this community, are left bearing the true long-term cost of this project, while the builder profits.

I implore the Design Review Board to consider my voice and perspective, which is one of many in our community. Putting yourselves in my situation and those of my neighbors, would you not also have these concerns and hope your community elected officials would stand up to represent your voice?

Sincerely,

Margrit Cavenecia
December 5, 2018

Mayor, City Council members, Design Review Board, and relevant City staff:

I am writing regarding my concerns (which have also been expressed by several neighbors) about the changes to the development plan for 10192 San Pablo Avenue (SE corner of Lincoln Avenue). I did not oppose the 4-story design of the proposed condominium building that had one parking spot per unit included. However, I do oppose the changes that add an additional story without adding corresponding parking spaces.

I have owned the home at 541 Kearney Street for over 13 years. My home is on the back side of the block where the new five story condo building is being proposed. The building will be visible from inside my home, and from my backyard. My neighbor who has lived in the 1906 house directly behind the proposed development for forty years has expressed the same concerns I write about here. My other neighbor whose grandparents built the house they live in and whose family has lived there for three generations, have also raised these concerns now that the design has changed. We feel like the City is not interested in the concerns of long-time residents like us. It appears that the City is more interested in catering to developers and the new people they hope to attract than to those of us who have been committed to this community for decades. I hope I am wrong and that the City will make a real effort to listen to and address our concerns before moving forward with this project.

Process. My first concern is a process concern. When I visited City Hall yesterday to review the plan revisions before the Design Review Board meeting to be held tonight, I was told that none of our concerns are within the design review board’s scope (parking, five stories out of scale for block, lack of public open space on block in the project, views, larger shadows of enlarged scale of project, environmental concerns due to history of the site, lack of public art from project). When I asked what forum there is for us long-time residents who will be directly impacted to express these concerns to an audience with authority do address them, the answer was essentially there is none due to the San Pablo Specific Plan. From a process prospective, if that is true, I find it outrageous that the City has set up a structure where residents who have been committed to this block for decades (several of whom are senior citizens who have been here since San Pablo corridor was truly a blighted area and stayed), have no outlet to voice concerns to any city official who can listen to them and take action. If this is truly the state of things in the wake of the San Pablo Specific Plan (which again, I supported with a few concerns expressed to the city), it needs to be fixed. If I misunderstood, and there is an appropriate forum, then we need to be informed of it. Otherwise, I am left with the strong impression that the notice of the Design Review Board meeting that was sent to me and my neighbors was little more than a deceptive effort for the City to attempt to appear to care about the concerns of its long-term residents and homeowners.
In terms of my specific concerns, they are the following:

**Parking.** The originally approved plans for the condo building included one parking space per unit. The new plan adds an extra story with 5 more two or three bedroom condos without adding corresponding parking. None of the condos are low-income housing units. It is a fiction to think that most of the families who buy these expensive multi-bedroom condominiums will not have two cars, let alone the notion that some significant number will choose to be carless. And them owning cars is not inconsistent with taking public transportation or biking. My wife and I take public transit (or walk/bike) to work, yet we have cars (as do all of our neighbors) to be able to do all of the other things one needs to do in the bay area. Our block is already highly impacted in terms of parking space (even with the 4 hour resident permits on one side of the street). There is often little to no parking in front of our homes due to BART riders or others driving here to enjoy the amenities of the neighborhood. By not providing adequate parking for this high-end condo complex, you are forcing us long-term residents to bear the brunt of the impact of this development with no tangible benefit. The developer should be required to stick to the original plan (again, which I did not oppose) of one space per unit so as to not create excessive additional strain on residents ability to park on our block. (As an aside, I note that having only 3 parking spaces that are wired for EVs seems very antiquated and not very environmentally friendly as the City purports that all this development will be. Individual wiring in a housing complex garage can be an expense that disincentivizes residents from choosing electric vehicles).

**Five Stories is out of scale.** The homes directly behind the condo development are all one and two stories and will be towered over by this five story complex that will block significant afternoon light and views of sky among other things. The house most impacted is a 1906 Victorian with views that will be blocked. That house is clearly the original house on this block, and likely one of the earlier homes in town. There are no five story buildings for miles right now. To put one of the first ones right behind that home is troubling. The addition of the fifth story makes a significant difference in how its scale towers over our homes on the other side of the block. Many of us were ok with or resigned to four stories, but the fifth takes it too far for comfort and is only being added so the developer can make additional profits squeezing more high-end condos out of the plot of land. Despite the developer’s effort to minimize it, the shadows will be longer and more of our views will be consumed by the building. We are the ones who bear the negative impacts of this additional story being built with no apparent benefit. The developer gets more profits, the City gets more fees. We get the negative externalities.

**Lack of public open space in project/lack of public art.** One of the things that I liked about the San Pablo Specific Plan as I understood it was that developers would need to include public open space in their projects, thus giving a local community benefit to their projects. In reviewing the plan, I see that the City has allowed the developer to pay a fee instead of creating open space. I was disappointed in this
pretty significant loophole to the plan. Will the money from that fee be used to provide some public benefit to the very neighborhood (our block) which is most impacted by this project? Or will it/can it be used for a purpose that is not felt much by us locally? Some clarity on the use of this loophole in this instance and the plans for the funds would be greatly appreciated. I have the same questions about the fees in lieu of public art. Will our immediate neighborhood benefit from that fee or will it be used somewhere else/for some other purpose that we don’t really get to enjoy?

**Environmental concern due to site’s history.** This concern is more of a question that may be able to be answered through a discussion, dialogue, forum for the neighbors. There is concern due to the fact that the site was most recently an autobody shop and I’m told by neighbors who have been here longer than me, was previously a gas station. The concern is that there are likely to be a lot of toxic materials in the ground under the site due to that history. Folks are very concerned that the construction will result in unhealthy impacts of digging that site up (whether it be leeching into the ground or airborne toxins). It would be helpful if someone could explain what has been considered with respect to that and what will be done to make sure our local environment doesn’t become more toxic due to this project. Several of us on the block are raising our kids here, and this is a particular concern due to that. My understanding is that there is no specific Environmental Impact Review of this site because of the San Pablo Specific Plan. That makes us concerned that the particular history of use of this site, and what resultingly may be underground because of that, may not have been fully taken into account. If I’m wrong about that, an explanation that will help us understand would be good.

I hope that I have not written this letter in vain and that these concerns will be taken seriously and that someone in the City government will engage with me and my other neighbors who have made this block our homes for decades. Unfortunately, tonight’s meeting conflicts with my board meeting for Prospect Sierra School, right here in El Cerrito. But, I hope that these comments and my strong opposition to the fifth story of this high-end condo building will be taken into account.

Yohance Edwards
541 Kearney Street
El Cerrito, CA
**Design Review Board Tier IV Staff Report**  
January 24, 2019

**GRiffin On San Pablo Avenue**

### DETAILS

**Application Number:** PL17-0134  
**Applicant:** Bavak El Cerrito LLC  
**Location:** 11048/11060 San Pablo Avenue  
**APN:** 502-411-021  
**Zoning:** Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)  
**General Plan:** Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)  
**Request:** Design Review Board consideration of Tier IV Design Review for two 6-story buildings, including a total of 173 residential units.  
**CEQA:** As part of the review of the project, the project will be evaluated for consistency with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed project includes 173 residential units. The units are located in two buildings, above two levels of parking (one level underground.) Additional uses such as a business center, lobbies, a lounge, exercise room and bike stop are located on the first floor. Each building would contain a courtyard on the podium level and a deck on the roof. The project would provide public open space in the form of two public plazas and a mid-block connection between San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway.

The project requires approval from both the Planning Commission and the Design Review Board. On November 21, 2018, the Planning Commission approved modifications to the Tier II Development standards for the project and a package of public benefits included in the project.

The Design Review Board’s purview includes:

- Limitations regarding building height, form and massing;
- Limitations regarding view blockage of the key views listed in Section 2.05.02.03 Views;
- Building facades and articulation;
- Exterior building colors and materials;
- Landscaping, including use and design of open spaces;
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way;
- Signs

The project features a contemporary architectural aesthetic, including a range of exterior materials and articulation.

Based on the information in this report, which supports the required findings, staff recommends approval of the project.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The project site is located on San Pablo Avenue between Manila Avenue and Madison Avenue. The site has frontages on both San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway. The site is 64,446 square feet (1.48 acres) in size. The site currently houses a Big 5 Sporting Goods store and parking lot.

Vicinity Map

Existing Public Right-of-Way

The site has 174 feet of street frontage along San Pablo Avenue. The street frontage on San Pablo Avenue features existing rain gardens which were installed by the City of El Cerrito as part of the San Pablo Avenue Streetscape project.

Existing/Previous Land Use

The site currently houses a sporting goods store and associated parking lot. The existing building and site improvements were constructed in 1980.
Adjacent Land Uses

North: Veterinary business and industrial use.

East: Ohlone Greenway. (An assisted living community and apartment complex are located across the
Ohlone Greenway).

South: Apartment complex

West: San Pablo Avenue. (A senior apartment complex is located across San Pablo Avenue.)

Analysis

Project Description

The proposed project consists of 173 residential units contained in two buildings. The buildings will be
located atop an at-grade and underground parking level. The at-grade parking will be located between
uses which front San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway. The underground parking level will span
the entire site. The parking and basement areas total 75,259 square feet. The interior portions of the
building total 174,330 square feet. One building will face San Pablo Avenue and will feature a business
center and building lobby accessible from San Pablo Avenue. Two residential units would also face San
Pablo Avenue on the ground floor. The at-grade parking podium parking area would be located behind
these uses. Vehicular access to the parking area would be provided from San Pablo Avenue as well as
from the existing end of Kearney Street. The parking area would be secured with a gate at each entrance.
The main parking driveway would separate the two buildings. The underground parking area would be
accessed via a ramp near the Kearney Street access. In total, 185 parking spaces would be included in the
two parking levels. A total of 65 parking spaces would be provided using puzzle parking lifts. The
remaining spaces would be traditional parking spaces. The rear building would feature a lobby, lounge,
yoga room, exercise room, pet/bike wash room, and publicly accessible bike stop on the ground floor.
Above the ground level, both buildings would be U-shaped, with the courtyards which face south. The courtyard or the rear building would feature a fire pit with outdoor furniture surrounding it, the front building would feature a fireplace along the southern edge with outdoor furniture adjacent to it, as well as additional seating areas in the courtyard. In addition, both buildings would feature rooftop decks along the western sides. These decks would be programmed with amenities, such as cooking facilities, bar seating, synthetic turf and shade trellises.

The project would also feature a pedestrian pathway which would link San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway. Adjacent to this pathway, along the Ohlone Greenway, would be located a publicly accessible bike stop.

Project Rendering

![Project Rendering](image)

**Design Review Board Purview**

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.D.4 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, The Design Review Board is authorized to review and act upon the Design Component of Tier IV applications. Generally, this review includes authority over the following elements:

- Limitations regarding building height, form and massing;
- Limitations regarding view blockage of the key views listed in Section 2.05.02.03 Views;
- Building facades and articulation;
- Exterior building colors and materials;
- Landscaping, including use and design of open spaces;
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way;
- Signs

As each Tier IV project will be different in terms of what components need to be considered under the Planning Commission purview, the Design Review Board purview for this project’s design is also unique to this project.

In this application:

- Shadows (the proposed project will cast shadows across the Ohlone Greenway)
- Ground floor front setbacks along the Ohlone Greenway
- Building height

have been approved in the Planning Commission action.
All other aspects of the elements listed above remain in the purview of the Board.

Compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

Chapter Two of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan establishes the land use regulations and development standards of the Specific Plan Area.

Some development standards apply throughout the Plan area. These include:
- Regulation by Street Type – which includes building placement, building form, and shadow analysis.
- Open Space Requirements – which include private, common and public types of open space.

Other development standards vary by transect zone. The development standards that are related to the transect zone include:
- Use-Types of land use permitted, conditionally permitted or prohibited.
- Building Height- the minimums and maximums heights allowed.
- Parking of vehicles – the minimum and maximum number of spaces allowed.
- Parking of bicycles- the minimum number of spaces allowed

The tables below show the relevant Specific Plan standards. Standards below that are in **bold** show components of the project that do not comply with the Specific Plan standards. The Planning Commission has already approved the exceptions themselves, considering their impact versus the public benefits provided by the project. The Design Review Board purview is the project’s design components specified in its purview, except where the Planning Commission has already given approval.

The project is located between San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway. This section of San Pablo Avenue is designated a Community Street. The project is located in the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed-Use (TOMIMU) Transect Zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation by Street Type: SPA Community Street</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Placement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</td>
<td>6 ft. min</td>
<td>6 ft. 6 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</td>
<td>8 ft. min</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Activity Zone</td>
<td>4 ft. min</td>
<td>10 ft. 11 in. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Front Setback</td>
<td>Min: distance needed to accommodate required zones Max: 10 ft. for non-residential uses, 15 ft. for residential uses</td>
<td>9 ft. max at non-residential 11 ft. 4 in. max at residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>5 ft. 6 in. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>Building will cast a shadow onto the Ohlone Greenway and adjacent parcels at 1:30 p.m. on December 21. Project requires exception to shadow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pedestrian Access
- Entries on front or side streets
- Building and unit entries on San Pablo Avenue

### Vehicular Access
- Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways.
- Side access on corner lots
- (1) 20 ft. driveway and (1) 26 ft. driveway. El Cerrito Fire Department has requested a 26 ft. wide access to meet code requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Form</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Setbacks</td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</td>
<td>14 ft. min clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Ceiling Height</td>
<td>9 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Length</td>
<td>200 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Transparency</td>
<td>Non-residential 75% min, Residential 40% min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Transparency</td>
<td>30% min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Encroachments</td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Encroachments</td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed Frontage Types</td>
<td>Min: 50% Flex Front Max. 50% Shop Front, Arcade (NE side SPA), or Eco-front</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regulation by Street Type: Ohlone Greenway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Placement</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Activity Zone</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Front Setback</td>
<td>10 ft. max for non-residential uses. 15 ft. max for residential uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Front Setback</td>
<td>11 ft. 6 in. max at Yoga Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building will cast a shadow onto the Ohlone Greenway and adjacent parcels at 1:30 p.m. on December 21. Project requires exception to shadow standards via Tier IV Design Review process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>Entries on front or side streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular Access</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Setbacks</td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td>9 ft. min clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td>9 ft. min clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Length</strong></td>
<td>200 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Non-residential 50% min, Residential 30% min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>25% min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowed Frontage Types</strong></td>
<td>Forecourt (NE Side), Flex, Front Yard or Eco-front. Max 50% shop front.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Space Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private/Common Open Space</strong></td>
<td>80 sq. ft./unit min (13,600 sq. ft. total)</td>
<td>17,816 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Open Space</strong></td>
<td>25 sq. ft./1,000 sq. ft. of building for buildings &gt;25,000 sq. ft. (Total of 4,358 sq. ft. required) May pay fee in-lieu of providing full amount of required public open space on site.</td>
<td>6,427 sq. ft. (total of mid-block connection and two plazas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parking</td>
<td>Up to 1.5 space/unit (Reductions and increases allowed with Zoning Administrator approval)</td>
<td>1.07 space per unit (total of 185 spaces)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bicycle Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min 1 short-term space/10 units (17 min)</th>
<th>Min 1.5 long-term spaces/unit (260 min)</th>
<th>22 short-term spaces 262 long-term spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Building Height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Height</th>
<th>55 ft. max</th>
<th>69 ft. (Requires exception through Tier IV Design Review Process)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Height</td>
<td>3 stories residential, 2 stories commercial</td>
<td>6 residential stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the project will implement the following strategies of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan:

**Strategy A.3:** Optimize Placemaking in all developments.

*The project addresses San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway with entries onto the street. The project will add public open space along San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway and will provide a mid-block pathway connecting San Pablo Avenue to the Ohlone Greenway.*

**Strategy A.4:** Attract pedestrian activity to key nodes to foster community and identify places of interest.

*The project focuses active non-residential uses along San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway and will provide public spaces along these two frontages and a publicly accessible bike stop on the Ohlone Greenway.*

**Strategy B.1:** Maximize TOD potential (BART and AC Transit).

*The project will provide 173 new residential units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines and the El Cerrito del Norte BART station. The project includes bike parking as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will face San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway, providing a pleasant pedestrian environment along the adjacent streets.*

**Strategy B.2:** Stimulate investment in vacant/underutilized sites at key focus areas.

*The project includes substantial investment in an underutilized site. The site currently contains one-story commercial building and a surface parking lot.*

**Strategy B.3:** Build on recent and planned private and public investments.

*Consistent with the findings for Tier IV Design Review, as a public benefit, the project will provide a publicly accessible bike station, and the applicant will contribute $1,000,000 to the City’s Low-Income Housing Asset Trust Fund and $700,000 toward capital improvement projects related to implementation of the complete streets program. See discussion below for more information. The project will also contribute its fair share requirement to implement the San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets plan.*

**Strategy C.3:** Allow ground floor residential development to provide flexibility and expand the Specific Plan Area’s residential base.
The project proposes ground floor residential units as well as other ground-floor uses and will expand the residential base within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area.

**Strategy D.3:** Create new gathering places to serve the needs of existing and new users.

The project will create two public plaza areas and a mid-block connection between San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway.

**Strategy E.1:** Promote infill development through increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure.

The project will provide 173 new housing units in close proximity to existing public transit infrastructure.

**Previous Review**

The project was previously reviewed in a joint meeting of the Planning Commission and Design Review Board on February 27, 2018. Commissioners and Boardmembers shared a variety of comments with the applicant, based on the purviews of both bodies. The applicant has made a series of notable changes since this meeting.

Prominent changes include:

- Relocation of the mid-block connection to the south side of the site.
- An improved relationship between the midblock connection and the adjacent building uses.
- Widening of the mid-block pathway.
- Enlargement of the public open space areas and a clearer delineation on the plans.
- Addition of a common lobby for units with access to the parking garage.
- Relocation of the trash enclosures.
- Provision of a pick-up/drop-off/turn around area for rideshare.
- A reconfiguration of the uses facing the Ohlone Greenway (relocating residential units and replacing with active, resident-serving uses.
- Provision of two elevators in each building.

**Planning Commission Approval**

On November 21, 2018, the Planning Commission reviewed the application as part of the Tier IV Design Review process. The Commission’s purview consisted of the site plan, the aspects of the project that do not meet the Tier II development standards of the Form-Based Code of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, and making a determination whether the project achieves an over-arching public benefit. The Commission approved these aspects of the project on a 4-0 vote.

The public benefits included in the project that were approved by the Planning Commission include:

1. $1,000,000 contribution to the City’s Low-Income Housing Asset Trust Fund
2. $700,000 contribution toward projects contained in the City’s Capital Improvement Program for projects related to implementation of San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets.
3. A publicly accessible bike station located adjacent to the Ohlone Greenway

**Art in Public Places**
The project is required to comply with Chapter 13.50: Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. The applicant is proposing to provide onsite public art along the mid-block connection.

**Monetary Contributions to the Community**

To understand the direct and indirect contributions to the community, staff has created a list illustrating the financial contributions that will be made by the applicant related to this project. Some are directly submitted to the City of El Cerrito. Others are submitted to community agencies such as the West Contra Costa Unified School District and West County Transportation Advisory Committee. These contributions are over and above what is required for their fair share of impacts to the Complete Streets component of the Specific Plan referenced below, any fees paid to the Stege Sanitary District and any building and planning user fees needed for processing the entitlement, plan review and inspection of the project during the construction phase.

1. Estimated* West Contra Costa Unified School District fee of $5.02 per square foot are assessed on gross square footage of the project. (174,330 sq. ft. x 5.02 = $875,136.60) This money is collected by the School District to help fund both modernization and new construction of school facilities.

2. Estimated* West County Sub Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP Fee) of $1,648 per multi-family dwelling unit. (173 du x $1,648 = $285,104). This is collected by the City and transferred to West County Transportation Advisory Committee to assure that new development in West County pays its fair-share toward regional circulation and transit improvements that are proportional to the traffic impact the new development will generate. The local fees collected in West County provide congestion relief to mitigate traffic on regional routes and through improved transit service.

Total community contribution of this project is estimated to be $1,160,240.60

*Denotes that these fees change on a periodic basis and are due at building permit. As construction plans typically take 12 to 18 months to complete, these fees may have changed by the time payment is due.

**Complete Streets Plan**

The project will be required to make a fair-share contribution toward the improvements contained in the Complete Streets chapter of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The improvements will be constructed by the City as funds become available.

**Public Notice and Comment**

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times, mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site and posted on the site on January 3, 2019.

Staff received three comments related to the project (Attachments 4-6). All of these comments expressed support for the project.

**Architectural Design**

The project utilizes a contemporary architectural style. The project will feature smooth stucco exteriors in predominantly white and tan colors, with light green accents. Wood veneer rain screens are also proposed at key architectural projections, primarily on the west and north elevations. The proposed material for the rainscreen is Trespa Meteon, with a Light Mahogany veneer.

Additionally, composite wood slat screens would be featured at balconies on the Ohlone Greenway-facing (east) elevation. The remaining balconies would feature perforated metal guardrails. The base of the building would be clad in natural stone veneer with two different finishes.
Aluminum casement windows would be featured throughout the project and aluminum storefront systems would be utilized along the San Pablo Avenue and Ohlone Greenway frontages.

The project features a high degree of architectural articulation.

**Landscape Design**

The project will feature landscaping on the ground floor perimeter areas, in the second floor courtyards and in the rooftop decks. Amenities in the courtyards include seating, outdoor furniture, a fireplace and a firepit. Amenities in the roof decks include games, a synthetic turf area, an outdoor kitchen, a shade structure, seating, outdoor furniture, and a projection screen.

The landscaping features a mixture of native and other drought tolerant plants, including Manzanita (*arctostaphylos ‘Dr Hurd’*), California Lilac (*ceanothus ‘skylark’*), and Brakelight Red Yucca (*Hesperaloe Parviflora ‘brakelights’*), and Berkeley Sedge (*carex divulsa*).

**Environmental Review**

A Program Environmental Impact Report (program EIR) was certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in 2014. This type of environmental documentation is authorized by section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for use in documenting the environmental impacts of specific plans, and other planning "programs." As explained in the CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR is useful in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of a project that involves a series of interrelated actions that can reasonably be characterized as a single project. Subsequent activities that fall within the scope of the program may not be subject to further environmental review if the environmental effects of the subsequent activity have been adequately addressed in the program EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR.

An Initial Study Checklist has been prepared for this project (Attachment 3). The responses contained in the checklist confirm that the project is considered within the scope of the evaluation completed for the program EIR. No new impacts were identified.

Several conditions of approval have been included in the draft resolution to ensure that key mitigation measures of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR are implemented with regard to this project. The inclusion of these conditions ensure that the project will not have environmental effects which have not previously been addressed in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR. In addition, a number of project-specific conditions of approval have been identified in the Initial Study and included in the draft resolution. These conditions are the result of project-level analysis that has been completed as part of the project review. The conditions do not identify new environmental impacts, and the project remains consistent with the analysis in the Program EIR.

**Compliance with the General Plan**

The project is consistent with and will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

**LU1.5: Suitable Housing.** Promote suitably located housing and services for all age groups within the city. Within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area, allow ground floor residential development and increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure to promote residential infill development and catalyze mode shift.

*The project will provide 173 new housing units on San Pablo Avenue, with close proximity to public transportation and commercial uses. The infill project contains ground-floor residential units in a*
location in close proximity to existing transit lines on San Pablo Avenue and the El Cerrito del Norte BART station.

LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area. Promote retail, office, and mixed uses within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area to provide more tax revenues to the city.

In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the proposed project will add housing units to San Pablo Avenue which will promote a balanced mixture of land uses in the corridor. The new residents of the project will support new and existing businesses along San Pablo Avenue.

LU4.1: Mixture of Uses. Encourage a mix of uses that promotes such community values as convenience, economic vitality, fiscal stability, public safety, a healthy environment, and a pleasant quality of life.

The proposed project will enhance the mixture of uses along San Pablo Avenue. The location of the project will provide the residents with convenient access to businesses, parks, schools, public transit and the Ohlone Greenway. The design of the project will allow for surveillance of San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway, enhancing public safety. The project will also provide public open space.

LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives. To the extent possible, encourage alternatives to the use of private automobiles. Encourage a full range of transportation options – driving, transit, walking and biking – without allowing any one to preclude the others. On San Pablo Avenue, in many constrained right-of-ways, it is not possible to provide optimum facilities for all user groups and in the event that trade-offs are necessary, transit users and pedestrians are the highest priority.

The location of the project provides convenient access to frequent public transit along San Pablo Avenue as well as the El Cerrito del Norte BART station. The location also provides convenient access to the Ohlone Greenway and local businesses. The project also provides 185 long-term and 22 short-term bicycle parking spaces and contributes its fair share to the San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets program.

CD1.9: Building Design. A variety of attractive images will be achieved by encouraging a variety of building styles and designs, within a unifying context of consistent “pedestrian” scale along streets and compatibility among neighboring land uses.

The proposed project is designed at a pedestrian scale and addresses San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway with building entries and windows along the street.

CD2.1: Street Frontages. Encourage street frontages that are safe, by allowing for surveillance of the street by people inside buildings and elsewhere, and are interesting for pedestrians. Require buildings in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area to be directly abutting sidewalks, with window openings, entries and high levels of transparency along the pedestrian frontage.

The building will abut the sidewalk or public plazas on San Pablo Avenue and features ample window openings, decks, and doors along the street. These windows and decks will allow surveillance of streets from the units within the project. The project meets or exceeds the transparency standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building also addresses the Ohlone Greenway with building entrances and windows at active uses, allowing for surveillance.

CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements. Maintain an active program of street tree planting and improved roadway landscaping through both public and private means. Design guidelines shall
describe appropriate types of trees for commercial areas – to enhance the shopping experience rather than detract from it.

*The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan implemented standards and requirements for public right-of-way improvements. The project is consistent with the standards and will enhance the adjacent public rights of way in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.*

**CD3.2: Usable Open Space.** Require the provision of usable open space in the form of ground-floor patios, upper-floor decks, and balconies, as well as common recreational facilities and amenities.

*The project features patios and decks on both ground floor and upper floor units. The project also provides common open spaces in the form of courtyards and roof decks and provides public open space in tow public plazas and a mid-block connection.*

**CD3.12: Landscape Species.** Indigenous and drought-tolerant species that reduce water usage and are compatible with El Cerrito’s climate are encouraged.

*The proposed plant palette includes native, drought-tolerant plants such as Manzanita, Eastern Redbud, California Lilac, Berkeley Sedge, Mat Rush, and Yarrow.*

**CD4.2: Building Articulation.** Ensure that buildings are well articulated. Avoid large unarticulated shapes in building design. Ensure that building designs include varied building facades, rooflines, and building heights to create more interesting and differentiated building forms and shapes. Encourage human scale detail in architectural design. Do not allow unarticulated blank walls or unbroken series of garage doors on the facades of buildings facing the street or the Ohlone Greenway.

*The proposed building is articulated in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building includes a varied façade and interesting building form. The building is designed at a human scale with building entries along San Pablo Avenue and the Ohlone Greenway.*

**CD5.1: Design Review Process.** Continue design review and approval process for all new development, changes, additions, and modifications of existing buildings (except for single-family homes on existing lots).

*The proposed project requires Tier IV Design Review. Pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, both the Planning Commission and the Design Review Board have authority over elements of the Tier IV Design Review Process.*

**T2.1: Land Use Patterns.** Recognize the link between land use and transportation. Promote land use and development patterns that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use. Emphasize high-density and mixed land use patterns that promote transit and pedestrian travel. Where feasible, emphasize the following land use measures:

1. Promote conveniently located neighborhood complexes that provide housing and commercial services near employment centers and within transit corridors.

2. Promote land use patterns that maximize trip-linking opportunities by assembling uses that allow people to take care of a variety of daily needs.

3. Encourage pedestrian-oriented land use and urban design that can have a demonstrable effect on transportation choices.

4. Direct growth to occur along transit corridors.
5. Encourage retail, commercial, and office uses in ground floor space in combination with upper-
floor housing along San Pablo Avenue.

The project will provide 173 new residential units in close proximity to public transportation and
local businesses. In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the project
will add housing units along San Pablo Avenue, a major transit corridor.

T2.2: Project Design. Projects should be designed to include features that encourage walking,
bicycling, and transit use.

The project will provide 185 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 22 short-term bicycle parking
spaces. The project’s proximity to the Ohlone Greenway and the inclusion of a publicly-accessible
bike-stop will encourage bicycling.

H2.2: Encourage the construction of transit-oriented developments (TODs) that seek to maximize
opportunities for the use of public transit and transportation corridors through high-density
residential and mixed-use projects along those corridors in accordance with the San Pablo Avenue
Specific Plan and the City’s Incentives Program (Chapter 19.23 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance.)

The project provides high-density housing along a transit corridor consistent with the Transit-
Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Transect Zone in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

H2.3: Continue to enforce the sections of the Zoning Ordinance that increase density, reduce
parking requirements, and establish design and development standards to create inviting, mixed-
use neighborhoods around transit, and enforce the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan reduced parking requirements and eliminated maximum
density in the plan area. This project will enhance the mix of uses in the corridor adjacent to public
transit. The project complies with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Required Findings

Pursuant to Section 2.02.07.01.02 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, in acting to approve or
conditionally approve a Tier IV application, the Design Review Board shall make the following findings:

a. That the project complies with all applicable and achievable Specific Plan design standards;

As discussed in the staff report, the project complies with all standards of the San Pablo Avenue
Specific Plan, as approved by the Planning Commission.

b. That the project implements applicable goals and policies of the El Cerrito General Plan.

As discussed in this report, the project will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito
General Plan: LU1.5: Suitable Housing, LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue, LU4.1: Mixture of Uses, LU6.2:
Circulation Alternatives, CD1.9: Building Design, CD2.1: Street Frontages, CD2.3: Streetscape
Improvements, CD3.2: Usable Open Space, CD3.12: Landscape Species, CD4.2: Building
Articulation, CD5.1: Design Review Process, T2.1: Land Use Patterns, T2.2: Project Design, and
Policies H2.2, and H2.3 of Housing Element Goal H2: New Housing Development.
Staff Recommendation

Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends approval of Planning Application No. PL17-0134, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.

Proposed Motion

Move adoption of Design Review Board Resolution DRB19-02 granting Tier IV Design Review approval to Planning Application No. PL17-0134: a project that includes two 6-story buildings containing 173 residential dwelling units and located at 11060/11048 San Pablo Avenue.

Appeal Period

Within ten (10) calendar days after the date of the decision, the Design Review Board action may be appealed to the Planning Commission.

Attachments

1. Draft resolution
2. Project Plans, dated January 18, 2019
3. Initial Study Checklist and appendices
4. Letter from Carl Guardino, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, dated January 11, 2019
5. Email from William Wagner, dated January 15, 2019
6. Email from Diego Navarro-Leal, dated January 17, 2019
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO DESIGN REVIEW BOARD GRANTING TIER IV DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO NEW BUILDING CONTAINING 173 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AT 11060/11048 SAN PABLO AVENUE.

WHEREAS, the site is located within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area;

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use and the project is located on a Community Street and the Ohlone Greenway;

WHEREAS, the site is located at 11060/11048 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 502-411-021;

WHEREAS, on October 2, 2017, the applicant submitted an application for Tier IV Design Review;

WHEREAS, on June 8, 2018, the applicant was determined to be complete; and

WHEREAS, on November 21, 2018, the El Cerrito Planning Commission, granted Tier IV Site Plan and Design Review approval to the project; and

WHEREAS, on January 24, 2019, the Design Review Board, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review, does find and determine the following:

1. The project is consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182 and is subject to the Program Environmental Impact Report mitigation measures listed below.

2. As discussed in the staff report, the project complies with all standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, as approved by the Planning Commission.


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that after careful consideration of all maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Design Review Board hereby approves Application No. PL17-0134, subject to the following conditions:

Planning Division:
1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans presented to the Design Review Board on January 24, 2019. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Once constructed or installed, all improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If Applicant constructs the building or makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for nonissuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.

4. If not used, this design review shall expire two years from the date of this action.

5. The applicant shall share the conditions of approval with their general contractor for the project. The general contractor shall sign a copy of the conditions of approval to acknowledge that he/she is aware of all these conditions of approval and will comply as directed. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, this signed copy shall be returned to the planning and building division and kept as part of the project file. The conditions of approval shall be reviewed at the mandatory pre-construction meeting held between the City and the General Contractor. A copy of the conditions of approval shall be maintained on the project site at all times during construction.

6. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Chapter 13.50: Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The project shall be fully compliant with Chapter 13.50 prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

7. Prior to the Certificate of Occupancy, the Applicant/Developer shall record an easement on the part of the property that is designated as privately-owned public open space to identify that area for that use in perpetuity, to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The Applicant/Developer shall also affix permanent, durable signage, to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator, in this open space area notifying the community that this area is available for public use from dawn to dusk.

8. In compliance with Chapter 16.34 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, the applicant shall submit plans for undergrounding of utilities adjacent to the project to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permit.

9. The cost of all automobile parking shall be separate from the sale or rental price of all residential units. All renters and/or buyers of market rate residential units shall be free to not rent and/or purchase parking.

10. A construction staging plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The construction staging plan shall illustrate where the construction equipment will be staged and the location of parking for the construction employees. This construction and staging plan may also require the submission of a Temporary Use Permit to allow this use.

Conditions based on applicable mitigation measures from the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR:
11. Aesthetics and Visual Resources. (Mitigation 4.2): The project shall install landscaping and incorporate other measures into and around parking structure(s) (light source shielding, etc.) as necessary to ensure that potential light and glare from vehicles would be avoided toward the Ohlone Greenway, residential uses, and other sensitive uses, consistent with El Cerrito City Resolution 82-9 and the El Cerrito design review process.

   Regarding reflective building materials, for all future development in the Specific Plan area, facades shall be of non-reflective materials, and windows shall incorporate non-reflective coating.

12. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.1): Implement the following Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction. City staff will spot check that these measures are being implemented throughout the construction phase of the project. These measures reduce diesel particulate matter PM2.5 and PM10 created from construction to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced:

   **Dust (PM2.5 and PM10) Control Measures:**

   a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp at all times.
   b. Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
   c. Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.
   d. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., previously graded areas that are inactive for 10 days or more).
   e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.
   f. Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph.
   g. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
   h. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site.
   i. Post a publically visible sign(s) with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

   **Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Particulate Matter and PM2.5 and other construction emissions:**

   j. The developer or contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City or BAAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average for the year 2011.
   k. Clear signage at all construction sites shall be posted indicating that diesel and gasoline equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site or adjacent to the construction site.
   l. The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).
m. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.

13. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.2): Prior to issuance of building permit the applicant shall require project-level construction health risk assessment shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. This assessment shall be completed either through screening or refined modeling to identify impacts and, if necessary, include performance standards and industry-recognized measures to be accomplished through, though is not limited to, the following measures:
   a. Construction equipment selection.
   b. Use of alternative fuels and engine retrofits temporary line power or electric equipment.
   c. Modified construction schedule; and
   d. Implementation of BAAQMD Basic and/or Additional Construction Mitigation Measures for control of fugitive dust.

14. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall implement a program, for review and approval of the Zoning Administrator, that includes the following elements:
   a. Archeological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Procedures for reporting archeological discoveries

15. Biological Impacts (Mitigation Measure 6.1): Removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation between February 1 and August 31 shall require a survey for nesting birds by a qualified wildlife biologist to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The survey shall be conducted no sooner than 14 days prior to the start of removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation. Survey results shall be valid for 21 days following the survey. Any removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation more than 21 days after a survey shall require a new survey. The area surveyed shall include all construction sites, access roads, and staging areas, as well as areas within 150 feet outside the boundaries of the areas to be cleared or as otherwise determined by the biologist.

In the event that an active nest is discovered in the areas to be cleared, or in other habitats within 150 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction shall be postponed for at least two weeks or until a wildlife biologist has determined that the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts.

A qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for bats and suitable bat roosting habitat at work sites where culverts, structures and/or trees would be removed or otherwise disturbed prior to the initiation of construction. If bats or suitable bat roosting habitat is detected, CDFW shall be notified immediately for consultation and possible on-site monitoring.

The survey for nesting birds, bats and suitable bat roosting habitat may be conducted simultaneously.

16. Historic and Cultural Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.2): If subsurface archeological or cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described in Mitigation Measure 7-3 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) shall apply, and there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the Contra Costa County Coroner has been notified of the remains and has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition
of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

17. Paleontological Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.3): The applicant shall implement a program that includes the following elements:
   a. Paleontological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitor of all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface
   c. Procedures for reporting paleontological discoveries and their geologic context

   If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered, excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources, and the project paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and its stratigraphic context. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts to paleontological resources. During monitoring, if potentially significant paleontological resources are found, “standard” samples shall be collected and processed by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils. If significant fossils are found and collected, they shall be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix shall be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of material collected and identified shall be provided to a local museum repository with the specimens. Significant fossils collected during this work, along with the itemized inventory of these specimens, shall be deposited in a local museum repository for permanent curatorship and storage. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities, and the significance of the fossils, if any, shall be prepared and submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

18. Geology and Soils (Mitigation Measure 8.1): As required by the Building Official, subject to City review and approval, the applicant shall complete and implement the geotechnical mitigation recommendations identified in the required site-specific geotechnical investigations and engineering studies, in coordination with City grading permit and building permit performance standards.

19. Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.1): Future development would be exposed to outdoor noise levels exceeding acceptable levels as defined in the El Cerrito and Richmond General Plans. Noise levels inside residential structures proposed in such noise environments would exceed 45 dBA Ldn, the local established land use compatibility threshold. In areas where residential developments would be exposed to an Ldn of greater than 60 dBA, El Cerrito General Plan Policy H3.9 requires the evaluation of mitigation measures for specific projects. In Richmond General Plan Action SN4.A, new noise-sensitive uses that are located in an area with day-night average sound levels (Ldn) of 55 or greater require a noise study report; the report shall identify noise mitigation measures that limit noise to an acceptable level compared to existing conditions.

   a. Utilize site planning to minimize noise in residential outdoor activity areas (shared outdoor space in multi-family developments) by locating the areas behind noise barriers, the buildings, in courtyards, or orienting the terraces to alleyways rather than streets, whenever possible. The goal is a maximum noise level of 60 dBA Ldn from roadway traffic and 70 dBA Ldn from BART noise.
   b. The City of El Cerrito requires project-specific acoustical analyses to achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or lower, and the adopted instantaneous noise levels in residential units exposed to exterior noise levels greater than 60 dBA Ldn should not exceed 50 dBA Lmax in bedrooms and 55 dBA Lmax in other rooms. Building sound insulation requirements would need to include the provision of forced-air mechanical ventilation in noise environments exceeding 60 dBA Ldn so that windows could be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control noise. Special building construction techniques (e.g., sound rated windows and building facade treatments) may be required where exterior noise levels exceed 65 dBA Ldn. These treatments include, but are not
limited to, sound rated windows and doors, sound rated exterior wall assemblies, acoustical caulking, etc. The specific determination of what treatments are necessary will be conducted on a unit-by-unit basis during project design. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, will be submitted to the City, along with the building plans, which shall be revised as necessary or approved prior to issuance of a building permit. Feasible construction techniques such as these would adequately reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or lower and meet instantaneous noise limits.

c. Similar to above, noise insulation features shall be considered on a case-by-case basis for noise-sensitive offices and commercial uses proposed where noise levels exceed 65 dBA Ldn, in order to meet adopted noise standards.

d. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential noise and land use compatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

20. Noise (Mitigation 13.2): New commercial development proposed in the same building as or adjacent to residential development could result in noise levels exceeding City standards.

a. Noise levels at residential property lines from commercial development shall be maintained not in excess of the General Plan and municipal code limits for the Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond. The approval of the commercial development shall require a noise study demonstrating how the business—including loading docks, refuse areas, and ventilation systems—would meet these requirements and would be consistent with the respective City’s noise standards.

b. Ensure that noise-generating activities, such as maintenance and loading and unloading, are limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM.

21. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.3): Construction equipment shall be well-maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical. The following measures shall be implemented to reduce noise from construction activities:

a. Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

b. Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

c. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as feasible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction area.

d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

e. Pre-drill foundation pile holes to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile.

f. Construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to operational business, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses.

g. If noise conflicts occur which are not irresolvable by proper scheduling, a temporary noise control blanket barrier shall be erected, as determined to be necessary by the Zoning Administrator, along building facades facing construction sites.

h. Route construction-related traffic along major roadways and as far as feasible from sensitive receptors.

i. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) and excavating, grading, and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and to the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Work shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays.

j. Businesses, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to construction sites shall be notified of the construction schedule in writing.

k. Designate a “construction liaison” who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The liaison would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g.,
starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the liaison at the construction site.

22. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation 13-4): The following measures are recommended to reduce vibration from construction activities:
   a. Avoid impact pile driving where possible. Drilled piles causes lower vibration levels where geological conditions permit their use.
   b. Avoid using vibratory rollers and tampers near sensitive areas.
   c. In areas where project construction is anticipated to include vibration-generating activities, such as pile driving, in close proximity to existing structures, site-specific vibration studies shall be conducted to determine the area of impact and to present appropriate mitigation measures that may include the following:
      1. Identify sites that would include vibration compaction activities (such as pile driving) and have the potential to generate ground-borne vibration, and the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 200 feet of the project. A qualified structural engineer should conduct this task.
      2. Develop a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, define structure-specific vibration limits, and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions.
      3. Design construction contingencies that would be implemented when vibration levels approached the limits.
      4. At a minimum, conduct vibration monitoring during initial demolition activities and during pile driving activities. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements.
      5. When vibration levels approach limits, suspend construction and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.
      6. Conduct post-survey on structures under either of these circumstances: (a) when construction monitoring has indicated high vibration levels or (b) when complaints of damage have been made due to construction activities. Make appropriate repairs or compensation when damage has resulted from construction activities.

Project Specific Conditions of Approval:

23. During construction activities, the project applicant and/or its contractor shall ensure that all diesel-powered off-road construction equipment with more than 50 horsepower is EPA Tier 4 certified or retrofitted with a CARB-verified level 3 diesel particulate filter. Grading plan notes shall include this requirement prior to issuance of a grading permit. Applicant’s contractor shall provide written verification of compliance with this condition of approval during construction.

24. Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, the project applicant shall submit a thorough asbestos survey prepared in accordance with the EPA NESHAP 40 CFR Part 61.

25. For the West Building residential façades facing and perpendicular to San Pablo Avenue, living room and bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 34.

26. Prior to issuance of building permit the applicant shall submit a request to the Public Works Department for at least 20 feet of red curb on the south side of the project driveway San Pablo Avenue. Applicant shall ensure that tree canopies are higher than six feet from the ground as to not restrict sight distance for exiting vehicles.
27. The project applicant shall participate in the Stege Sanitary District’s San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program.

28. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with the City of El Cerrito, to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator, to provide north/south pedestrian and bicycle access through the driveway/EVA that bisects the project and aligns with Kearney Street should such access be required in to complete the north/south Mid-Block Connection in the Midtown District of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan as outlined in the El Cerrito Active Transportation Plan. City acceptance and construction of future pedestrian and bicycle access shall only occur if and when a public connection is secured through the property to the south of the project site, allowing pedestrian and bicycle connection between the two currently discontinuous portions of Kearney Street. Public access to this portion of the site shall be restricted to between 5:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., or shorter hours as approved by the Zoning Administrator. The applicant shall not be financially responsible for improvements required to provide the pedestrian and bicycle access.

Public Works Department:

29. The applicant shall not utilize existing raingarden facilities on San Pablo Avenue as a storm water control method.

30. Any improvements on the Ohlone Greenway shall approved by the Public Works Department and BART and will require a separate Public Works Encroachment Permit as well as a Hold Harmless Agreement.

31. Applicant shall secure all required approval from the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District for construction adjacent to the aerial BART tracks.

32. Prior to issuance of a building permit, applicant shall provide a detailed civil plan for off-site work (improvements in the public right-of-way).

33. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a request for red curb on Kearney Street, adjacent to the project driveway, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

34. Applicant shall install mirrors on both sides of the project driveways to aid drivers’ and pedestrians’ visibility and buzzing system to alert pedestrians when a vehicle is exiting the driveway. Applicant shall also provide truncated domes and proper striping and signs for the protection of pedestrians crossing the proposed driveways.

35. Applicant shall remove any abandoned driveway curb cuts around the property and replace with standard curb, gutter and sidewalk.

36. Storm water control plan and all C.3 measures shall be re-submitted with the building permit set to confirm that the plans comply with most recently adopted Municipal Regional Permit.

37. For any street tree, sidewalk and driveway work, applicant must obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees. Any sidewalk, curb ramp and driveway work shall meet current ADA and City of El Cerrito Standards.

38. If any new street trees are to be installed, they must be from the City Master Tree List and approved by the City Arborist before installation. Tree species, location, spacing, tree well size, and planting details, are to be approved by the City Arborist before installation.
39. Any new street trees are required to have irrigation and an establishment period of 3 years prior to acceptance by the City.

40. Applicant shall provide ADA compliant path of travel along property frontages. Replacement of sidewalk flags along the property frontage is required to meet current City and ADA standards. Some replacement locations may be at the discretion of the Public Works Engineering Manager.

41. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, etc. Applicant must look at drainage runoff coming from the BART track area and the Ohlone Greenway and how it will be collected and discharged along proposed improvements on the east side improvements.

42. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, etc. Applicant must look at drainage runoff coming from the BART track area and the Ohlone Greenway and how it will be collected and discharged along proposed improvements on the east side improvements.

43. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, etc. Applicant must look at drainage runoff coming from the BART track area and the Ohlone Greenway and how it will be collected and discharged along proposed improvements on the east side improvements.

44. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, etc. Applicant must look at drainage runoff coming from the BART track area and the Ohlone Greenway and how it will be collected and discharged along proposed improvements on the east side improvements.

45. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, etc. Applicant must look at drainage runoff coming from the BART track area and the Ohlone Greenway and how it will be collected and discharged along proposed improvements on the east side improvements.

46. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, etc. Applicant must look at drainage runoff coming from the BART track area and the Ohlone Greenway and how it will be collected and discharged along proposed improvements on the east side improvements.

47. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, etc. Applicant must look at drainage runoff coming from the BART track area and the Ohlone Greenway and how it will be collected and discharged along proposed improvements on the east side improvements.

48. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, etc. Applicant must look at drainage runoff coming from the BART track area and the Ohlone Greenway and how it will be collected and discharged along proposed improvements on the east side improvements.

49. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, etc. Applicant must look at drainage runoff coming from the BART track area and the Ohlone Greenway and how it will be collected and discharged along proposed improvements on the east side improvements.

50. Compliance with the Building Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required.
51. Compliance with the Fire Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required. The following list is provided to assist the Applicant/Development Team with the preparation of the building plans:

a. Emergency Vehicle Access
   1. Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) roads shall be a minimum of 24 feet in width and 13 feet 6 inches of unobstructed vertical clearance with an all-weather driving surface that can support a minimum of 75,000 pounds except in proximity to East Building where the minimum EVA road width shall be 26 feet for aerial apparatus access.
   2. Turf block or similar material may be used to create EVA providing it meets weight requirements.
   3. If gates are installed across EVA roads, gates shall be operable by the use of a Knox Key.
   4. A “KNOX BOX” shall be installed with keys for all common areas.

b. Fire Flow Requirements
   1. Provide code analysis of required total firefighting water.
   2. Based on required fire flow, show on plans the number of fire hydrants required and locations based on maximum spacing requirements.
   3. If required, plans for fire service underground shall be submitted for review, approval and permit under separate cover.
   4. Based on proposed project a minimum of two fire hydrants shall be required and installed in proposed locations.

c. Fire Sprinkler/Underground
   1. Fire riser and FDC locations shall be submitted for review and approval.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable for fire department for emergency operations.
   3. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected with fire sprinklers and standpipes.
   4. Fire Sprinkler Plans shall be submitted for review and approval.
   5. Fire system underground pipe plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

d. Standpipes
   1. Standpipes shall be wet.
   2. Standpipes shall extend to the roof where required.
   3. Fire Department valve connections shall be in the intermediate landings of stairwells.
   4. Standpipes shall be located in the stairwells noted on plans with (SP).

e. Premises Identification
   1. Approved numbers or address shall be provided in such a position to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property.
   2. Address shall be either internally or externally illuminated.

f. Automatic Fire Sprinklers
   1. Automatic Fire Sprinklers shall be installed throughout the Complex.
   2. Fire sprinkler plans shall be submitted for review, approval and permit.

g. Emergency Egress
   1. Exit signs shall be internally or externally illuminated.
   2. Emergency electrical system to automatically illuminate means of egress.

h. Fire Sprinkler / Underground
   1. Fire riser and FDC locations shall be submitted for review and approval.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable for fire department for emergency operations.
   3. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected with fire sprinklers and standpipes.
   4. Fire Sprinkler Plans shall be submitted for review and approval.
   5. Fire system underground pipe plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

i. Standpipes
   1. Standpipes shall be wet.
   2. Standpipes shall extend to the roof where required.
3. Fire Department valve connections shall be in the intermediate landings of stairwells.

j. Smoke & Heat Vents
   1. Smoke & heat vents shall be installed on roof above each stairwell.
   2. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with fusible link.
   3. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with manual release for emergency operations.

k. Fire alarm System
   1. Fire alarm plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

l. Smoke Detection
   1. Smoke detection shall be installed in each bedroom, in hallways adjacent to bedrooms, and one detector per floor level (top and bottom of stairs).
   2. Smoke detectors shall be 120v powered with battery backup.
   3. Smoke detectors shall be interconnected when more than one is required per sleeping area.
   4. Single Station or Multiple-Station Smoke alarm(s) not required to activate fire alarm system outside of sleeping area.

m. Carbon Monoxide Detectors
   1. Carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of and adjacent to sleeping areas where fuel-burning appliances are installed; and in dwelling units that have attached garages.
   2. Carbon Monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 720.
   3. Carbon Monoxide alarms shall be 120v powered with battery backup and be interconnected with the smoke detectors.

n. Electrical
   1. All electrical breakers shall be labeled.

o. Radio Communications
   1. Radio frequency signal strength analysis shall be conducted throughout the building.
   2. If radio signal strength deficiencies are identified, signal boosters shall be installed to achieve adequate signal strength and boosters shall be maintained.

Police Department
52. Prior to issuance of building permit, the Applicant/Developer shall submit a plan for construction site security to the satisfaction of the Police Chief.

Stege Sanitary District:
53. This applicant shall pay all applicable sewer connection fees pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Stege Sanitary District Ordinance Code.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Design Review Board at a special meeting held on January 24, 2019 upon motion of Commissioner _____, second by Commissioner ______:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

_________________________
Sean Moss, AICP
Acting Planning Manager
UNIT 2A | 2 Bedroom
Unit Area: 1208 SF
Deck Area: 120 SF

UNIT 2B | 2 Bedroom
Unit Area: 1171 SF
Deck Area: 120 SF

GRIFFIN
11060 SAN PABLO AVENUE
EL CERRITO, CALIFORNIA
UNIT 2C | 2 Bedroom
Unit Area: 1135 SF
Deck Area: 156 SF

UNIT 2D | 2 Bedroom
Unit Area: 1169 SF
Deck Area: 109 SF
UNIT 3A | 3 Bedroom
Unit Area: 1319 SF
Deck Area: 173 SF
NORTH ELEVATION

NATURAL WOOD RAINSCREEN
NATURAL STONE VENEER
STUCCO
ROCK TERRACE
COMPOSITE SCREEN
METAL GUARDRAIL
MIXED PRIVATE COMPOSITE PATIO SCREEN + GATE
SOUTH ELEVATION TRANSPARENCY STUDY

- UPPER LEVEL FACADE: 14,013 SF
- UPPER LEVEL GLAZING: 2,437 SF
- GROUND LEVEL NON-RES. FACADE: 3,887 SF
- GROUND LEVEL NON-RES. GLAZING: 1,103 SF
- GROUND LEVEL RES. FACADE: 671 SF
- GROUND LEVEL RES. GLAZING: 196 SF

TRANSPARENCY - SOUTH ELEVATION
1. Mt. Tamalpais
2. Golden Gate Bridge
3. San Francisco Skyline
BUSINESS CENTER ON SAN PABLO AVENUE
SAN PABLO PLAZA

EXERCISE ROOM & BIKE STOP ON OHLONE TRAIL
OHLONE TRAIL PLAZA
PROPOSED CONDITION VIEW 1 - DONAL AVE. AND LAWRENCE ST.

PROPOSED CONDITION VIEW 2 - POTRERO AVE. AND DOUGLAS DR.
MATERIALS LIST
1. STUCCO (TEXTURED-SMOOTH)
2. NATURAL STONE VENEER
3. WOOD VENEER PANELS RAIN SCREEN
4. COMPOSITE WOOD SLATS SCREEN
5. METAL SCREEN (AT GARAGE OPENING)
6. METAL GUARDRAIL
7. ALUMINUM WINDOW (FIXED & CASEMENT)
8. CYLINDRICAL WALL SCONCE
9. METAL GATE
10. ALUMINUM STOREFRONT

COLOR AND MATERIALS BOARD

MATERIAL SAMPLES
1. STUCCO (TEXTURED)
1.1 STUCCO (SMOOTH)
2. NATURAL STONE VENEER (TOP LEGE COTTON WOOD; BOTTOM LEGE COTTON WOOD)
3. TRESPA METEON - LIGHT MAHOGANY

PAINT COLORS
A. INDIAN RIVER (BM_985)
B. MANCHESTER TAN (BM_HC 81)
C. CYPRESS GREEN (BM_509)
D. SITTERLICH (BM_2114-10)
E. NAVADO WHITE (BM_347)
1. SPECIMEN TREE IN RAISED PLANTER
2. BUILT-IN COUCH
3. FIREPLACE & LOUNGE FURNITURE
4. FIRE PIT & LOUNGE FURNITURE
5. PLANTER WALLS WITH MOUNDS
6. WALL LIGHT
### Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) Gallons Per Year

\[
\text{MAWA} = (ETo)(0.62)(0.55\times LA) + (1.0-0.55)\times SLA
\]

- **ETo** = Reference evapotranspiration
- **0.7** = ET adjustment factor
- **LA** = Landscaped Area (square feet)
- **0.62** = Conversion factor (gallons per square foot per year)

### Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU) Gallons Per Year

\[
\text{ETWU} = (ETo)(PF)(HA/IE) + SLA
\]

- **ETo** = Reference evapotranspiration
- **PF** = Plant factor for hydrozones
- **HA** = Hydrozone area (square feet)
- **0.62** = Conversion factor (gallons per square foot per year)
- **IE** = Irrigation efficiency (0.81) bubbler/drip
- **0.71** = Irrigation efficiency (0.71) spray
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1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

This document is an Initial Study to examine the environmental effects of the proposed 11060 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 (City). According to Section 15168(c)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, a program environmental impact report (EIR) can be used in compliance with CEQA to address the effects of a subsequent activity so long as the activity is within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR and no new effects are found and no new mitigation measures would be required.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR. This Initial Study provides a description of the proposed project and substantial evidence to confirm that the environmental effects of the project are covered by the analysis contained in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (SPASP EIR) and would have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP EIR. As such, the City of El Cerrito can approve the project as being within the scope of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan covered by its Environmental Impact Report; no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the proposed project does not require any further review under CEQA. The analysis finds that a Notice of Determination may be prepared for the project and filed with the Contra Costa County Clerk.

1.2 LEAD AGENCY

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

1.3 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This document is divided into the following chapters:

1.0 INTRODUCTION

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

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

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

4.0 REFERENCES

This chapter identifies resources used in the preparation of this document.
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION
This chapter describes the proposed 11060 San Pablo Avenue Project, which would be located in the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. This chapter includes a summary description of the project location and existing site characteristics, required approvals, and entitlements. The City of El Cerrito is the lead agency for review of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act.

2.1 PROJECT SITE

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

LOCATION

The project site is approximately 1.479 acres (64,446 square feet) and is located at 11048/11060 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito, Contra Costa County. The site is on the east side of San Pablo Avenue, midblock between Madison Avenue and Jefferson Avenue, abutting the Ohlone Greenway and the elevated Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) line. The west side of San Pablo Avenue marks the El Cerrito city limit boundary with the City of Richmond. The project site is approximately 1 mile east of the Richmond Inner Harbor of San Francisco Bay. Regional vehicular access to the project site is via Interstate 80 (I-80), approximately 1,350 to the west, and I-580, approximately 3,900 feet to the west. The El Cerrito del Norte BART station is approximately 0.5 mile to the north. Alameda-Contra Costa (AC) Transit bus service is available along San Pablo Avenue, adjacent to the site.

The project site is generally surrounded by commercial and residential uses. A multifamily residential development called Civic Plaza Apartments is directly south of the site, and commercial uses are directly north of the site, including a veterinary clinic, an office building, and a retail center called Bank of the West Plaza. Figure 2.0-1, Project Regional Vicinity, shows the site’s regional and local context. Figure 2.0-2, Project Location, depicts the project site and surrounding land uses.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND CURRENT SITE CONDITIONS

The project site is generally level and consists of one parcel (Assessor’s Parcel Number [APN] 502-411-021-47). The site is developed with a single-story, 16,516-square-foot commercial building constructed in 1980 that is occupied by Big 5 Sporting Goods, along with a parking lot in the rear of the property.

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

2.2 EXISTING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) in the City’s General Plan, as shown on Figure 2.0-3, General Plan Land Use. The site is zoned TOMIMU, as shown on Figure 2.0-4, Zoning Districts.

SAN PABLO AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN

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

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP were evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Report. The SPASP EIR, certified in 2014, evaluates the environmental impacts of approximately 1,706 units of residential development, 3,840 new residents, and 243,112 square feet of commercial floor area.

The SPASP includes a Form-Based Code that regulates development along the corridor, a plan for complete streets, and an infrastructure analysis. The complete streets plan addresses circulation and public investment needs along San Pablo Avenue and adjoining streets to improve the user experience in the area, while proactively mitigating the impacts of future population growth on mobility in the SPASP area. The infrastructure analysis identifies the utility providers for San Pablo Avenue, includes a general review of capacity limitations, and recommends feasible improvements and associated costs to avoid significant impacts on the level of service.

2.3 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would result in the construction of a 162,504-square-foot, five-story, 69-foot-tall development with two residential buildings over the street and basement levels, which would include a parking garage and building amenities. The project would include 173 residential units, 185 parking spaces, bicycle parking, a bike stop with storage, public open space including plaza areas, private open space, and various amenities for residents. See Figure 2.0-5, Ground Floor Plan, Figure 2.0-6, South Elevation, and Figure 2.0-7, East and West Elevations.

The proposed residential units include a combination of studios and 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom units, as summarized in Table 2.0-1. Project amenities would include a bike stop, courtyards, lobbies, business center, leasing office, pet/bike wash, exercise room, yoga room, bike repair, rooftop terraces, and basement storage. Detailed project plans are included in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>427 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>495–765 SF</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>1,016–1,208 SF</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>1,319 SF</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential Area</td>
<td>139,553 SF</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: SF = square feet
OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING

The proposed project would include a total of 16,524 square feet of private open space, in the form of a patio area for each unit. Residents would also have access to 15,373 square feet of common open space, including the 1,891-square-foot east courtyard, 3,731-square-foot west courtyard, 5,062-square-foot east roof terrace, and 4,689-square-foot west roof terrace.

The project would also provide a total of 6,427 square feet of public open space, composed of four areas:

- San Pablo Avenue Plaza, at the front of the development facing San Pablo Avenue, would be 1,646 square feet.
- Ohlone Plaza, at the rear of the development facing Ohlone Parkway, would be 954 square feet.
- A Midblock East Courtyard (2,104 square feet) and a Midblock West Courtyard (1,723 square feet) would be provided along the southern boundary of the development, forming an east-west connection through the site from San Pablo Avenue Plaza to Ohlone Plaza.

Consistent with City requirements, landscaping would be located throughout the site and would include trees, planters, and seating along the edges of the site and in the public plaza areas.

ACCESS, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING

Vehicular access to the project would be via the existing right-in/right-out curb cut on San Pablo Avenue, with an L-shaped driveway extending through the site, with access to another entrance at the terminus of a portion of Keamey Street (see Figure 2.0-5). From the driveway, the project would incorporate access to a ground-level parking area containing 52 spaces and a subgrade parking area containing 133 parking spaces. Of the 185 total parking spaces, 18 would be electric vehicle (EV) charging spaces and 4 would be accessible spaces. Parking would be unbundled, meaning the parking spaces would be leased separately from the residential apartments.

The project would have 262 long-term spaces for bicycle storage in the basement of the development. There would also be bike racks with a total of 19 spaces, located along the building frontage on San Pablo Avenue and in front of the proposed bike stop facing the Ohlone Greenway.

Pedestrian access to the development would be through a main lobby, accessible from San Pablo Avenue and from the parking garage, and a secondary lobby on the east side of the site.

PROJECT CONSTRUCTION

The duration of construction would be approximately 18 months. Construction activities would be performed in accordance with the City’s Municipal Code, which permits construction between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. No construction activity is allowed on Sundays and holidays.

Project construction would involve approximately 20,850 cubic yards of soil export from the site.
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The project site is in an urban area and is currently served by existing utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, electricity and natural gas, and telecommunications infrastructure. Most of the existing utilities on the project site would be removed and replaced, as required, by excavation.

Water

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

Wastewater

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

Stormwater

The project would include 59,223 square feet of impervious surfaces (roof and paving) and 5,223 square feet of pervious surfaces (landscaping and pavers), as shown on Figure 2.0-8, Stormwater Control Plan. The project would include a stormwater filter treatment unit, which would connect to the City’s stormwater conveyance system.

2.4 APPROVALS/PERMITS

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

- City of El Cerrito CEQA review and various entitlements, including Tier IV Design Review and grading and building permit approvals
- East Bay Municipal Utility District approval of water connections
- Stege Sanitary District approval of sewer capacity and connections (per SSD Ordinance 7.2 and California Government Code Section 66013(a))
- Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) approval of electricity and natural gas connections
- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) approval per stormwater discharge orders R2-2009-0074 and R2-2011-0083
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FIGURE 2.0-6
South Elevation
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East and West Elevations

Source: Dahlin, 2018
**FIGURE 2.0-8**

Stormwater Control Plan

Source: Dahlin, 2018
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CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in an EIR. This checklist confirms that the proposed 11060 San Pablo Avenue Project is within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (SPASP EIR) and will have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP EIR. As such, the City of El Cerrito can approve the project as being within the scope of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan covered by its EIR, and no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the project does not require any further review under CEQA.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION

As noted in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, the approximately 1.48-acre project site is currently developed with a single-story, 16,516-square-foot commercial building constructed in 1980 that is occupied by Big 5 Sporting Goods, along with a parking lot in the rear of the property. The general area surrounding the property is developed with commercial and residential uses. The site is approximately 1 mile east of the Richmond Inner Harbor of San Francisco Bay and 0.5 miles south of the El Cerrito del Norte BART station. While San Pablo Avenue is a State highway, there are no designated scenic highways or scenic vistas within 1 mile of the project site (Caltrans 2018; El Cerrito 2014a). Therefore, the project would not adversely affect scenic resources or scenic highways.

The site is developed with a single-story, 16,516-square-foot commercial building constructed in 1980 that is occupied by Big 5 Sporting Goods, along with a parking lot in the rear of the property. The proposed project would result in the construction of a 162,504-square-foot, five-story, 65-foot-tall development with 173 residential units. Compared to the existing developed parcel, the project would improve the visual and aesthetic character of the site by incorporating Form-Based Code and complete streets design and development standards. These design and development standards were assessed in the SPASP EIR and can be found in Chapter 2, Form Based Code, and Chapter 3, Complete Streets, of the Specific Plan (El Cerrito 2014a, 2014b).
The TOMIMU designation includes a 55-foot height limit. The project applicant is seeking Tier IV Design Review, which allows exceptions to the Tier II Design Review Standards, requires the provision of a public benefit as part of the project, and requires approval from the Planning Commission. The applicant is seeking a height exception through this process to allow for a 65-foot-tall building. The project would include a public bike stop along the Ohlone Greenway and contributions to affordable housing and public street improvements as public benefits. The project design also incorporates elements of visual interest, including:

- Variable Wall Pane and Height: the walls offset a minimum of 1 foot for every 50 feet of length
- Articulation: 50 percent of the façade surface area would change in plane, color, and materials to break up the building mass
- Transparency: 32 percent ground-floor transparency, with upper-floor transparency ranging from 43 to 61 percent

In addition, the project would include public art and publicly-accessible open space. See Appendix A for detailed project plans. Compared to existing conditions, these features would improve the visual quality of the site.

The city’s location between I-80 and the East Bay Hills affords views of the Golden Gate Bridge, the San Francisco skyline, and Mount Tamalpais. The primary potentially significant impact to scenic resources identified in the SPASP EIR was the potential for Specific Plan development to obstruct scenic views of Mount Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, the San Francisco skyline, the East Bay Hills, and Albany Hill from public rights-of-way, the two BART station platforms (El Cerrito Plaza and El Cerrito del Norte), and areas of lower elevation such as hillside homes in El Cerrito and Richmond (Impact 4-1). This impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable; however, the SPASP EIR requires individual development projects to complete further evaluation to determine whether they meet the standards and guidelines set forth in the Specific Plan.

Figure 3.1-1, Project Photo Simulation, shows views from vantage points in El Cerrito with the proposed project. Both views are from locations east of the project, facing west toward San Francisco Bay: View 1 is from Donal Avenue and Lawrence Street; and View 2 is from Potrero Avenue and Douglas Drive. As shown in the photo simulation, the project would change these views by adding a new building in the existing developed context of El Cerrito but would not obstruct views of the key elements identified in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. In View 1, the roof of the proposed building would be of the same approximate height as other buildings in the vicinity and would blend in with utility poles, trees, the elevated BART tracks, and other surrounding buildings. In View 2, the proposed building would be viewed within the context of surrounding development and would similarly blend in with other buildings and structures. Views of San Francisco Bay, the San Francisco skyline, Mount Tamalpais, and the Golden Gate Bridge would not be obstructed from either vantage point. In addition, the proposed project would be less than 200 feet in length, which would help to preserve intermittent views, consistent with SPASP regulations. Therefore, the project’s impact on views would be less than significant.

The SPASP EIR also found that potentially significant impacts could result from the introduction of new light and glare in the plan area (Impact 4-2), but it concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, which requires the installation of nonreflective building materials and windows, would reduce potential glare impacts of individual development projects to a less than significant level. The project would implement Mitigation Measure 4-2 and would not cause any new light and glare impacts.
FIGURE 3.1-1
Project Photo Simulation

PROPOSED CONDITION VIEW 1 - DONAL AVE. AND LAWRENCE ST.
Source: Dahlin, 2018

PROPOSED CONDITION VIEW 2 - POTRERO AVE. AND DOUGLAS DR.
Source: Dahlin, 2018
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APPLICABLE MITIGATION

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

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. The applicant is seeking Tier IV Design Review to allow a height exception for a 65-foot-tall building. The project would incorporate SPASP design standards and elements of visual interest and would be consistent with policies related to visual character and design. The project would not obstruct views of San Francisco Bay, the San Francisco skyline, Mount Tamalpais, and the Golden Gate Bridge from locations east of the project site. The project’s impact on views would be less than significant. In addition, the project would not result in a substantial increase in light and glare. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential aesthetic impacts related to the project, and there would be no new impact on visual and aesthetic resources.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒

d) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 51104(g))? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒

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

DISCUSSION

The project site is a developed, urban parcel without any agricultural or forestry resources. The SPASP area is predominantly urbanized and is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land by the California Department of Conservation (2016). El Cerrito and the SPASP area do not contain any land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project would not be located on land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract (California Department of Conservation 2013). The project site is not currently used for any type of agricultural or forestry use and is not zoned for agricultural or forestry use. The project site does not meet the definition of forestland in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) due to its location in an intensely developed area, which would preclude the management of any forestry resources. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact on agriculture or forestry resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIR QUALITY</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 nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

An air quality plan describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or region classified as a nonattainment area. The main purpose of an air quality plan is to bring an area into compliance with the requirements of federal and state air quality standards. The SPASP EIR stated that the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB) was nonattainment for ozone, fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$), and coarse particulate matter (PM$_{10}$). Air quality and compliance with federal and state standards for the SFBAAB fall under the regulatory authority of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). There have been no changes in attainment status for the air basin since certification of the SPASP EIR.

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

The BAAQMD's current clean air plan is the 2017 Clean Air Plan, which was adopted on April 19, 2017 (BAAQMD 2017a). As described in the 2017 plan, all of the 2010 TCMs were carried forward into the 2017 Clean Air Plan, although the measure descriptions and numbering were updated. In addition, 8 of the 10 MSMs, all 6 LUMs, and all 4 ECMS were carried forward into the 2017 plan. The MSMs primarily address vehicles and their components as they relate to emissions and are not directly applicable to the project. The SSMs are not applicable to the project.
The project’s population and housing units are within the scope of development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, as described in Section XIII, Population and Housing. The project would not result in new or more significant population growth impacts (and the associated VMT growth) than were analyzed and described in the SPASP EIR. In addition, the project site is designated Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) in the City’s General Plan. Residential and mixed-use residential/commercial developments in transit-oriented areas typically have reduced VMT per capita compared to other areas of the region.

Consistency with the Clean Air Plan is determined by examining whether the project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts or hinder implementation of control measures (e.g., preclude the extension of a transit lane or bicycle path). As discussed above, project implementation would not increase population, vehicle trips, or VMT beyond that analyzed and described in the SPASP EIR. Therefore, the project would support the goals of the 2017 Clean Air Plan and would not conflict with any of the control measures identified in the plan or designed to bring the region into attainment. The project’s impact related to conflict with an air quality plan would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP EIR.

**Short-Term Construction Emissions**

The SPASP EIR identified that construction activities associated with implementation of the Specific Plan would result in short-term emissions from construction activities such as site grading, asphalt paving, building construction, and architectural coating. Emissions commonly associated with construction activities include fugitive dust from soil disturbance, fuel combustion from mobile heavy-duty diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, and worker commute trips. During construction, fugitive dust is generated when wheels or blades disturb surface materials. Uncontrolled dust from construction can become a nuisance and potential health hazard to those living and working nearby. The SPASP EIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-1 to reduce construction impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 5-1 requires that the BAAQMD-recommended basic mitigation measures be implemented to control PM emissions during construction and BAAQMD-recommended additional measures to reduce diesel particulate matter (DPM), PM$_{2.5}$, and other construction emissions to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced. Table 3-1 in the BAAQMD (2017b) CEQA Air Quality Guidelines lists project screening sizes for different land uses. A mid-rise apartment project of fewer than 240 dwelling units would have construction-related emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) that would be less than significant, providing that project construction does not involve demolition or extensive soil import or export.

The project size of 173 dwelling units would be below the BAAQMD screening criteria. However, project construction would require demolition of existing buildings, as well as substantial removal of material from the project during excavation for subgrade parking. Therefore, project construction emissions were estimated using California Emissions Estimator Model (CaEE Mod) version 2016.3.2. CaEE Mod allows for the use of default data (e.g., emission factors, trip lengths, meteorology, source inventory) provided by the various California air districts to account for local requirements and conditions and/or user-defined inputs. The calculation methodology and input data used in CaEE Mod can be found in the CaEE Mod User’s Guide, Appendices A, D, and E (CAPCOA 2017). See Appendix AQ for the project model output files and site/project-specific assumptions used in the model.

Estimated maximum daily construction-related emissions for the project are summarized in Table 3.3-1. Construction details were not available at the time of this analysis. Therefore, the CaEE Mod default construction schedule was used with an extra 23 working days added to account for removal of existing concrete and asphalt and for excavation of the subgrade parking area.
Construction is estimated to commence in the summer of 2020 and be complete in approximately 18 months. Architectural coating activities are assumed to occur throughout the last half of the building construction period, as components are completed. Construction would require the export of approximately 20,850 cubic yards of material. Implementation of SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1 is assumed in the emissions estimates presented in Table 3.3.1. In addition, as discussed below in the analysis of toxic air contaminants, a project-specific condition of approval would require the use of Tier 4 engines or diesel particulate filters on all off-road diesel construction equipment with more than 50 horsepower. This condition of approval would reduce emissions of criteria air pollutants, and the emissions estimated presented in Table 3.3-1 account for these reductions.

### Table 3.3-1
**CONSTRUCTION-RELATED EMISSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Activities</th>
<th>Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions (pounds per day) &lt;sup&gt;a, b, c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 maximum daily emissions</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 maximum daily emissions</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions of All Years of Construction</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Potentially Significant Impact Threshold</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed BAAQMD Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Notes:

a. Project construction activities are assumed to occur over an 18-month period.

b. Emissions estimates account for the quantifiable components of the SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1, specifically watering unpaved portions of the construction site twice daily, limiting off-road equipment to speeds of 15 mph, and removing dirt track-out on adjacent public roads with a wet power vacuum once daily.

c. Emissions account for the project-specific condition of approval requiring Tier 4 engines or diesel particulate filters.

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

### Long-Term Operational Emissions

The SPASP EIR evaluated operational emissions and concluded that the SPASP would not cause significant increases in VMT compared to service population growth and would not interfere with Clean Air Plan control measures. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in accordance with the BAAQMD significance criteria for plan-level analysis of criteria pollutants and precursors. The proposed project would result in long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors (i.e., ROG and NO_x). Project-generated increases in emissions would be
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Predominantly associated with motor vehicle use, energy required for residential building operations, energy used due to water consumption, energy used in solid waste collection and disposal, and area sources such as hearths and use of landscaping equipment. Per Table 3-1 in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, a mid-rise apartment project of fewer than 494 dwelling units would have operational-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that would be less than significant. Therefore, the project (with 173 dwelling units) would contribute to, but would not exceed, operational emissions impacts identified in the SPASP EIR. The impact on long-term operational emissions would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP EIR.

Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots

Recognizing the relatively low carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations experienced in the Bay Area, the BAAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines state that a project would have a less than significant impact if it does not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. As identified in the SPASP EIR, peak-hour traffic volumes attributed to implementation of the Specific Plan would be far below this threshold. Since intersections affected by the project would have volumes lower than the threshold of 44,000 vehicles per hour, the impact of the proposed project related to localized CO concentrations would therefore be less than significant.

Sensitive Receptors

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

The closest existing sensitive receptors are multifamily residences adjacent to the project site to the south and across the BART tracks to the east, and a senior assisted living facility across San Pablo Avenue to the west. The closest school is St. John the Baptist School, approximately 650 feet to the north. For project specific sensitive receptor impacts related to short-term construction air quality, long-term operational air quality and odor, please refer to the sections below. Short-Term Construction Toxic Air Contaminants and PM2.5

The SPASP EIR concluded that construction activities could result in short-term emissions of DPM, which is a toxic air contaminant. DPM emissions would be generated with the use of off-road diesel equipment required for demolition, excavation, paving, and other construction activities. Although the use of diesel-powered construction equipment would be temporary and episodic, the SPASP EIR concluded this would be a potentially significant impact. The SPASP EIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-2 to reduce potential impacts associated with TAC exposure. Mitigation Measure 5-2 requires individual projects to undergo an individual assessment for construction health risks, either through screening or refined modeling. A health risk screening was completed for the project to analyze the potential impacts on the closest sensitive receptors to the project site from the project's estimated construction emissions using the CARB Hotspots Analysis and Reporting Program, Air Dispersion Modeling and Risk Tool (ADMRT) version 18159, following the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (2015) Air Toxics Hot Spots Program – Risk Assessment Guidelines. The ADMRT incorporates air dispersion modeling from specified pollutant sources using the US Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) AERMOD Gaussian model,
calculation of local concentrations, and evaluation of the resulting health risks for specified sensitive receptors. The ADMRT output files, model inputs, and assumptions are included in Appendix AQ. Inputs to the screening model included CARB meteorological data from the Oakland International Airport station, terrain data from the CARB Richmond 30-meter digital elevation model file, and the project’s estimated construction maximum daily and total emissions of exhaust PM$_{10}$ from CalEEMod. DPM comprises a complex mixture of particles, 90 percent of which are less than 1 micron in size. The health risk screening conservatively assumes that 100 percent of the construction exhaust PM$_{10}$ generated on the project site is DPM. The heaviest use of diesel construction equipment would occur during the demolition, site preparation, and grading phases of construction, lasting a total of approximately 2 months. The use of diesel equipment during building construction would be highest while the building foundations and shells are constructed, then would diminish during interior and exterior finish work. To be conservative, an exposure duration of 1 year was used in the health risk screening.

The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines recommend thresholds for assessing community health risks for individual projects of a maximum increased excess cancer risk of 10 in one million, and a maximum chronic health risk index of 1.0. For the closest sensitive receptors to the project site (multifamily residences adjacent to the project to the south and across the BART tracks to the east, and a senior assisted living facility across San Pablo Avenue to the west), the health risk screening estimated the maximum increased excess cancer risk from project-generated construction DPM would be 70 in 1 million and the maximum chronic health index would be 0.079. To reduce the impact on community health risks resulting from project construction TAC emissions, the project applicant would be required to implement the following project-specific condition of approval:

**Project-specific condition of approval:** During construction activities, the project applicant and/or its contractor shall ensure that all diesel-powered off-road construction equipment with more than 50 horsepower is EPA Tier 4 certified or retrofitted with a CARB-verified level 3 diesel particulate filter. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City shall ensure that grading plan notes include this requirement. The City shall monitor compliance by requiring the applicant’s contractor to provide written verification during construction.

Diesel particulate filters required for EPA-certified Tier 4 engines reduce DPM emissions by a minimum of 85 percent compared to non-certified engines. Diesel particulate filters can also be retrofitted to older engines. CARB-verified level 3 diesel particulate filters would also reduce DPM emissions by a minimum of 85 percent. With implementation of this condition of approval, the maximum increased excess cancer risk for nearby sensitive receptors from project-generated construction DPM would be 1.9 in 1 million and the maximum chronic health index would be 0.022. Therefore, the impact on community health risks from localized concentrations of construction-generated DPM would be less than significant.

The BAAQMD has also determined that localized concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ could pose a health risk. CARB has not designated PM$_{2.5}$ as a toxic air contaminant, and cancer or health risk exposure levels have not been established. The BAAQMD has recommended thresholds for a maximum increase in PM$_{2.5}$ concentration resulting from a project of 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter annual average. Using the maximum daily and total on-site project construction PM$_{2.5}$ emissions (including both exhaust and fugitive dust sources), the health risk screening estimated that the maximum increased annual average concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ at the closest sensitive receptors would be 0.032 micrograms per cubic meter. Therefore, the impact on community health risks from localized concentration of PM$_{2.5}$ would be less than significant.
Long-Term Operational Toxic Air Contaminants

The project would not site any new stationary TAC sources. However, it would result in sensitive receptors (residential uses) within 75 feet of San Pablo Avenue. Vehicle traffic on San Pablo Avenue is an existing source of TAC emissions. In the decision for the case of California Building Industry Association (CBIA) v. BAAQMD, December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court unanimously concluded that agencies subject to CEQA generally are not required to analyze the impact of existing environmental conditions on a project’s future users or residents. Therefore, the impact of existing sources of toxic air contaminants on future residents of the project is not a CEQA consideration. Moreover, CBIA established that CEQA cannot be used to require mitigation for the impact of existing TAC conditions on future project residents. However, this does not preclude the City from requiring, as a condition of approval for the project, a site-specific TAC analysis for potential impacts on future project residents, as well as the implementation of any mitigation identified in such an analysis.

Nonetheless, for long-term operations, the SPASP EIR, which was certified prior to the CBIA decision, concluded that if projects with sensitive receptors under the Specific Plan are located within the overlay distances listed in Table 5-7 in the EIR, this would represent a potentially significant impact. Under the SPASP EIR, because residential areas of the project would be located with 75 feet of San Pablo Avenue, Mitigation Measure 5-3 requires a site-specific analysis to determine the level of TAC and PM$_{2.5}$ exposure.

Peak-hour traffic volume on San Pablo Avenue (State Route 123) in the project vicinity is in excess of 3,400 vehicles per hour, and average annual daily traffic is in excess of 44,000 vehicles per day (Caltrans 2016). According to the transportation impact analysis prepared for the project (Fehr & Peers 2018), the project would add a net 38 peak-hour trips to the project area, consisting primarily of cars and light trucks, which would be a negligible contribution to traffic-generated TACs. Moreover, the project would not involve activities that would include a substantial number of heavy diesel trucks, which are the primary existing source of DPM in the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would not substantially contribute to or exacerbate traffic-generated TAC emissions on San Pablo Avenue compared to existing conditions.

Odors

The SPASP EIR identified that the Specific Plan area would include potential odor sources that could affect new sensitive receptors. Most of these major existing sources are, however, already buffered by existing uses. The SPASP EIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-4 to ensure potential land use compatibility impacts due to odors would be appropriately identified and mitigated. Consistent with SPASP policies and Mitigation Measure 5-4, the project would be in an area surrounded by commercial uses and would not be in an area where substantial odors (such as those associated with industrial, manufacturing, processing, or treatment uses) are generated. The project would result in a less than significant impact.

Applicable Mitigation

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION

The project site is in a highly urbanized area in El Cerrito. The site is currently developed with a commercial building and parking lot. The project would result in the removal of ten existing trees and other vegetation on the project site. An arborist report for the project was prepared (O’Dell Engineering 2017) and is included as Appendix BIO. According to the arborist report, the existing trees are between 10 and 20 feet tall and are located in the parking lot, along the property line, or adjacent to the existing retail building.

The SPASP EIR found that implementation of the Specific Plan would largely result in minimal impacts to biological resources because the Specific Plan area is a highly developed urban area with approximately 90 percent of the land developed, recently disturbed, or ruderal (El Cerrito 2014b). The SPASP EIR concluded that the plan area does not contain any plant or animal species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the plan area does not contain any federally protected wetlands, and no habitat conservation
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A plan or natural community conservation plan is applicable to the Specific Plan area (El Cerito 2014b). No creeks, wetlands, or riparian habitats are near or adjacent to the project site; therefore, the project would not result in any significant impacts on these habitats.

With regard to potential interference with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, there are no fish habitats in the vicinity of the site. However, 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds. The SPASP EIR identified Mitigation Measure 6-1 to minimize potentially significant impacts associated with tree removal on nesting birds to less than significant levels. Tree removal would comply with all City requirements and SPASP Mitigation Measure 6-1 to minimize impacts on biological resources during removal.

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

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

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. Tree removal activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 6-1. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential biological impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact on biological resources.
CULTURAL 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)</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

Historic Resources

The SPASP EIR identified properties or features in the Specific Plan area that may be eligible for listing in a local, state, or federal register of historic resources. The EIR identified Mitigation Measure 7-1 to be applied to any individual discretionary project within the Specific Plan area that the City determines may involve a property that contains a potentially significant historic resource (e.g., a recorded historic resource or an unrecorded building or structure 45 years or older). Mitigation Measure 7-1 requires the resource to be evaluated by City staff and, if warranted, assessed by a qualified professional on the California Historical Resources Information System list of consultants who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards to determine whether the property is a significant historical resource and whether the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the historical resource.

In compliance with SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 7-1, the project site was evaluated for cultural resources in a preliminary review memorandum (LSA 2017; Appendix CUL). The preliminary review consisted of background research (including a record search, a literature and map/photograph review, and a focused archival review) and a field survey by an architectural historian. As noted in the review, the site is developed with a sporting goods retail store that is less than 50 years old, was developed by an architect and a builder who were identified as unimportant creative individuals and is not considered a historic resource or of importance. For these reasons, further research was not recommended. The project would have no new impact on historic resources (LSA 2017).

Archaeological and Paleontological Resources

The SPASP EIR concluded that the potential impact of development in the Specific Plan area on cultural resources, including archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains, would be less than significant with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures (El Cerrito 2014b). Specifically, disturbance of previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources, including human remains, could occur during grading and development of individual project sites within the SPASP area. The EIR identified Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, which would
reduce the potential impacts on known or undisclosed cultural resources to less than significant levels.

The SPASP area of El Cerrito has been identified as sensitive for buried prehistoric cultural resources (Koenig 2013). Since there is elevated prehistoric archaeological sensitivity and the potential exists for previously unknown archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains to be encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the project site, SPASP EIR Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3 are required. These measures specify compliance with existing codes and regulations applicable to the accidental discovery of archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains during construction activities. As such, with implementation of previously identified mitigation measures, the project would have no new impact on cultural resources.

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. The project has fulfilled SPASP Mitigation Measure 7-1 through preparation of a cultural resources report, which determined the project would not have a significant adverse impact on a historic resource (LSA 2017). No new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP EIR Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, would be required.

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. Ground-disturbing activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP EIR Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resource impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact on cultural resources.
### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI GEOLOGY AND SOILS. 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 Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The discussion of potential geology and soils impacts associated with the project is based on the geotechnical investigation prepared for the project (Friar Associates 2018), included as Appendix GEO. The report examines potential impacts resulting from site clearing, constructing an underground parking garage, grading, tree removal, installing stormwater drainage facilities, landscaping, and associated project improvements. Key information from the report is summarized below.

**Seismic Conditions**

The closest active earthquake faults are the Hayward (total length), Concord-Green Valley, and Calaveras (north of Calaveras Reservoir) faults. The Hayward fault is approximately 0.62 miles northeast of the project site, and of the three, is the closest. Based on US Geological Survey (2014) research, the San Francisco Bay Area will likely experience an earthquake magnitude of 6.74 or greater by 2045. As a result, the project site would be subjected to severe ground shaking from earthquakes generated by the Calaveras and Hayward faults, as well as any other active Bay...
Area faults. Risk of damage to the project site from fault rupturing, landsliding, compaction, liquefaction, and lateral spreading is relatively low (Friar Associates 2018).

The SPASP EIR concluded that the geologic and soil impacts in the plan area are primarily related to potential ground shaking and associated impacts related to ground failure. Since the Specific Plan area is not in an Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone, the likelihood of surface fault rupture is minimal (El Cerrito 2014b). In addition, the SPASP EIR found that slope instability hazards are minimal due to the absence of appreciable slopes in the SPASP area.

The Specific Plan area is susceptible to ground shaking from the Hayward fault or one of the other active faults in the region. However, the SPASP EIR determined that impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant with compliance with the latest California Building Standards Code. The project would be designed and constructed in accordance with these requirements. In compliance with SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 8-1, the project applicant has prepared a geotechnical report for the project site (Friar Associates 2018; Appendix GEO). The project would implement project design features and actions discussed in the geotechnical report to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

Geology and Soils

The project site is developed and gently slopes toward the west, with vegetation along the southwest property line. The subsurface soil consists of man-made fill, clay, silt, sand, and gravel. The man-made fill consists of asphalt concrete and aggregate base material with a cap that is underlain by alluvial deposits. The near-surface soil below the fill consists of dark brown silty clay of moderate to high plasticity and is underlain by light yellowish-brown to tan lean sandy clay. Groundwater was encountered at depths between 7 and 14 feet below the ground surface.

The principal geotechnical conditions that would impact the proposed development are the shallow groundwater and the near-surface clayey soil. The proposed development would involve excavations to make room for the planned below-grade parking and basement. Near-surface clayey soils are moderately to highly expansive. The cycle of contraction and expansion in the soil tends to have detrimental effects on foundation elements, particularly on concrete slabs-on-grade.

Foundation design and flatwork at or near the existing ground surface require special design consideration; however, this consideration generally does not apply to the foundations of larger structures such as the proposed project because of the relatively deep foundation. Surficial clays can be managed if stonework is properly designed and constructed. Damage to surface improvements from expansive soils may be mitigated by engineering foundations and flatwork with the installation and continued maintenance of landscaping and proper drainage. The foundation system for the project recommended in the geotechnical report is a deep stiffened raft, which would not be affected by expansive soil.

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

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

The SPASP area is served by a comprehensive, integrated wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system. Neither septic tank systems nor alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the project or in the Specific Plan area.

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. In compliance with SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 8-1, the project applicant has prepared a geotechnical report (see Appendix GEO). No new mitigation measures would be required.

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. The project would be required to comply with the California Building Standards Code and City-required erosion control techniques. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential geology and soil impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact associated with geology and soils.
The project site is in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. Air quality and compliance with state greenhouse gas (GHG) and climate change goals and policies for the SFBAAB fall under the regulatory authority of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. GHG science, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 9, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change, of the SPASP EIR.

GHG emissions in this discussion are presented in carbon dioxide equivalents (CO$_2$e), which weigh each gas by its global warming potential. Expressing GHG emissions in CO$_2$e takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO$_2$ were being emitted.

**DISCUSSION**

**GHG Emissions**

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

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

**Construction GHG Emissions**

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

The project construction emissions were estimated using California Emissions Estimator Model version 2016.3.2. CalEEMod allows for the use of default data (e.g., emission factors, trip lengths,
meteorology, source inventory) provided by the various California air districts to account for local requirements and conditions and/or user-defined inputs. The calculation methodology and input data used in CalEEMod can be found in the CalEEMod User's Guide, Appendices A, D, and E (CAPCOA 2017). See Appendix AQ for the project model output files and site/project-specific assumptions used in the model.

Estimated maximum daily construction-related emissions for the project are summarized in Table 3.7-1. Construction details were not available at the time of this analysis. Therefore, the CalEEMod default construction schedule was used with an extra 23 working days added to account for removal of existing concrete and asphalt and for excavation of the subgrade parking structure. Construction is estimated to commence in the summer of 2019 and be complete in approximately 18 months. Architectural coating activities are assumed to occur throughout the last half of the building construction period, as components are completed. Construction would require the export of approximately 20,850 cubic yards of material. Implementation of SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1 and the project-specific condition of approval requiring the use of Tier 4 engines or diesel particulate filters on all off-road diesel construction equipment with more than 50 horsepower (see Section III, Air Quality, of this document) is assumed in the emissions estimates presented in Table 3.7-1.

**TABLE 3.7-1**

**CONSTRUCTION-RELATED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>CO₂e (Metric Tons per Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>309.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>162.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>472.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472.1 metric tons/30 years</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Notes: Project construction activities are assumed to occur over an 18-month period. Emissions account for the implementation of the SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1, and the project-specific condition of approval described in Section III, Air Quality.

**Operational GHG Emissions**

For plan-level operational emissions, the BAAQMD recommends applying a specific plan-level GHG efficiency threshold of 6.6 metric tons (MT) CO₂e per year per service population. The SPASP EIR compared plan-level GHG emissions to the more conservative BAAQMD project-level efficiency threshold of 4.6 MTCO₂e per year per service population.

In the SPASP EIR, operational GHG emissions in 2040 were estimated for both traffic scenarios—Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift—using CalEEMod version 2013.2.2. The SPASP EIR found that 2040 full development capacity associated with development under the Specific Plan would have emissions of 3.9 and 3.7 MTCO₂e per year per service population under the Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift cases, respectively, neither of which would exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 4.6 MTCO₂e per year per service population. Therefore, the SPASP EIR concluded this impact would be less than significant.
The current BAAQMD service population efficiency GHG threshold of 4.6 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e per year per service population was developed to achieve the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. Senate Bill (SB) 32 requires that California, by the year 2030, reduce its statewide GHG emissions such that they are 40 percent below those that occurred in 1990. Accordingly, a service population efficiency threshold of 2.8 MTCO\textsubscript{2}e per service population per year that is 40 percent lower than the current BAAQMD threshold would achieve the state GHG emission targets for 2030. This estimated threshold is a surrogate threshold while the BAAQMD develops thresholds to achieve the GHG reduction targets of SB 32. Service population is defined as project residents plus project employees. Using the CalEEMod default population factor of 2.86 people per dwelling unit for mid-rise apartments in Contra Costa County (CAPCOA 2017), the project’s residential population is estimated to be 495, and assuming 3 employees for the apartments, the total service population would be 498.

The project’s GHG emissions and the GHG emissions from the existing use of the project site were estimated using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. The project’s GHG emissions estimates assume emissions reductions per BAAQMD Regulation 6, Rule 3 (no wood-burning devices shall be installed in new building construction). Daily trip rates for the project’s operational-related vehicle trips used in the model were based on the estimate of 43 PM peak-hour trips for the existing land use and 81 PM peak-hour trips for the project from the transportation impact analysis (Fehr & Peers 2018). The PM peak-hour trips were converted to average annual daily trips (AADT) using a K factor (percentage of AADT which are peak hour) of 6.77 from Caltrans (2016) data for state routes in western Contra Costa County. The estimated net annual increase in regional GHG emissions resulting from project operation would be the sum of project’s operation emissions plus the amortized construction emissions, minus the emissions from the existing land use. The project’s net increase in GHG emissions is summarized in Table 3.7-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Source</th>
<th>Metric Tons CO\textsubscript{2}e per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commercial Land Use</td>
<td>(479.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Land Use</td>
<td>1,621.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Project Emissions</td>
<td>1,157.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong> (GHG 1,157.4/Service Population 498)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Metric Tons CO\textsubscript{2}e/Service Population/Year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Threshold Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Threshold</th>
<th>2.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Metric Tons CO\textsubscript{2}e/Service Population/Year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceed Threshold? No

Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2 See Appendix AQ for emission model outputs. Notes: Emissions estimates account for BAAQMD Regulation 6, Rule 3. Emissions account for the implementation of the SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1, and the project-specific condition of approval described in Section III, Air Quality.

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

Consistency with Adopted Plans to Reduce GHG Emissions

The SPASP EIR analyzed this impact and concluded that the Specific Plan would be subject to new requirements under rulemaking developed at the state and local levels regarding GHG emissions. The plan would also be subject to local and General Plan policies, including the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, that are expected to reduce emissions of GHGs. Therefore, this impact was determined to be less than significant.

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

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

The project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services. The project would develop higher-density residential uses on the site, similar to what the SPASP envisioned and in support of land use planning strategies identified in Plan Bay Area 2040 and the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with adopted plans to reduce GHG emissions. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP EIR.

Applicable Mitigation

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

Conclusion

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

<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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The SPASP EIR concluded that there were no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials within the Specific Plan area. The SPASP EIR identified the potential to expose construction workers to existing spilled, leaked, or otherwise discharged hazardous materials or wastes during development project construction, due to the large number of auto-related businesses in the plan area. However, the SPASP EIR determined that compliance with all applicable requirements for site assessment, remediation, removal, and disposal for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination would ensure potential impacts are less than significant. Specifically, compliance with City standards and with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) requirements would ensure that health and safety impacts associated with implementation of individual development projects are less than significant (El Cerrito 2014b).
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Site Conditions

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the project. Information in this section summarizes the ESA, prepared by AEL Consultants (2017), which is included as Appendix HAZ.

As described in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, the project site is developed with a single-story, 16,516-square-foot commercial building on an approximately 1.48-acre parcel. The site has street frontage on San Pablo Avenue to the east and is surrounded by commercial and residential development, the BART line, and the Ohlone Greenway. The project site was formerly vacant for 4 years and was later used as part lumber storage yard/part boat storage yard and sales with a commercial building for approximately 30 years. Sanborn maps from 1926 to 1930 depicted unimproved land with part of a fruit stand present in the northwest corner of the property. Aerial photographs from 1950 showed one large and one small lumber storage warehouse, and a small storage shed. Aerial photographs from 1966 to 1968 depicted a single-story store with a trailer sales office and a single-story furniture storage structure. The aerial photos are consistent with the City’s directories and also included a change in tenants to a company that sold paint from 1985 to 1990.

AEL Consultants conducted a site reconnaissance at the project site and vicinity on December 1, 2017. At the time of the reconnaissance, the site was observed with an interior showroom floor, staff area, bathroom, mezzanine storage, and meeting areas on the eastern side of the property. The exterior asphalt parking lot and dumpster enclosure were also observed. Evidence of stressed vegetation or dumping of hazardous materials was not observed. Adjacent properties were occupied by single-family homes, apartment buildings, and various small businesses.

A prior Phase I ESA was prepared by EMG on August 6, 2003, for the existing commercial building currently operating as Big 5 Sporting Goods. During EMG’s site visit, random samples of accessible suspect asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) were collected. All samples were in good condition, but the floor tile was tested positive for 5 percent chrysotile. Based on these findings, the following project-specific condition of approval is required:

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** Prior to demolition or renovation activities that may disturb ACMs, the project applicant shall submit a thorough asbestos survey to be prepared in accordance with the EPA NESHAP 40 CFR Part 61.

The SPASP EIR determined that the residential, commercial, and open space uses planned for the Specific Plan area would not involve the routine transport, use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials to the extent that a significant public or environmental hazard would occur. Operations in the SPASP area may involve the occasional transport, use, storage, or disposal of common hazardous substance such as fuel, paint, and solvents, but would be subject to local, state, and federal regulations. The SPASP EIR determined that compliance with these standard regulations would ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

As described above, the project applicant has investigated recognized environmental concerns (see Appendix HAZ) and identified measures that the project would include to address the potential presence of asbestos. All remediation and construction activities would comply with applicable regulations to ensure potential health and safety impacts are less than significant.

Schools

There are several private and public schools within 1 mile of the project site, including Fairmont Elementary School, Cameron Special Education School, St. John the Baptist School, Balboa...
School, and Korematsu Middle School. The closest school is St. John the Baptist School, approximately 650 feet to the north. Project construction and operation would not result in hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous waste. The project would comply with applicable regulations to ensure that potential health and safety impacts are less than significant and would not result in impacts related to handling hazardous materials near a school.

Airports and Airstrips

The project site is approximately 19 miles northwest of the nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the plan area. Because the project is not located within the Oakland International Airport Influence Area, no safety hazards would be anticipated (El Cerrito 2014b).

Emergency Response

The El Cerrito Fire Department (ECFD) is responsible for the City’s Emergency Operations Center and development of the Emergency Operations Plan in the event of a major disaster affecting El Cerrito and the community of Kensington. The Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond share reciprocal duties for emergency response services. The Richmond Fire Department (RFD) Office of Emergency Services leads the City of Richmond’s comprehensive emergency management, including planning and preparedness for, response and recovery from, and mitigation of natural, man-made, and accidental incidents of high consequence. In addition, both the ECFD and the RFD participate in the Community Emergency Response Team program, which provides training for fire safety, hazardous material and terrorist incidents, disaster medical operations, and search and rescue to enable its citizens to be self-sufficient for up to 72 hours and beyond in the event of a major disaster. The SPASP EIR states that all roadways must be engineered and maintained to support emergency response vehicles and equipment. The project would be developed on an infill site that is currently developed and would not change the street network. It would include emergency access, including through a restricted entrance for emergency vehicles. In addition, traffic generated by the project would be consistent with the SPASP EIR and combined with other currently proposed and planned projects would generate fewer AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips than the total trip generation assumed for the high priority opportunity sites in the EIR (see Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic). As a result, project-generated traffic would not substantially increase response to the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Wildfire Hazards

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

The SPASP EIR concluded that there are no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials within the Specific Plan area. The EIR identified 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 Specific Plan area. However, the SPASP EIR determined that compliance with all applicable existing city, regional, and state-mandated site assessment, remediation, removal, and disposal
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

requirements for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination would ensure that potential impacts are less than significant. Specifically, compliance with City of El Cerrito, RWQCB, and DTSC requirements would ensure that health and safety impacts associated with implementation of individual development projects are less than significant.

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval described above, no new mitigation measures are required.

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. The project would be required to comply with existing regulations related to hazardous soil or groundwater conditions at the site during ground-disturbing activities. As noted above, the project would include a project-specific condition of approval to address the potential for existing on-site asbestos containing materials. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, and there would be no new impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.
**3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. 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 of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The applicant has prepared a Stormwater Control Plan, consistent with requirements for all projects in the SPASP area (see Figure 2.0-8 in Chapter 2.0 and the detailed Stormwater Control Plan in Appendix HYD). The city would confirm that this plan conforms to all applicable local and state requirements as part of the development review process.

The project site is currently developed with a single-story, 16,516-square-foot commercial building, with a paved parking lot and some ornamental landscaping. The site’s topography is relatively flat. Stewerk for the project would include ramps for the underground parking, minor grading,
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

drainage, pavement, and landscaping. Currently, the majority of the site contains paved concrete and flat slopes.

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

The project would include 59,223 square feet of impervious surfaces (roof and paving) and 5,223 square feet of pervious surfaces (landscaping and pavers), as shown on Figure 2.0-8, Stormwater Control Plan. The project would result in a net increase of 1,010 square feet of impervious surface compared to the existing development (58,213 square feet) on the site and would be subject to compliance under Provision C.3 of the RWQCB stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. According to the project’s Stormwater Control Plan, typical low impact development (LID) treatments would not be practical for the site. The project meets Category B Special Project requirements for 100 percent non-LID treatment (Bellecci & Associates 2018) Because typical LID treatments will not be practical in the site area, to adequately treat all run-off, including the net-increase of impervious areas, a new storm drainage system around and inside the building would be installed to collect various roof leaders, site area drains and subdrains. All stormwater runoff collected would run through a vault-based stormfilter unit before being discharged to the city storm drainage system after treatment. A new manhole would be installed to connect the stormfilter unit to the 15-inch storm drainage pipe along the San Pablo Avenue.

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

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

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

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

CONCLUSION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION

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

The project site is designated TOMIMU (Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use) in the City’s General Plan and SPASP, and the site is also zoned TOMIMU. The intent of the TOMIMU designation is to provide for a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented higher-density area within 1 mile of BART that allows a variety of uses, including retail, commercial, residential, and public uses in the downtown and uptown areas. The TOMIMU designation allows for a 55-foot height limit and requires a minimum height of three stories for residential uses. The project applicant is seeking Tier IV Design Review. This process allows exceptions to the Tier II Design Review Standards, requires provision of a public benefit as part of the project, and requires approval from the Planning Commission. The applicant is seeking a height exception through this process to allow for a 69-foot-tall building. The project is otherwise consistent with the type, intensity, and scale of development contemplated by the SPASP in this location.

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

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

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

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

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. The applicant is seeking Tier IV Design Review for a height exception and an exception to the shadow standards for the Ohlone Greenway, but the project would otherwise be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP EIR and required by the El Cerrito General Plan. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential land use impacts related to the project, and there would be no new impact related to land use and planning.
XI MINERAL 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)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The project does not involve the loss of an available known resource that would be of value to the region. The El Cerrito General Plan does not identify mineral deposits within the Specific Plan area or in the vicinity (El Cerrito 1999). Therefore, the project would have no new impacts on mineral resources.
XII  NOISE. Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The impact analysis in this section is based, in part, on the project’s environmental noise analysis, prepared by J. C. Brennan and Associates (2017), included as Appendix NOI. All noise levels reported in this section are in terms of A-weighted decibel levels (dBA) but may be expressed as dB, unless otherwise noted.

This section compares noise and vibration impacts from the project with impacts identified in the SPASP EIR. The project would include residential uses in a developed area in El Cerrito. Operational noise can be categorized as mobile source noise and stationary source noise. Mobile source noise would be attributable to the additional trips that would result from the project. Stationary source noise includes noise generated on-site by the project’s residential uses.

Traffic on San Pablo Avenue, approximately 60 feet west of the project (measured to the roadway centerline), is the primary contributor to the existing ambient background noise. Other components of the existing noise environment include noise from the BART tracks approximately 50 feet to the east of the project site, traffic on I-80 approximately 0.25 miles to the west, and operational noise from the adjacent commercial and residential uses (e.g., parking lot activities, building mechanical equipment, people talking).

The existing ambient noise level in the project vicinity was measured and documented in the project’s environmental noise analysis (J. C. Brennan and Associates 2017; see Appendix NOI). Two continuous 24-hour measurements form the SPASP EIR and one short-term measurement taken by J. C. Brennan and Associates are summarized in Table 3.12-1.
TABLE 3.12-1
EXISTING NOISE MEASUREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Average Measured Noise Levels, dBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ldn (24 hours)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Daytime – hourly</strong> (7:00 am – 10:00 pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leq - Low</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leq - Low</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuous 24-Hour Noise Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Ldn (24 hours)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>60 feet from San Pablo Avenue centerline</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60 feet from the center of the BART tracks</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short-Term Noise Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>November 22, 2017, 10:30 am</th>
<th><strong>Leq</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lmax</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60 feet from San Pablo Avenue centerline</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, childcare facilities, and senior housing. The closest existing sensitive receptors are multifamily residences adjacent to the project to the south and across the BART tracks to the east, and a senior assisted living facility across San Pablo Avenue to the west. The closest school is Balboa School, approximately 710 feet to the west.

**Noise and Land Use Compatibility**

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

In the decision for the case of California Building Industry Association (CBIA) v. BAAQMD, December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court unanimously concluded that agencies subject to CEQA generally are not required to analyze the impact of existing environmental conditions on a project’s future users or residents. Therefore, the impact of existing sources of noise on future residents of the project is not a CEQA consideration. Moreover, CBIA established that CEQA cannot be used to require mitigation for the impact of existing noise conditions on future project residents. However, this does not preclude the City from requiring, as a condition of approval for the project, a noise analysis for potential impacts on future project residents and the implementation of any mitigation identified in such an analysis. The levels of long-term noise and

---

1 Ldn (day-night average sound level) is a time of day weighted measure of average community noise.
3.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

vibration to which the project’s residents would be exposed was analyzed in the environmental noise analysis (J. C. Brennan and Associates 2017) and is summarized below.

**BART Noise Levels**

Noise level measurements conducted for the BART operations in the SPASP EIR indicated that the $L_{dn}$ due to BART operations was 74 dBA $L_{dn}$ at a distance of 60 feet. Based on the location of the project site, the predicted noise level due to BART operations at the project site is 75 dB $L_{dn}$.

The project includes common outdoor activity areas on the roof (referred to as roof terraces). Based on the project design, there would be a 6-foot-tall parapet around the outdoor areas, which would reduce overall noise levels by a minimum of 6 dBA. Therefore, the common areas would comply with the exterior noise level standard of 70 dBA $L_{dn}$, as contained in the SPASP EIR mitigation measures.

**BART Vibration Levels**

Based on the SPASP EIR, vibration levels due to BART operations are below the 72 VdB Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines and are not considered to be a significant source of vibration.

**San Pablo Avenue Noise Levels**

Based on the proposed setback distance to the project buildings, traffic noise levels are summarized in Table 3.12-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Distance to San Pablo Ave Centerline</th>
<th>Predicted Traffic Noise Level, $L_{dn}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Building Façade</td>
<td>75 feet</td>
<td>65.6 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Building Façade</td>
<td>265 feet</td>
<td>57.4 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: J. C. Brennan & Associates 2017*

The project includes common outdoor activity areas on the roof (referred to as roof terraces). Based on the project design, there would be a 6-foot-tall parapet around the outdoor areas, which would reduce overall noise levels by a minimum of 6 dBA. Therefore, the common areas would comply with the exterior noise level standard of 65 dBA $L_{dn}$, as contained in SPASP EIR the mitigation measures.

Therefore, exterior noise levels for the project’s residents would not exceed City standards. For interior noise levels, the environmental noise analysis (J. C. Brennan and Associates 2017) recommended the following: the project applicant would be required to implement the following project-specific condition of approval:

**Project-specific condition of approval:** For the West Building residential façades facing and perpendicular to San Pablo Avenue, living room and bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 34.
Exposure of Persons to or Generation of Noise Levels in Excess of Standards

Construction

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

Typical noise levels from construction equipment are shown in Table 3.12-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Maximum Level, dBA at 50 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auger Drill Rig</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressor (air)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Saw</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: J. C. Brennan & Associates 2017

Activities involved in project construction would typically generate maximum noise levels ranging from 76 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. There is an apartment complex immediately adjacent to the project site, approximately 8 to 20 feet from the property line. The nearest sensitive receptors would be located 50 feet, or farther, from construction activities generating the highest noise levels. The project would be required to implement SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 13-3 and would not be expected to generate construction noise greater than that anticipated under the SPASP EIR. However, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable as identified in the SPASP EIR.

Operation

Per the project applicant, each residential unit would have a water-source heat pump (WSHP) system located in a closet. These systems result in STC ratings of approximately 35, and exterior noise levels are not perceptible with background noise levels above 50 dBA. Therefore, the buildings’ mechanical equipment is not expected to be a significant noise source on surrounding uses.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Based on project’s trip generation analysis (Fehr & Peers 2018), the project would result in a total of 48 peak-hour trips. As a means of determining the noise levels due to parking lot activities, J. C. Brennan & Associates utilized noise level data collected for previous parking lot studies, as well as operations data supplied by the project developer. A typical SEL due to automobile arrivals/departures, including car doors slamming and people conversing, is approximately 71 dB at a distance of 50 feet. The proposed parking lot would result in noise levels of approximately 52 dB peak-hour Leq at a distance of 50 feet. The neighboring apartment building would be more than 50 feet from the proposed parking lot. The peak-hour Leq is less than the measured background noise levels and would be consistent with the City’s noise level standards.

Therefore, the project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the City’s General Plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies. The impact would be less than significant, as identified in the SPASP EIR.

Groundborne Vibration

The primary vibration-generating activities associated with the proposed project would occur during construction when activities such as grading, utilities placement, and parking lot construction occur. Table 3.12-4 shows the typical vibration levels produced by construction equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>PPV at 25 Feet (inches per second)</th>
<th>PPV at 50 Feet (inches per second)</th>
<th>PPV at 100 Feet (inches per /second)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Truck</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auger/Drill Rig</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Hammer</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: J. C. Brennan & Associates 2018
Note: PPV = peak particle velocity

The SPASP EIR found construction-related vibration impacts to be potentially significant and identified Mitigation Measure 13-4 to reduce those impacts to the extent feasible. However, it may not be possible to avoid using pile drivers, jackhammers, and related construction equipment entirely during construction associated with the Specific Plan. Because of the proximity of development in the area, some of these activities may take place near sensitive areas. In these cases, Mitigation Measure 13-4 may not be sufficient to reduce groundborne vibrations below a level of significance. Therefore, this impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable in the SPASP EIR.

There is an apartment complex immediately adjacent to the project site, approximately 8 to 20 feet from the property line. The threshold for architectural damage to structures is 0.20 inches per
second peak particle velocity (PPV). Continuous vibrations of 0.10 inches per second PPV, or greater, would likely cause annoyance to sensitive receptors (Caltrans 2013). Sensitive receptors that could be impacted by construction-related vibrations, especially vibratory compactors/rollers, are located approximately 50 feet or farther from construction activities which could produce significant vibrations. At 50 feet, construction vibrations are not anticipated to exceed acceptable levels. Additionally, construction activities would be temporary in nature and would occur during normal daytime working hours. Therefore, the project would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The impact would be less than significant and would not be more significant than identified in the SPASP EIR.

### Ambient Noise Levels in the Project Vicinity

Motor vehicles are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity. The amount of noise varies according to many factors, such as volume of traffic, vehicle mix (percentage of cars and trucks), average traffic speed, and distance from the observer. The SPASP EIR found that cumulative traffic noise levels, with or without implementation of the Specific Plan, are not anticipated to increase substantially along the roadways serving the plan area, and the Specific Plan’s contribution to cumulative traffic noise level increases would be less than 1 dB Ldn. Cumulative traffic noise increases would not be considered substantial. The proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to increased noise levels, and the impact would be less than significant.

As detailed in Appendix NOI, the predicted traffic noise levels at the nearest existing sensitive receptors in the project vicinity were modeled and are summarized with and without the project in Table 3.12-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway/Segment</th>
<th>Predicted Exterior Noise Level (dBA Ldn) at Closest Sensitive Receptors – First Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue/Stockton Avenue to Potrero Avenue</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: J. C. Brennan & Associates 2017

Except in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, a change of 1 dB cannot be perceived by humans and, outside of the laboratory, a 3 dB change is considered a just-perceivable difference. A change in level of at least 5 dB is required before any noticeable change in community response would be expected. An increase of 5 dB is typically considered substantial. As shown in Table 3.12-5, the project would result in a 0.3 dBA increase in the traffic noise level. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The impact would be less than significant, as identified in the SPASP EIR.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Aircraft Noise

The project is not located within 2 miles of a public or private use airport. Aircraft noise is occasionally audible at the project site. However, no portion of the project site lies within the 65 dB CNE\_L noise contours of any public airport, nor is any portion of the project site within 2 miles of any private airfield or heliport.\(^2\) Therefore, the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources, and there would be no impact.

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP EIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. No new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP EIR Mitigation Measures 13-1, 13-3, and 13-4, would be required.

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. In compliance with Mitigation measure 13-1, a site-specific noise impact analysis was completed for the project (J. C. Brennan and Associates 2017; Appendix NOI) and mitigation for reducing interior noise levels for future project residents was identified. The project would also be required to implement SPASP EIR Mitigation Measures 13-3, and 13-4. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential noise and vibration impacts of the project, and there would be no new or more severe impacts associated with noise.

\(^2\) CNE\_L is a weighted average of community noise level over time.
XIII POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

DISCUSSION

The SPASP EIR evaluated potential environmental impacts that could occur with approximately 243,112 net new square feet of commercial space, 1,706 residential units, and 3,840 new residents. The project would include 173 residential units, 185 parking spaces, bicycle parking, a bike stop with storage, 6,427 square feet of public open space including plaza areas, 16,524 square feet of private open space, and various amenities for residents. The 2017 population in El Cerrito was estimated to be 25,515, and there are approximately 10,554 housing units in the city (US Census Bureau 2018). ABAG expects the number of housing units in El Cerrito to increase by about 11.9 percent between 2010 and 2040, to a projected total of 12,000 housing units (MTC and ABAG 2017).

The SPASP EIR concluded that the increase in population associated with the Specific Plan would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth beyond the Specific Plan area boundaries. As noted in the EIR, Specific Plan implementation would not extend roads or infrastructure through undeveloped or low-density areas and, therefore, would not indirectly induce substantial population growth beyond the Specific Plan area boundaries. Rather, Specific Plan implementation would facilitate the projected residential and commercial growth within a transit-rich, mixed use area identified for such growth in both local and regional plans and forecasts (El Cerrito 2014b). In addition, the EIR concluded that the impact of the Specific Plan related to displacement would be less than significant as the Specific Plan provides for the addition of approximately 1,706 net new residential units.

Table 3.13-1 shows the housing and population assumptions evaluated in the SPASP EIR for projections from 2013 to 2040 as well as existing and proposed housing development within the SPASP area. Because the population and housing units proposed by the project fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with population and housing.
TABLE 3.13-1
EXISTING AND PROPOSED HOUSING UNITS AND POPULATION IN THE PROJECT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluated in the SPASP EIR</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Remaining Development Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>2,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Estimated population was calculated using El Cerrito’s 2014 average household size of 2.36 (El Cerrito 2015).

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

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

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. The project would be within the growth projections evaluated in the EIR and would not in and of itself substantially contribute to significant population growth in El Cerrito. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential population and housing impacts related to the project, and there would be no new impact on population and housing.
### PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

#### DISCUSSION

**Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services**

The closest fire station is at 10900 San Pablo Avenue, approximately 700 feet from the project site.

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

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

The SPASP EIR identified that any demand for additional fire protection personnel would be funded by annual budget review and allocation. Given these factors, impacts on fire protection services were determined to be less than significant (El Cerrito 2014b). The project is consistent with the density regulations applicable to the site and the project’s population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR. Therefore, the project would not require the ECFD to expand fire protection facilities and personnel to accommodate additional demand and this impact would be less than significant.
Police Protection

The El Cerrito Police Department (ECPD) provides community police services through three divisions: Field Operations, Administrative and Support, and Special Operations. The ECPD operates out of the Public Safety Building at 10900 San Pablo Avenue, which is approximately 700 feet from the project site. The City contracts with state and other local agencies to provide and support police services. Police dispatching is contracted with the Richmond Police Department (RPD); criminalist services and animal control services are contracted with Contra Costa County.

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

The SPASP EIR identified police department-required approvals that would ensure the department is equipped and has the ability to maintain acceptable levels of service. The EIR also noted that any demand for additional police protection personnel or equipment resulting from Specific Plan implementation would be funded by the annual municipal budget review and allocation process. The project is consistent with the density regulations applicable to the site and the project's population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR. Therefore, the project would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities and this impact would be less than significant.

Public Schools

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

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

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

The SPASP EIR evaluated the impact that the Specific Plan’s anticipated 1,706 new residences and the associated increase in expected student population would have on the services provided and facilities operated by the WCCUSD. The SPASP EIR concluded that the new residences would generate approximately 1,147 new students in district schools over the 25-year horizon of Specific Plan implementation. The EIR concluded that new students would be accommodated in existing schools and that plan implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. The proposed project would add 173 new housing units and increase the population of El Cerrito by approximately 408 residents. These numbers would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR (refer to Section XIII, Population and Housing); the project would also
generate students within the assumptions of the SPASP EIR. As such, existing school facilities would accommodate students from the project.

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

Parks and Recreational Facilities

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

The City of El Cerrito established a standard of 5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. The SPASP EIR concluded that the City’s parks and recreation facilities would satisfy the expected park requirements for the Specific Plan area. Even with the anticipated population associated with implementation of the SPASP, the City’s level of service would be above the level adopted in the City’s General Plan (El Cerrito 2014b). Additionally, the SPASP EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would not create the need for new or physically altered government facilities. Because the project’s population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, the project would result in no new impacts on parks and recreational facilities and the service levels of 5.85 acres per 1,000 residents in the Specific Plan area would not be substantially diminished. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact. In addition, the proposed project would include a total of 6,427 square feet of public open space and 16,524 square feet of private open space in the form of a patio area for each unit and common open space that includes courtyards and terraces.

Applicable Mitigation

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

Conclusion

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. Development of the project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated in the SPASP EIR. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential public services impacts related to the project, and there would be no new impact on public services.
### 3.0 Environmental Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The project would increase the local population by approximately 408 residents, which would be negligible compared to the total city population.

Because the population and housing units fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR, the project would conform to Specific Plan and General Plan open space standards for El Cerrito. Therefore, the project’s impact on parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant. Additionally, the proposed project would include a total of 16,524 square feet of private open space area, in the form of a patio area for each unit. Residents would also have access to 15,373 square feet of common open space, including the 1,891-square-foot east courtyard, 3,731-square-foot west courtyard, 5,602-square-foot east roof terrace, and 4,689-square-foot west roof terrace. The project would also provide a total of 6,427 square feet of public open space.

**Applicable Mitigation**

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

**Conclusion**

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. Development of the project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated in the SPASP EIR and General Plan policies. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential recreation impacts related to the project, and there would be no new impact on recreation.


**3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

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

**DISCUSSION**

This section compares traffic impacts from the project with impacts identified in the SPASP EIR. Fehr & Peers (2018) prepared a transportation impact analysis for the project, which is provided as Appendix TRA.

**Trip Generation and Impacts**

The SPASP EIR estimated net trip generation for the Specific Plan at 740 AM peak hour trips and 1,590 PM peak hour trips for the potential new development capacity, plus 100 AM peak hour trips and 370 PM peak hour trips for development that is already entitled or planned. This trip generation estimate was the basis for the traffic analysis, including the cumulative analysis.

The proposed project’s trip generation estimate is shown in Table 3.16-1. Consistent with the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology, a reduction of 12 percent was applied to the trip generation rates. This reduction is used to account for the project’s setting in a dense urban environment as well as multimodal functionality (i.e., pedestrian, bicycle, transit). To account for trip generation of the existing site, Fehr & Peers collected AM and PM peak hour counts at the existing site driveway. Accounting for the rate adjustments used in the SPASP and existing land uses, it is estimated that the project would generate about 50 AM and 38 PM net-new peak-hour trips. This would represent less than one percent of the trip generation estimate for the Specific Plan area in the EIR, as described above.
TABLE 3.16-1
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Size a</th>
<th>ADT b</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments (#223) c</td>
<td>173 DU</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>General Office (710) d</td>
<td>2.54 KSF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project Trip Generation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Existing Trip Generation:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Net New Project Trip Generation:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers 2018

a. DU = dwelling units; KSF = 1,000 square feet
b. ADT = average daily traffic
c. ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 223 (mid-rise apartments), adjusted based on the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology.
d. ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 710 (general office), adjusted based on the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology.
e. Existing trip generation based on counts collected on Wednesday, November 29, 2017.

The SPASP EIR assumed developments at planned/entitled and high priority opportunity sites as part of the traffic analysis for the EIR. Although the project site is within the SPASP area, it was not included as a planned/entitled project or high priority opportunity site as part of the EIR traffic analysis. However, this analysis compares the project to the high priority opportunity sites analyzed in the EIR to ensure the project does not exceed the total assumptions for the SPASP area. Since the certification of the SPASP EIR, 14 developments in the high priority opportunity sites, including this project, have been proposed and are in some stage of the city’s approval process. As shown in detail in Appendix TRA, the 14 developments combined would generate about 259 AM and 352 PM net-new peak hour trips. The combined trip generation is less than the total trip generation estimated for all the opportunity sites in the SPASP EIR (Fehr & Peers 2018).

Since the uses proposed by the project are consistent with the assumptions in the SPASP EIR and the proposed project would generate fewer automobile trips than assumed in SPASP EIR, the project would not result in additional impacts on traffic operations at the intersections analyzed in the SPASP EIR (Fehr & Peers 2018). Therefore, the project’s impact related to traffic and congestion would be less than significant.
Air Traffic Patterns

The project site is not located within an airport influence area and would not affect the physical operations of an airport. The project does not have an aviation component and is not sufficiently large to noticeably affect the demand for air traffic. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Site Plan Review

As part of the transportation impact analysis, Fehr & Peers (2018) evaluated the project’s site plan for consistency with the SPASP form based code.

Vehicle Access and On-Site Circulation

Residents would access the site through a right-in/right-out driveway on San Pablo Avenue at the southwest corner of the project site. The driveway would provide access to a gated two-level parking garage. A second driveway would be located at the end of the Keamey Street cul-de-sac at the north side of the project site and would provide emergency vehicle and service vehicle access only. An internal ramp adjacent to the Keamey Street driveway would connect the two parking levels. As part of the city’s approval process, the fire department has reviewed the project site plan to ensure adequate emergency access.

Project Driveway Sight Distance

Vehicles would exit the project driveway on San Pablo Avenue from the drive aisle on the ground level of the garage. The driveway would provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the project driveway and pedestrians in both directions on the adjacent sidewalk (Fehr & Peers 2018).

Vehicles parked on the south side of the San Pablo Avenue driveway may block the sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and vehicles traveling northbound on San Pablo Avenue. Trees planted on south side of the driveways may also affect visibility of exiting vehicles if the tree canopy is lower than six feet from the ground. Therefore, based on the traffic impact analysis findings, the project applicant would be required to implement the following project-specific condition of approval:

**Project-specific condition of approval:** The following should be provided on the south side of the project driveway on San Pablo Avenue: Provide at least 20 feet of red curb and ensure that tree canopies are higher than six feet from the ground as to not restrict sight distance for exiting vehicles (Fehr & Peers 2018).

Alternative Transportation

Bicycles

Section 2.05.07.04 of the SPASP Form-Based Code requires bicycle parking for residential uses at a rate of 1.5 spaces per unit for long-term bike parking and 1 space per 20 units for short-term bike parking. As shown in Table 3.16-2, the project would meet or exceed these requirements. The long-term spaces would be available for residents in secured rooms located on the basement level of the garage. The short-term spaces would be provided along the building frontage on San Pablo Avenue and in front of the project’s proposed bike stop on the east side of the building adjacent to the Ohlone Greenway. The project would not impede bicycle access in the area.
### Table 3.16-2
**BICYCLE PARKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size ²</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spaces per Unit b</td>
<td>Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>173 DU</td>
<td>1.5 DU</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2.54 KSF</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Required Bicycle Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bicycle Parking Provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Surplus</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fehr & Peers 2018

a. DU = dwelling units; KSF = 1,000 square feet

b. Based on SPASP Form-Based Code Table 29: Number of Parking Spaces Required

### Pedestrians

The SPASP Form-Based Code requires a minimum of 14 feet of sidewalk space along community streets, including 8 feet of clear pedestrian right-of-way and 6 feet of amenity space, which includes landscaping. As shown in Figure 2.0-5, the project does not propose any changes to the existing sidewalk. The project would provide new pedestrian connections, as described in Chapter 2.0, Project Description. The project would not impede pedestrian access in the area.

### Transit

Alameda-Contra Costa (AC) Transit provides bus service near the project site, with multiple bus routes running along San Pablo Avenue. The nearest northbound bus stop is on northbound San Pablo Avenue, at the far side of the San Pablo Avenue/Madison Avenue intersection, approximately 0.05 miles from the project site. In addition, the El Cerrito Plaza BART station is approximately 1.5 miles to the south, and the El Cerrito del Norte BART station is approximately 0.5 miles to the north. The project would not remove or interfere with transit access.

### Transportation Demand Management

The SPASP Form-Based Code requirements for the TOMIMU zoning district apply to the project site, requiring a maximum of 1.5 vehicle parking spaces per dwelling unit and a basic Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan (El Cerrito 2014a). The project would provide 185 parking spaces in a two-level garage, or approximately 1.07 spaces per unit, in compliance with City regulations.

Fehr & Peers (2018) reviewed the TDM plan proposed for the project, which would be implemented by the project applicant, and has verified that the strategies are sufficient to reduce automobile trips and parking demand generated by the project. As described in greater detail in Appendix TRA, the project proposes the following TDM strategies that would reduce automobile trips and parking demand generated by the project:

- Unbundled parking, meaning that parking is rented or sold separately from the residential unit, rather than automatically included in the rent or cost.
• Long- and short-term bicycle parking, slightly exceeding code requirements.

• Direct bicycle and pedestrian access to the Ohlone Greenway, including a new pedestrian path along the northern side of the building and a bike stop with bicycle repair equipment.

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

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

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP EIR. Traffic generated by the project would be within what was analyzed in the EIR. The project would be consistent with the development standards envisioned in the EIR, including the SPASP form-based code. As such, the SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the potential transportation impacts related to the project, and there would be no new impact on transportation.
XVII TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

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

i) A listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(k)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

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

DISCUSSION

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

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

While the City is not required to conduct formal consultation under AB 52 for the project, as stated above, SPASP EIR Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the project and would protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.
APPLICABLE MITIGATION

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

CONCLUSION

The SPASP EIR adequately evaluated the project’s potential cultural resources impacts (and by extension, impacts on tribal cultural resources), and no new impact would result.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVIII UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The project is consistent with the density regulations applicable to the site and the project’s population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP EIR. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the demand for utilities including water, wastewater, and solid waste, that was estimated in the SPASP EIR. Further discussion of these utilities is provided below.

Water Supply

The SPASP EIR determined that there would be an increase in water demand as a result of buildout of the Specific Plan; average daily demand was estimated to be 882,720 gallons per day (gpd), which represents less than 1 percent of the planning-level water demand forecast in the EBMUD Urban Water Management Plan (El Cerrito 2014b). The SPASP EIR concluded that this demand represents a small increase and would be a less than significant impact on water supply. The SPASP EIR also noted that development within the Specific Plan area would incorporate the City’s requirements for adequate water supply, including compliance with adopted performance standards; application of these standards in each jurisdictional City’s development review process; coordination of development review with EBMUD (including consistency with the Urban Water Management Plan); and the requirement that new development pay its share of the costs associated with provision of water facilities through project-specific mitigation required as
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

conditions of approval. The SPASP EIR concluded that since future development facilitated by the Specific Plan, including the project, would require less than 1 percent of EBMUD’s forecast planning-level water demand for its service area by the year 2040, and would be subject to EBMUD and jurisdictional City plans, regulations, and ordinances regarding water supply, the impact on water supply would be less than significant. The project would be consistent with SPASP requirements and would not therefore not result in a significant impact related to water supply.

Utility Infrastructure

The project site is in a developed urban setting, and existing water utility infrastructure is present on the project site. Since the site is developed, domestic water consumption and wastewater generation are currently associated with the site.

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

The project would rely on potable and nonpotable water for both domestic use and fire protection from existing major facilities, including reservoirs and pumping plants that are serviced by EBMUD. Service would be granted subject to EBMUD regulations governing water services, which may include watermain extensions and/or off-site pipeline improvements. With adherence to these requirements, the project would not result in any impacts.

Wastewater

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

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

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

Solid Waste

The increase in commercial and residential density under the SPASP would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste generated in the Specific Plan area. The SPASP EIR concluded that the increase in solid waste generation would be incremental but would not exceed acceptable rates established by plans, policies, and regulations. Moreover, the projected amount of solid waste

would be served by solid waste and recycling facilities with sufficient capacities to accommodate
development included as part of the SPASP, including the project. The project would be consistent
with SPASP requirements and other applicable regulations. As such, solid waste impacts would
remain less than significant.

APPLICABLE MITIGATION

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions
to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP EIR
was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. With implementation of the
project-specific condition of approval included above, no new impacts related to utilities and
service systems would result.

CONCLUSION

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the
SPASP EIR. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval included above, the
project would not result in new impacts related to utilities and service systems. As such, the SPASP
EIR adequately evaluated the potential utilities impacts related to the project, and there would
be no new impact on utilities.
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APPENDICES

January 11, 2019

Sean Moss
Development Services, Community Development Department
City of El Cerrito
10890 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, CA 94530

RE: Support for The Griffin, 11060 San Pablo Avenue

Dear Mr. Moss,

On behalf of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, I express our enthusiastic support for the 173 proposed new homes of The Griffin residential development on San Pablo Avenue. At a time when the Bay Area is in a dire housing crisis, building dense housing near a BART station and on the transit-rich San Pablo Avenue corridor leverages the significant investment in our transit systems.

The Silicon Valley Leadership Group was founded in 1978 by David Packard, Co-Founder of Hewlett Packard. Today, the Leadership Group is driven by more than 350 CEOs/Senior Executives to proactively tackle issues to improve our communities and strengthen our economy, with a focus on education, energy, the environment, health care, housing, tech policy, tech & innovation policy, and transportation. One of the top concerns of the members we represent in the Silicon Valley is the need for housing here in the Bay Area.

We believe The Griffin could be a cornerstone development in activating the San Pablo Avenue corridor as envisioned in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. Architecturally, the design features are modern, inviting, and thoughtful, creating walkable spaces that will lead to vibrant sidewalks and streetscapes. We are pleased the design includes a courtyard for residents to enjoy while also serving as the space for entry into each unit, limiting the proposed development’s noise for the neighboring apartment complex.

The ample community benefits proposed, including the bicycle repair station, pedestrian thoroughfare, and contributions to the City’s Affordable Housing Trust Fund, are investments in the community for years to come. Along with the benefits the proposed development would provide, there are goods and services nearby to the development to which residents could easily walk and bike, thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

We applaud the City of El Cerrito for doing its part to provide much needed homes for the residents and workforce that enable the Bay Area to thrive. The Leadership Group is committed to increasing the housing supply in the Bay Area, and we proudly support proposed residential developments like the one before you.

Sincerely,

Carl Guardino
President & CEO
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Carl Groch,

Chair Design and Review Board

Dear Chair Groch;

I drive along Berkeley’s Shattuck Avenue occasionally and I don’t understand how they could have approved so many new projects that look so bad. I don’t want to see El Cerrito’s San Pablo Avenue looking like Shattuck does just south of their downtown.

The proposed project at 11048/11060 San Pablo Avenue is nothing like these. The mid-block connection with the Ohlone Greenway is a big plus. The architectural style complements the area. I understand there is going to be pretty high quality facades on the buildings and smart, attractive lighting. I really like the idea of a public open space and space for a non-profit to run a community resource for those using the Ohlone Greenway.

A big thumbs up from me on this project

Local 104 member
William Wagner
2420 Edwards ave
El Cerrito ca. 94530

Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android Device
Dear Chair Groch;

I’m glad to see our city is doing its part to help solve the regions housing shortage. That is one reason why I’m so supportive of the 173 unit project being proposed at 11048/11060 San Pablo Avenue. The balance of having more housing and addressing traffic issues is a tough one. This project is on a major transit corridor and minutes from BART. Few residents will have to have a car to get to work.

I encourage the Design Review Board to approve this project.

Diego Navarro-Leal
6543 Portola Dr. Apt#9
El Cerrito, CA 94530
Design Review Board Tier I Staff Report
January 24, 2019

10300 San Pablo Avenue

DETAILS

Application Number: PL18-0176

Applicant: Lisa Vilhauer, The Little Hill LLC

Location: 10300 San Pablo Avenue

APN: 503-392-028

Zoning: Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)

General Plan: Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)

Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier I Design Review of proposed material and color changes to a previous Design Review Board approval of Tier IV Design Review (PL16-0139) of a new residential building containing a total of 30 residential units and 2 live-work units in one 4-story building, with parking located behind the building. Proposed changes to the project include revisions to colors and materials; revised rear building entry location; reduced sizes of windows; and a proposed gate at the parking lot entry. The changes are minor and are within the scope of Tier I Design Review. However, since the design element of the project were previously approved by the Design Review Board, the Zoning Administrator has elected to refer the revisions to the Board for consideration.

CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The requested entitlement for Design Review Board review consists of a Tier I Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Tier I Design Review applies to exterior alterations that cost less than 50% of the appraised value of the improvements on the property including painting of buildings and minor alterations or façade changes. The Zoning Administrator has review authority under the Tier I process and may refer any such project to the Design Review Board for consideration.

A previous version of the project was approved by the Planning Commission and Design Review Board on August 16, 2017 and September 6, 2017, respectively, under the Tier IV Design Review process.

The proposed project still includes 30 new residential units and 2 new live-work units in one 4-story building, with parking located behind the building. Proposed changes to the project include revisions to colors and materials; revised rear building entry location; reduced sizes of windows; and a proposed gate at the parking lot entry. The changes are minor and are within the scope of Tier I Design Review. However, since the design element of the project were previously approved by the Design Review Board, the Zoning Administrator has elected to refer the revisions to the Board for consideration.

Based on the information in this report, which supports the required findings, staff recommends approval of the project.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The project site is located at the northeast corner of San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue, within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area. The site is comprised of one parcel (APN 503-392-028). The site is a total of 24,958 square feet (0.57 acres). The site is an ‘L’ shaped parcel with three street frontages. The site extends through the entire block from San Pablo Avenue to Kearney Street, along Eureka Avenue. The site slopes up gently from San Pablo Avenue.

Vicinity Map

Site Photo

Adjacent Land Uses

North: Retail businesses on San Pablo Ave; an apartment building on Kearney Street (Zoning: TOMIMU. General Plan: TOMIMU)
East: Kearney Street (Fairmont Elementary School is located across Kearney Street) (Zoning: PS. General Plan: Parks & Open)

South: Eureka Avenue (The site across Eureka Avenue has received entitlement for a 14-unit residential project at 10290 San Pablo Ave.) (Zoning: TOHIMU. General Plan: TOHIMU)

West: San Pablo Avenue. (Across San Pablo Avenue sits commercial uses in the City of Richmond.)

Analysis

Previously Approved Project

The previously project consists of a 51,360 square foot L-shaped building containing a total of 30 residential units and 2 live-work units. The site plan features a public plaza located at the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue and a public plaza along Kearney Street. Behind the buildings would be a parking area consisting of 16 surface parking spaces and 17 parking spaces in garages at the back of the proposed buildings. The parking area would be accessed from Kearney Street. The building would have a central lobby which could be accessed from the public plaza or from the rear parking area.

The project features a combination of flats and two-story units. The project contains 15 three-bedroom units, 15 two-bedroom units and 2 live-work units. The live-work units would be located adjacent to the public plaza, with the commercial portion of the unit located on the ground floor and a living room and bedroom on the upper floor.

25 long term bicycle parking spaces would be accommodated with vertical racks in the garages. An additional 22 long-term bike parking spaces would be accommodated in a bike room in the building lobby.

A trash enclosure accommodating the required bins would be located near the entrance to the parking area and would be accessed from Kearney Street.

The colors included a dark brown-gray (‘Raccoon Fur’) for projected portions of the building and a slightly lighter gray (‘Charcoal Slate’) for recessed areas of the building. Most architectural features and colors were carried to the base of the building on the Eureka Avenue Elevation and the building base color on the San Pablo Avenue elevation was ‘Charcoal Slate’. The balcony edges featured Bok Modern railing systems.

Proposed Project Changes

Proposed changes to the project include revisions to colors and materials; revised rear building entry location; reduced sizes of some windows, and a proposed gate at the parking lot entry. The applicant is proposing lighter greys than previously approved, as well as green accent with additional brick veneer accent. After consulting with a color consultant, the applicant decided to propose these revised colors and materials to bring more texture and color to the building and to select colors considered more timeless. The color gradient was also inspired by Fairmount Elementary School to give the building a more playful look. The location of the building’s rear entry changed in order to bring the direct path of travel from the ADA parking space to the building into compliance with the California Building Code. The dimensions of a number of windows were revised so that water will not collect on bathroom
window sills; to allow for sufficient amount of cabinet storage at Unit F2 kitchens; and due to structural shearwall requirements for the storefront windows on the live-work units.

Compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

Chapter Two of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan establishes the land use regulations and development standards of the Specific Plan Area.

Some development standards apply throughout the Plan area. These include:

- Regulation by Street Type – which includes building placement, building form, and shadow analysis.
- Open Space Requirements – which include private, common and public types of open space.

Other development standards vary by transect zone. The development standards that are related to the transect zone include:

- Use-Types of land use permitted, conditionally permitted or prohibited.
- Building Height- the minimums and maximums heights allowed.
- Parking of vehicles – the minimum and maximum number of spaces allowed.
- Parking of bicycles- the minimum number of spaces allowed.

The tables below show the relevant Specific Plan standards. Given that changes are proposed to a previously approved project, the tables below focus on the component of the project that were changed. The Design Review Board purview is the project’s design components specified in its purview, that were changed from the previously approved project.

The project is located on the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue. This section of San Pablo Avenue is designated a Commercial Street. Eureka Avenue is a Neighborhood Street. The project is located in the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed-Use (TOMIMU) Transect Zone.

### Regulation by Street Type:

**SPA Commercial Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Form</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Non-residential 75% min,</td>
<td>75% for Shop Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential 40% min.</td>
<td>41% for Flex Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>30% min</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowed Frontage Types</strong></td>
<td>Min: 50% Shop Front</td>
<td>Shop Front (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 50% Arcade (NE side),</td>
<td>Flex Front (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forecourt (NE side), Flex,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or Eco-front</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Neighborhood Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Form</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Transparency</td>
<td>Non-residential 50% min, Residential 30% min.</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Transparency</td>
<td>25% min</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed Frontage Types</td>
<td>Front Yard, Forecourt (NE side), Flex (commercial), Shop Front (commercial)</td>
<td>Flex Front</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Space Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/Common Open Space</td>
<td>Min 80 sq. ft. deck/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
<td>1,614 sq. ft. of public open space provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height</td>
<td>55 ft. max</td>
<td>55 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design Review Process**

The proposed revisions are within the scope of Tier I Design Review. Tier I Design Review applies to exterior alterations that cost less than 50% of the appraised value of the improvements on the property including painting of buildings and minor alterations or façade changes. Pursuant to Section 2.02.07.01.02 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the Zoning Administrator is authorized to review and act upon Tier I applications, and may refer any such project to the Design Review Board for consideration. Since the design elements of the project were previously approved by the Design Review Board, the Zoning Administrator has chosen to refer this Tier I Design Review to the Board for review. The Design Review Board includes authority over the following items for this application:

- Limitations regarding building height, form and massing;
- Building facades and articulation;
- Exterior building colors and materials;
Architectural Design

The building’s architecture incorporates a contemporary aesthetic. The building features upper floor pop-outs and recesses, which are mostly carried down to the ground floor. The façade facing San Pablo Avenue, features a more traditional storefront-type ground floor. This façade features two live-work units at the plaza. The rear of the building also features architectural pop-outs. The balcony edges throughout the project feature an aluminum Corten AZP Flat sheet railing system. Most exterior building surfaces would be color-integrated elastomeric plaster.

The projected portions of the building would be colored with a medium gray (‘Not My Fault’), while the recessed areas of the building would be a lighter gray (‘City Tower’). On the Eureka Avenue Elevation, most architectural features and colors would be carried to the base of the building. On the San Pablo Avenue elevation, the building base would be colored ‘City Tower.’ Brick Veneer with varying colors including light gray (‘Light Pumice’), light green (‘Pelican’), and brown (‘Graphite’) would be used throughout the building on building recesses. Light green (‘Pelican’) accents would be used on corner elements.

The two live-work units would employ a shop front building frontage type and would utilize aluminum storefront windows to achieve the required transparency. In all other locations, the building would feature VPI black vinyl windows. The corners of the building have been emphasized through the use of corner balconies.

The lighting plan for the site features a mixture of ceiling-mounted and wall-mounted fixtures at the building entries. In addition, two pole-mounted lights are proposed in the parking area.

Previous Project Rendering
Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times, mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site on January 3, 2019.

Staff received no comments.

Environmental Review

A Program Environmental Impact Report (program EIR) was certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in 2014. This type of environmental documentation is authorized by section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for use in documenting the environmental impacts of specific plans, and other planning "programs." As explained in the CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR is useful in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of a project that involves a series of interrelated actions that can reasonably be characterized as a single project. Subsequent activities that fall within the scope of the program may not be subject to further environmental review if the environmental effects of the subsequent activity have been adequately addressed in the program EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR.

An Initial Study Checklist has been prepared for this project. The responses contained in the checklist confirm that the project is considered within the scope of the evaluation completed for the program EIR. No new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required.

Several conditions of approval were included in the original project approval resolution to ensure that key mitigation measures of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR were implemented with regard to this project. The inclusion of these conditions ensured that the project will not have
environmental effects which have not previously been addressed in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

The revisions proposed as part of this project are minor and do not affect the environmental analysis that has already been completed for the project. The Initial Study Checklist that was completed when the project was initially approved is attached to this report along with a memo noting that none of the proposed changes affect the analysis in the Checklist.

Intent of the Specific Plan

The proposed revisions to the previously approved project will implement the following strategies of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan:

**Strategy A.3:** Optimize placemaking in all developments.

_The proposed revisions to the previously approved colors and materials will create a more timeless and inviting building with lighter colors and additional texture, along with providing additional visual interest._

General Plan Compliance

The project is consistent with and will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

**CD1.9: Building Design.** A variety of attractive images will be achieved by encouraging a variety of building styles and designs, within a unifying context of consistent “pedestrian” scale along streets and compatibility among neighboring land uses.

_The proposed project is designed at a pedestrian scale and addresses San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue with building entries and windows along the street. The proposed revised colors and additional brick veneer material will provide a more distinct building style and will create additional variety in the building exterior._

**CD4.2: Building Articulation.** Ensure that buildings are well articulated. Avoid large unarticulated shapes in building design. Ensure that building designs include varied building facades, rooflines, and building heights to create more interesting and differentiated building forms and shapes. Encourage human scale detail in architectural design. Do not allow unarticulated blank walls or unbroken series of garage doors on the facades of buildings facing the street or the Ohlone Greenway.

_The proposed building is articulated in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building includes a varied roofline and interesting building form. The project meets or exceeds the transparency standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building is designed at a human scale with building entries along San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue._

_The proposed revised colors and additional brick veneer material will provide additional variation and building articulation._

**CD5.1: Design Review Process.** Continue design review and approval process for all new development, changes, additions, and modifications of existing buildings (except for single-family homes on existing lots).
The proposed project requires Tier I Design Review approval from the Zoning Administrator, or Design Review Board if referred from the Zoning Administrator, in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Required Findings

Pursuant to Section 2.02.07.01.02.A.3 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, in acting to approve or conditionally approve an application for the Design Component of a Tier I Site Plan and Design Review, the Zoning Administrator, or Design Review Board if the project is referred to the Design Review Board, shall make the following findings:

a. That the project brings the property not closer compliance with the development standards of the Specific Plan as deemed appropriate and achievable by the Zoning Administrator; and

   As discussed in this report, the proposed changes to the previously approved project comply with all standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

b. That the project implements applicable goals and policies of the El Cerrito General Plan.

   As discussed in this report, the project will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan: CD1.9: Building Design, CD4.2: Building Articulation, CD5.1: Design Review Process.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends approval of Planning Application No. PL18-0176, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.

Proposed Motion

Move adoption of Design Review Board Resolution DRB19-03 granting Tier I Design Review approval to Planning Application No. PL18-0176: a project that includes a 4-story residential building containing 30 dwelling units and 2 live-work units located at 10300 San Pablo Avenue.

Appeal Period

Within ten (10) working days after the date of the decision, the Design Review Board action may be appealed to the Planning Commission.

Attachments

1. Draft resolution
2. Project Plans, dated October 15, 2018
3. Initial Study Checklist
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO DESIGN REVIEW BOARD GRANTING TIER I DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE PREVIOUS TIER IV DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL PL16-0139 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING CONTAINING A TOTAL OF 30 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND 2 LIVE-WORK UNITS AT 10300 SAN PABLO AVENUE.

WHEREAS, the site is located within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area;

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use and the project is located on San Pablo Avenue Commercial Street and Neighborhood Street designations;

WHEREAS, the site is located at 10300 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 503-392-028;

WHEREAS, on October 17, 2016, the applicant submitted an application for Tier IV Design Review, PL16-0139;

WHEREAS, on August 16, 2017, the El Cerrito Planning Commission granted Tier IV Site Plan and Design Review approval to the project;

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2017, the Design Review Board granted Tier IV Design Review approval to the project;

WHEREAS, on October 18, 2017, the El Cerrito Planning Commission granted approval of a tentative parcel map for condominium purposes for the project;

WHEREAS, on October 15, 2018, the applicant submitted a Tier I Design Review application requesting to revise the exterior colors and materials which were previously approved by the Design Review Board; and

WHEREAS, on January 24, 2019, the Design Review Board, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review does find and determine the following:

1. The project is consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182 and is subject to the Program Environmental Impact Report mitigation measures as required by this resolution.

2. The project complies with all applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The project complies with the standards for the San Pablo Avenue Commercial Street type and Neighborhood Street type, the standards for the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use district, and all other applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

3. The project will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan: CD1.9: Building Design, CD4.2: Building Articulation, CD5.1: Design Review Process.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Design Review Board hereby approves Application No. PL18-0176, subject to the following conditions:

Planning Division:

Standard conditions- All projects:

1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans dated October 15, 2018. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Once constructed or installed, all improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If Applicant constructs buildings or makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for nonissuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.

4. This design review approval and these Conditions of Approval supplant the prior design review approval for this site, Design Review Board Resolution 17-04.

5. If not used, this design review approval shall expire two years from the date of this action.

6. The applicant shall share the conditions of approval with their general contractor for the project. The general contractor shall sign a copy of the conditions of approval to acknowledge that he/she is aware of all these conditions of approval and will comply as directed.
   a. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, this signed copy shall be returned to the planning and building division and kept as part of the project file. The conditions of approval shall be reviewed at the mandatory pre-construction meeting held between the City and the General Contractor. A copy of the conditions of approval shall be maintained on the project site at all times during construction.

7. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Chapter 13.50: Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The project shall be fully compliant with Chapter 13.50 prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

8. In compliance with Chapter 16.34 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, the applicant shall submit plans for undergrounding of utilities adjacent to the project to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permit.

9. The cost of all automobile parking shall be separate from the sale or rental price of all residential units. All renters and/or buyers of residential units shall be free to not rent and/or purchase parking.
10. **Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.1):** Implement the following BAAQMD-recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction. City staff will spot check that these measures are being implemented throughout the construction phase of the project. These measures reduce diesel particulate matter PM2.5 and PM10 created from construction to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced:

**Dust (PM2.5 and PM10) Control Measures:**

b. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp at all times.

c. Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

d. Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.

e. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., previously graded areas that are inactive for 10 days or more).

f. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.

g. Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph.

h. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

i. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site.

j. Post a publically visible sign(s) with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

**Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Particulate Matter and PM2.5 and other construction emissions:**

k. The developer or contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City or BAAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average for the year 2011.

l. Clear signage at all construction sites shall be posted indicating that diesel and gasoline equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site or adjacent to the construction site.

m. The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).

n. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.

11. **Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.2):** Prior to issuance of building permit the applicant shall require project-level construction health risk assessment shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. This assessment shall be completed either through screening or refined modeling to
identify impacts and, if necessary, include performance standards and industry-recognized measures to be accomplished through, though is not limited to, the following measures:

a. Construction equipment selection.
b. Use of alternative fuels and engine retrofits temporary line power or electric equipment.
c. Modified construction schedule; and
d. Implementation of BAAQMD Basic and/or Additional Construction Mitigation Measures for control of fugitive dust.

12. Biological Impacts (Mitigation Measure 6.1): Removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation between February 1 and August 31 shall require a survey for nesting birds by a qualified wildlife biologist to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The survey shall be conducted no sooner than 14 days prior to the start of removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation. Survey results shall be valid for 21 days following the survey. Any removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation more than 21 days after a survey shall require a new survey. The area surveyed shall include all construction sites, access roads, and staging areas, as well as areas within 150 feet outside the boundaries of the areas to be cleared or as otherwise determined by the biologist.

In the event that an active nest is discovered in the areas to be cleared, or in other habitats within 150 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction shall be postponed for at least two weeks or until a wildlife biologist has determined that the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts.

A qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for bats and suitable bat roosting habitat at work sites where culverts, structures and/or trees would be removed or otherwise disturbed prior to the initiation of construction. If bats or suitable bat roosting habitat is detected, CDFW shall be notified immediately for consultation and possible on-site monitoring.

The survey for nesting birds, bats and suitable bat roosting habitat may be conducted simultaneously.

13. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall implement a program that includes the following elements:

a. Archeological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
b. Procedures for reporting archeological discoveries

14. Historic and Cultural Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.2): If subsurface archeological or cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described in Mitigation Measure 7-3 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) shall apply, and there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the Contra Costa County Coroner has been notified of the remains and has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

15. Paleontological Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.3): The applicant shall implement a program that includes the following elements:
c. Paleontological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel

d. Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitor of all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface

e. Procedures for reporting paleontological discoveries and their geologic context

If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered, excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources, and the project paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and its stratigraphic context. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts to paleontological resources. During monitoring, if potentially significant paleontological resources are found, “standard” samples shall be collected and processed by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils. If significant fossils are found and collected, they shall be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix shall be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of material collected and identified shall be provided to a local museum repository with the specimens. Significant fossils collected during this work, along with the itemized inventory of these specimens, shall be deposited in a local museum repository for permanent curatorship and storage. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities, and the significance of the fossils, if any, shall be prepared and submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

16. Geology and Soils (Mitigation Measure 8.1): As required by the Building Official, subject to City review and approval, the applicant shall complete and implement the geotechnical mitigation recommendations identified in the required site-specific geotechnical investigations and engineering studies, in coordination with City grading permit and building permit performance standards.

17. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/ Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.3): Construction equipment shall be well-maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical. The following measures shall be implemented to reduce noise from construction activities:
   a. Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
   b. Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
   c. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as feasible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction area.
   d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.
   e. Pre-drill foundation pile holes to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile.
   f. Construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to operational business, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses.
   g. If noise conflicts occur which are not irresolvable by proper scheduling, a temporary noise control blanket barrier shall be erected, as determined to be necessary by the Zoning Administrator, along building facades facing construction sites.
   h. Route construction-related traffic along major roadways and as far as feasible from sensitive receptors.
   i. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) and excavating, grading, and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and to the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Work shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays.
   j. Businesses, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to construction sites shall be notified of the construction schedule in writing.
   k. Designate a “construction liaison” who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The liaison would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to
correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the liaison at the construction site.

Project Specific Conditions of Approval:

18. The following interior noise reduction measures shall be included for all west facing (facing San Pablo Avenue) units:
   a. Living room and bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 38.
   b. Exterior finish shall be three-coat stucco or system with equivalent weight per square foot;
   c. Interior gypsum at exterior walls shall be 5/8” Type X or Type C hung on resilient channel (RC);
   d. Ceiling gypsum shall be 5/8” type X or Type C;
   e. 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 shall 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. The Zoning Administrator shall approve any substitute measures or alternatives to the measures detailed above.

19. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall provide $50,000 to the City of El Cerrito to be used towards public improvements at Fairmont Park.

20. Commercial uses shall be maintained in each of the two live-work units at all times. These commercial uses shall maintain active business licenses.

21. The building entries nearest the two live-work units shall be outfitted with equipment that allows occupants/employees of the units to grant access to the building from within the unit.

22. Public access shall be maintained to the 761 square foot public plaza located at the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue and the 835 square foot public plaza located at Eureka Avenue and Kearney Street. The plazas shall be designated with signage to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. Any changes to public access shall require approval of the Zoning Administrator.

23. Prior to issuance of building permit the applicant shall submit a request to the Public Works Department for at least 10 feet of red curb on the north side of the project driveway on Kearney Street.

24. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall include on the plans a trellis or covering located either in the public plaza at San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue or at the bus stop adjacent to the project (subject to approval by the Public Works Director and any other applicable agencies). The intent of the trellis or covering shall be to cover the bus stop or provide a covered waiting area for bus riders.

Public Works Department:

25. The existing granite blocks and street furniture along the project frontage shall remain in place or shall be relocated consistent with the public right-of-way improvement standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.
26. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a detailed grading plan, obtain a Grading & Transportation Permit, and pay all associated fees for earthwork and grading operations in excess of 50 cubic yards.

27. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall provide a drainage plan for new roof and any rain leaders. All drainage shall stay on-site, draining away from the foundations, 10’ from property lines, and shall not cause a nuisance to neighboring properties.

28. The building plans shall note that all sidewalk, curb and gutter along the development’s public right-of-way frontages shall be replaced to meet current City and ADA standards to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

29. All improvements on the property frontage shall comply with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, including the Complete Streets chapter to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

30. Before any work commences related to any street tree, sidewalk and driveway, applicant shall obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.

31. If any new street trees are to be installed, they must be from the City Master Tree List and approved by the City Arborist before installation. Tree species, location, spacing, tree well size, and planting details, are to be approved by the City Arborist before installation.

32. Any new street trees are required to have irrigation and an establishment period of 3 years prior to acceptance by the City.

33. Applicant shall pay a fair share of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Complete Streets Improvements as determined by the Public Works Director.

Building/Fire Department:

34. Building construction shall meet current Building, California Fire Codes, and the El Cerrito Fire Code.

35. Prior to issuance of building permit:
   a. The applicant shall provide code analysis of required total firefighting water. Based on required fire flow, the applicant shall show on plans the number of fire hydrants required and locations based on maximum spacing requirements.
   b. The applicant shall submit plans for fire service underground.
   c. Fire sprinkler plans shall be submitted for review and approval to the satisfaction of the Fire Marshall.

36. The following information shall be included on the Construction Plans:
   a. Fire Department Connections (FDC's) shall be in locations acceptable to the fire department for emergency operations.
   b. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected between standpipes and fire sprinkler system and shall be located on Lincoln Ave.
   c. A fire standpipe shall be required in each common stairway.
   d. Smoke detection shall be installed in each bedroom, in hallways adjacent to bedrooms, and one detector per floor level (top and bottom of stairs). Smoke detectors shall be 120v powered with battery backup. Smoke detectors shall be interconnected.
e. Carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of and adjacent to sleeping areas where fuel-burning appliances are installed; and in dwelling units that have attached garages. Carbon Monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 720. Carbon Monoxide alarms shall be interconnected with the smoke detectors.

f. All electrical breakers shall be labeled.

g. Approved numbers or address shall be provided in such a position to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property. Address shall be either internally or externally illuminated.

h. Automatic Fire Sprinklers shall be installed throughout the Complex.

i. An automatic fire alarm system is required in all common areas of the building. The automatic fire alarm system shall be interconnected with the fire sprinkler system.

j. Every sleeping room shall have at least one operable window or door approved for emergency escape or rescue in accordance with CBC 310.4. Escape or rescue windows shall be installed in accordance with CBC 310.4.

37. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall provide analysis for angle of approach and departure for driveway entering off Kearney Street. If necessary, the Zoning Administrator may approve minor modifications to the project site plan to meet Fire Department requirements.

38. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, a “KNOX BOX” shall be installed with keys for all common areas.

Stege Sanitary District:

39. This applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Stege Sanitary District and participate in the San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program as it is developed, and pay all applicable fees.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Design Review Board at a regular meeting held on January 24, 2019, upon motion of Boardmember ____, second by Boardmember ______:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

_________________________
Sean Moss, AICP
Acting Planning Manager
10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito
(Re-Submittal)
**SITE ZONING INFORMATION**

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

**UNIT TYPE SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA*</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td>TH1.1</td>
<td>2 STORY UNIT - 2 BED/2.5 BATH</td>
<td>1,072 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td>TH2</td>
<td>1 STORY UNIT - 3 BED/2 BATH</td>
<td>1,102 SF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td>TH3</td>
<td>1 STORY UNIT - 3 BED/2 BATH</td>
<td>1,048 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td>TH4</td>
<td>2 STORY UNIT - 3 BED/2 BATH</td>
<td>1,274 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td>PH1</td>
<td>2 STORY UNIT - 2 BED/1.5 BATH</td>
<td>882 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td>PH2</td>
<td>2 STORY UNIT - 2 BED/1.5 BATH</td>
<td>925 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td>PH2.1</td>
<td>2 STORY UNIT - 2 BED/1.5 BATH</td>
<td>925 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td>TH1.1</td>
<td>LIVE-WORK UNIT</td>
<td>80 SQ.FT. MIN.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td>TH2</td>
<td>FLEX SPACE</td>
<td>80 SQ.FT. MIN.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOT AREA:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA*</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,083sf</td>
<td>51,630sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144,000sf*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOT COVERAGE (PER 19.03.110):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ALLOWABLE</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% MAX.</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUND FLOOR FRONT SETBACK:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ALLOWABLE</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15' MAX. (RES.)</td>
<td>15' MAX. (RES.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15' MAX. (RES.)</td>
<td>15' MAX. (RES.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIDE SETBACK:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ALLOWABLE</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4' MAX.</td>
<td>4' MAX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4' MAX.</td>
<td>4' MAX.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUND FLOOR TRANSPARENCY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ALLOWABLE</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% MIN.</td>
<td>25% MIN. (RES.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

- **SITE LOCATION:** 10300 SAN PABLO AVE. - CITY OF EL CERRITO, CA
- **PROJECT SCOPE:** THE PROPOSED MULTIFAMILY BUILDING HAS 32 UNITS WITH FLEX SPACE AND SHOPFRONT ON THE GROUND LEVEL.
- **FLOOR AREA (PER 19.03.090):** 12,083sf & 51,630sf
- **MINIMUM HEIGHT OF FIRST FLOOR:** 14 FEET MIN. CLEAR TO ALLOW FOR FLEX SPACE
- **MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF UPPER FLOOR:** 9 FEET MIN. CLEAR
- **TYPE VA CONSTRUCTION:**
  - **1 HR. EXTERIOR WALLS:**
  - **YES SPRINKLERED:**
  - **YES ELEVATOR:**
- **ALLOWABLE AREA: 1/10,000 S.F. OUTDOOR LANDSCAPE:
  - **MAX. 1 SPACE / UNIT:**
  - **33 SPACES PROVIDED:**

**CONTACT:**

WINFIELD DEVELOPMENT L.L.C.
3800 MOUNT DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 200
SAN RAMON, CA 94583
PHONE: (925) 866-0322
EMAIL: mbranagh@leftcoastarch.com

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT:
WINFIELD DEVELOPMENT L.L.C.
3800 MOUNT DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 200
SAN RAMON, CA 94583
PHONE: (925) 866-0322
EMAIL: mbranagh@leftcoastarch.com

LEFTCOAST ARCHITECTURE
3800 MOUNT DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 200
SAN RAMON, CA 94583
PHONE: (925) 866-0322
EMAIL: mbranagh@leftcoastarch.com

THOMAS BAAK & ASSOCIATES, LLP
3036 SAN RAMON VALLEY BLVD., SUITE 200
LAFAYETTE, CA 94549
PHONE: (925) 743-9500
EMAIL: scott@leftcoastarch.com

**SITE ZONING INFORMATION**

- **ALLOWABLE COMMERCIAL AREA:**
  - **1 STORIES:**
    - **MIN. HEIGHT:** 80 SQ.FT. MIN. / UNIT
  - **2 STORIES:**
    - **MIN. HEIGHT:** 80 SQ.FT. MIN. / UNIT

**ALLOWABLE PROPOSED AREA:**

- **1 STORY:**
  - **MIN. HEIGHT:** 4' MIN.
  - **MAX. HEIGHT:** 0' MIN.
- **2 STORY:**
  - **MIN. HEIGHT:** 4' 3' MIN.
  - **MAX. HEIGHT:** 0' MIN.

**LOT COVERAGE (PER 19.03.110):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ALLOWABLE</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% MAX.</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUND FLOOR TRANSPARENCY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ALLOWABLE</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST/2ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% MIN.</td>
<td>25% MIN. (RES.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD/4TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

- **SITE LOCATION:** 10300 SAN PABLO AVE. - CITY OF EL CERRITO, CA
- **PROJECT SCOPE:** THE PROPOSED MULTIFAMILY BUILDING HAS 32 UNITS WITH FLEX SPACE AND SHOPFRONT ON THE GROUND LEVEL.
- **FLOOR AREA (PER 19.03.090):** 12,083sf & 51,630sf
- **MINIMUM HEIGHT OF FIRST FLOOR:** 14 FEET MIN. CLEAR TO ALLOW FOR FLEX SPACE
- **MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF UPPER FLOOR:** 9 FEET MIN. CLEAR
- **TYPE VA CONSTRUCTION:**
  - **1 HR. EXTERIOR WALLS:**
  - **YES SPRINKLERED:**
  - **YES ELEVATOR:**
- **ALLOWABLE AREA: 1/10,000 S.F. OUTDOOR LANDSCAPE:
  - **MAX. 1 SPACE / UNIT:**
  - **33 SPACES PROVIDED:**

**CONTACT:**

WINFIELD DEVELOPMENT L.L.C.
3800 MOUNT DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 200
SAN RAMON, CA 94583
PHONE: (925) 866-0322
EMAIL: mbranagh@leftcoastarch.com

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT:
WINFIELD DEVELOPMENT L.L.C.
3800 MOUNT DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 200
SAN RAMON, CA 94583
PHONE: (925) 866-0322
EMAIL: mbranagh@leftcoastarch.com

LEFTCOAST ARCHITECTURE
3800 MOUNT DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 200
SAN RAMON, CA 94583
PHONE: (925) 866-0322
EMAIL: mbranagh@leftcoastarch.com

THOMAS BAAK & ASSOCIATES, LLP
3036 SAN RAMON VALLEY BLVD., SUITE 200
LAFAYETTE, CA 94549
PHONE: (925) 743-9500
EMAIL: scott@leftcoastarch.com

**SITE ZONING INFORMATION**

- **ALLOWABLE COMMERCIAL AREA:**
  - **1 STORIES:**
    - **MIN. HEIGHT:** 80 SQ.FT. MIN. / UNIT
  - **2 STORIES:**
    - **MIN. HEIGHT:** 80 SQ.FT. MIN. / UNIT

**ALLOWABLE PROPOSED AREA:**

- **1 STORY:**
  - **MIN. HEIGHT:** 4' MIN.
  - **MAX. HEIGHT:** 0' MIN.
- **2 STORY:**
  - **MIN. HEIGHT:** 4' 3' MIN.
  - **MAX. HEIGHT:** 0' MIN.10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito (Re-Submittal) Planning Dept. Submittal
10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito (Re-Submittal)
Planning Dept. Submittal

Unit Breakdown

- 32 Units:
  - (12) 3-bedroom Flat (+/- 1,060sf - 1,305sf)
  - (6) 2-bedroom Flat (+/- 989sf - 1,070sf)
  - (9) 2-bedroom 2-Story (+/- 872sf - 1,082sf)
  - (3) 3-bedroom 2-Story (+/- 1,292sf)
  - (2) Live/Work 2-Story (+/- 1,226sf)

Vehicle Parking Count:

- 33 Parking Spaces:
  - (15) Regular Spaces + (17) Garage Spaces + (1) ADA Space

Bicycle Parking Count:

- 5 Short-term Bike Parking spaces required
- (6 spaces provided)
- 47 Covered Long-term Bike Parking Required
  - (22) Inside Bike Storage Room (Vertical Rack System) + (25) Inside Vertical Racks at Garages

Accessible Path of Travel, TYP.

- 2% Max. Cross Slope
- 5% Max. Slope in Direction of Travel
- Path shall not be interrupted by steps or by abrupt changes in level exceeding 1/2

All existing buildings and parking to be demolished. See Civil Drawings for grading and drainage. See Landscape Drawings for Street Frontage and Parking Lot Landscaping.
10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito (Re-Submittal)
Planning Dept. Submittal

SITE PLAN - Shadow Study - Neighbor

SHADOW STUDY MEASURED ON WINTER SOLSTICE (DECEMBER 21) AT 1:30PM
10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito (Re-Submittal)
Planning Dept. Submittal

VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM CORNER OF SAN PABLO AVE. AND EUREKA AVE.

VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM CORNER OF EUREKA AVE. AND KEARNEY ST.

VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM KEARNEY ST.

VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE ALONG SAN PABLO AVE.

VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM EUREKA AVE.

VIEW OF EXISTING PROJECT SITE FROM KEARNEY ST.

EXISTING CONDITIONS
JULY 13, 2018
BUILDING DEPT. SUBMITTAL

PHOTO KEY

EXISTING PROJECT SITE

PHOTO KEY
10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito (Re-Submittal)
Planning Dept. Submittal

Unit Legend
- BIKE STORAGE
- ELEC. METER
- ELEC. RM.
- GARAGE
- MECH. RM.
- STAIR 1
- STAIR 2
- UNIT TH1
- UNIT TH1.1
- UNIT TH2
- UNIT TH3 (LIVE/WORK)
- UNIT TH3 (ALT)/LIVE/WORK
- UNIT TH4

FIRST LEVEL FLOOR PLAN

1" = 10'-0"
10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito (Re-Submittal)
Planning Dept. Submittal
Potential mural and artistic railing at plaza; see examples on Sheet A-3.4

10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito (Re-Submittal)
Planning Dept. Submittal

Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
# MATERIALS & COLORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1</th>
<th>SIDING</th>
<th>Material: 7/8&quot; Thick Stucco System Color: KM - Not My Fault (KM5825)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Material: 7/8&quot; Thick Stucco System Color: KM - Not My Fault (KM5825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SIDING</td>
<td>Material: 7/8&quot; Thick Stucco System Color: KM - Not My Fault (KM5825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>SIDING</td>
<td>Material: Thin Brick Veneer Manufacturer: Glen-Gery, Klayco Brick Color: Light Pumice (K86-237) Graphite (K11-9047) Pelican (K13-3059) *See color samples at sidebar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>SIDING</td>
<td>Material: Thin Brick Veneer Manufacturer: Glen-Gery, Klayco Brick Color: Light Pumice (K86-237) Graphite (K11-9047) Pelican (K13-3059) *See color samples at sidebar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>ROOF</td>
<td>Material: FRP Fiberglass Manufacturer: Tournesol Siteworks Color: Shadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>SIDING</td>
<td>Material: Aluminum Manufacturer: Western States Metals Color: Match Brick Color Pelican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>WINDOWS &amp; DOORS</td>
<td>Material: Vinyl Manufacturer: VPI Quality Windows Color: Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>WINDOWS &amp; DOORS</td>
<td>Material: Vinyl Manufacturer: VPI Quality Windows Color: Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BRICK VENEER COLORS:**
- Light Pumice (K86-237)
- Pelican (K13-3059)
- Graphite (K11-9047)

---

10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito (Re-Submittal)
Planning Dept. Submittal
PUBLIC ART EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE MURALS BY DAVID POLKA

EXAMPLE RAILINGS BY DEFAUWER DESIGN

10300 San Pablo Ave. El Cerrito (Re-Submittal)
Planning Dept. Submittal
Memorandum

Date: January 24, 2019
To: Interested Parties
From: Sean Moss, Zoning Administrator
Subject: Revised modifications to 10300 San Pablo Avenue project have no effect on environmental review documents

Staff notes that the project has been slightly modified since the June 2017 environmental documentation has been completed. The modifications include slight changes to exterior colors and materials, a revised rear building entry location, reduced sizes of windows, and a proposed gate at the parking lot entry. These changes are in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. Staff notes that there is no change to the number of units, the number of parking spaces, or to the maximum height and number of stories. While the changes are notable; they are minor in terms of the CEQA review and have no impacts on the conclusion of the environmental documentation.
10300 San Pablo Avenue

SAN PABLO AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

PREPARED BY:

METROPOLITAN PLANNING GROUP
22561 MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
HAYWARD, CALIFORNIA 94541
510.634.8443

June 28, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>10300 San Pablo Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead agency name and address:</td>
<td>City of El Cerrito Planning Division 10890 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, CA 94530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact person and phone number:</td>
<td>Sean Moss (510) 215-4359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location:</td>
<td>City of El Cerrito – San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Number:</td>
<td>PL16-0139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project sponsor’s name and address:</td>
<td>Mike Branagh Winfield Development L.L.C. 3800 Mount Diablo Blvd., Suite 200 Lafayette, CA 94549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner:</td>
<td>Stanley Zimmerman Revocable Trust 6363 Christie Ave, Apt 2517 Emeryville, CA 94608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Designation:</td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of project:</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>Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project’s surroundings:</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>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 32
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,</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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...
would be below the BAAQMD’s significance thresholds as described above. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be expected to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during project construction. The proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to short term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the TASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.

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

<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, 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>
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-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, paint, 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,\textsuperscript{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 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 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>

\textsuperscript{2} Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission, 2010. \textit{Oakland International Airport, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan}, Figure\textsuperscript{3}-2. September.

e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Sources: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR

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</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</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 dBA 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 from 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 with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</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

<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>
</table>
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>
</table>

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:

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

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

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.

1) LSA, Historical Resource Evaluation of 10300 San Pablo Avenue/State Route 123, El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California, February 8, 2017.


5) Fehr and Peers, 10300 San Pablo Avenue Preliminary Transportation Analysis, February 8, 2017.

6) AEI Consultants, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment at 10300 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California 94530, March 30, 2016.

http://www.el-cerrito.org/DocumentCenter/View/11102/10300-SPA-CEQA-Appendices
Memorandum

Date: January 24, 2019
To: Interested Parties
From: Sean Moss, Zoning Administrator
Subject: Revised modifications to 10300 San Pablo Avenue project have no effect on environmental review documents

Staff notes that the project has been slightly modified since the June 2017 environmental documentation has been completed. The modifications include slight changes to exterior colors and materials, a revised rear building entry location, reduced sizes of windows, and a proposed gate at the parking lot entry. These changes are in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. Staff notes that there is no change to the number of units, the number of parking spaces, or to the maximum height and number of stories. While the changes are notable; they are minor in terms of the CEQA review and have no impacts on the conclusion of the environmental documentation.
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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>
</table>
| **Lead agency name and address:** | City of El Cerrito Planning Division  
10890 San Pablo Avenue  
El Cerrito, CA 94530 |
| **Contact person and phone number:** | Sean Moss (510) 215-4359 |
| **Project Location:** | City of El Cerrito – San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area |
| **File Number:** | PL16-0139 |
| **Project sponsor's name and address:** | Mike Branagh  
Winfield Development L.L.C.  
3800 Mount Diablo Blvd., Suite 200  
Lafayette, CA 94549 |
| **Property Owner:** | Stanley Zimmerman Revocable Trust  
6363 Christie Ave, Apt 2517  
Emeryville, CA 94608 |
| **General Plan Designation:** | Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) |
| **Zoning:** | Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) |
| **Description of project:** | 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. |
| **Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings:** | 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. |
| **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):** | None |
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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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></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
would be below the BAAQMD's significance thresholds as described above. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be expected to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during project construction. The proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to short term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the TASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.

**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

<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, 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

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ii. Strong Seismic ground shaking?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

iv. Landslides?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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, paint, 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,\textsuperscript{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>
</table>

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  
\[\Box\] \[\Box\] \[\Box\] \[\times\]

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)?  
\[\Box\] \[\Box\] \[\Box\] \[\times\]

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?  
\[\Box\] \[\Box\] \[\Box\] \[\times\]

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?  
\[\Box\] \[\Box\] \[\Box\] \[\times\]

\textsuperscript{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 retails 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 with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</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>[x]</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>[x]</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>[x]</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**

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
</table>

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:

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

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

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.
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5) Fehr and Peers, 10300 San Pablo Avenue Preliminary Transportation Analysis, February 8, 2017.

6) AEI Consultants, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment at 10300 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California 94530, March 30, 2016.
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