1. Executive Summary

This Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to provide an assessment of the potential environmental consequences of approving and implementing The Outdoor Project Camp from the Mosaic Project (proposed project). This executive summary includes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in the Revised Draft EIR and presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified. The remainder of this Final EIR contains corrections and clarifications to the text and analysis of the Revised Draft EIR, where warranted, along with a response to comments matrix and a list of commenters. For a complete description of the proposed project, see Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the Revised Draft EIR. For a complete discussion of alternatives to the proposed project, see Chapter 5, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*, of the Revised Draft EIR.

The Revised Draft EIR addressed the environmental effects associated with approval and implementation of the proposed project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An EIR is a public document designed to provide the public, local, and State governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making.

The Revised Draft EIR was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA[1] and the State CEQA Guidelines[2] to determine if approval of the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment. The County of Alameda, as the Lead Agency, reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable County technical personnel and review technical reports. Information for the Revised Draft EIR was obtained from on-site field observations; discussions with public service agencies; analysis of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies, reports, data, and similar literature in the public domain; and specialized environmental assessments (e.g., air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, transportation, and utilities).

1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

The Revised Draft EIR, in conjunction with this Final EIR, has been prepared to assess the environmental effects associated with approval and development of the proposed project. The main purposes of the documents as established by CEQA are:

- To disclose to decision-makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.

[1] The CEQA Statute is found at California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Sections 21000 to 21177.

[2] The CEQA Guidelines are found at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 to 15387.

- To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
- To disclose to the public reasons for agency decision of projects with significant environmental effects.
- To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in the statute and in the CEQA Guidelines. It provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. An EIR is intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Final EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- Chapter 1: Executive Summary. Summarizes environmental consequences that would result from implementation of the project, describes recommended mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of environmental impacts before and after mitigation. Underlined text in Table 1-1, *Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, represents language that has been added to the impacts and mitigation measures in the EIR; text in ~~strikethrough~~ has been deleted from the EIR.
- Chapter 2: Introduction. Provides an overview describing the use and organization of this Final EIR.
- Chapter 3: Revisions to the Revised Draft EIR. Contains corrections to the text and graphics of the Revised Draft EIR. Underlined text represents language that has been added to the EIR; text in ~~strikethrough~~ has been deleted from the EIR.
- Chapter 4: List of Commenters. Lists the names of agencies and individuals who commented on the Revised Draft EIR.
- Chapter 5: Comments and Responses. Presents comments received from agencies and the public on the Revised Draft EIR alongside responses to each comment. Also contains "master responses" that provide comprehensive responses to key issues raised by several comments.

- Appendix: The appendix for this Final EIR contains the following:
  - Appendix D: Revised Biological Resources Information. This appendix has been revised to include the updated California Natural Diversity Database Summary Table.
  - Appendix E: Revised Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report. This appendix has been revised to add the memo confirming validity of the Geotechnical Engineering Report.
  - Appendix G: Revised Water and Wastewater System Reports. This appendix has been renamed from "Hydrology Reports" to "Revised Water and Wastewater System Reports." It has also been revised to include the most recent version of the NorthStar *Basis of Design Report for the Mosaic Project*, add the acceptance letter from State Water Resources Control Board Division of Drinking Water, the Preliminary Technical Report for a New Public Water System, and the onsite wastewater treatment system feasibility study approval from the Alameda County Environmental Health Department.
  - Appendix K: Revised Williamson Act Compatible Use Plan. This appendix has been revised to include the updated Compatible Use Plan, which removed the provision of pigmy goats.
  - Appendix L: Comment Letters. This appendix contains all comments received during the public review period for the Revised Draft EIR in their original format along with annotations that identify each individual comment number.
  - Appendix M: Safety Guidelines for Mosaic Camp Life. This appendix contains project-applicant-provided safety guidelines for the proposed project.
  - Appendix N: Civil Engineering Drawings and Creek Setback Calculations. This appendix contains the creek setback calculations prepared in July 2024.
  - Appendix O: Agricultural Plans. This appendix contains additional information on the agricultural component of the proposed project.
  - Appendix P: Castro Valley Unified School District Letter. This appendix contains the agreement letter from Castro Valley Unified School District for the provision of buses to transport students.
  - Appendix Q: Landscaping and Vegetation Plans. This appendix contains the proposed landscaping and vegetation plans.

The Revised Draft EIR is available online and incorporated here by reference. It constitutes part of the Final EIR.

1.2.1 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EIR

According to Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of an EIR is to:

> Inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

The EIR was prepared as a project EIR, pursuant to Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines. As a project EIR, the environmental analysis discussed the changes in the environment that would result from the development of proposed project. The Revised Draft EIR examined the specific short-term impacts (project construction) and long-term impacts (project operation) that would occur as a result of project approval by the Alameda County Planning Department, along with cumulative impacts. The conclusions made in the Revised Draft EIR are listed in Table 1-1 of this Final EIR, below.

1.2.2 DRAFT EIR

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, a lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 but before certification. The Notice of Availability was published on October 5, 2022, initiating the 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR, which closed on November 21, 2022. A public hearing was held on November 9, 2022, to receive public comments on the Draft EIR. Based on comments received on the Draft EIR, Alameda County recirculated the Revised Draft EIR prepared for the proposed Outdoor Project Camp. The following summarizes the revisions made to the October 2022 Draft EIR:

- Chapter 1, *Executive Summary*. This chapter was revised to include the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines related to recirculating a Draft EIR prior to certification, and a summary of the revisions made to the Draft EIR.
- Chapter 2, *Introduction*. This chapter was revised to include the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines related to recirculating a Draft EIR prior to certification, and a summary of the revisions made to the Draft EIR.
- Chapter 3, *Project Description*. This chapter was revised to reference the properties along the western boundary of the project site as agricultural instead of residential, and include an additional required permit for the project.
- Chapter 4.1, *Agriculture and Forestry Resources*. This chapter was revised to provide additional details regarding Williamson Act compliance and include reference to Appendix J, *Williamson Act Compatibility Plan*, of the Revised Draft EIR.
- Chapter 4.4, *Cultural Resources*. This chapter was revised to include reference Appendix K, *Cultural and Tribal Resources*, of the Revised Draft EIR.
- Chapter 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*. This chapter was revised to replace Figure 4.8-4, *Proposed Septic Layout*, of the Draft EIR with an updated figure that would not relocate the culvert and update references to the renamed Appendix G, *Hydrology Reports*, of the Revised Draft EIR.
- Chapter 4.13, *Tribal Cultural Resources.* This chapter was revised to include reference Appendix K, *Cultural and Tribal Resources*, of the Revised Draft EIR.
- Chapter 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*. This chapter was revised to update references to the renamed Appendix G, *Hydrology Reports*, of the Revised Draft EIR.

- Chapter 5, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*. This chapter was revised to rename the "Reduced Development Alternative" to the "Reduced Capacity Alternative" and include analysis of the newly added "Reduced Building Footprint Alternative."
- Appendix A, *Notice of Preparation*. This appendix was revised to include comments received during the scoping process.
- Appendix E, *Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report*. This appendix was revised to include Appendix C, *Exploratory Trench Logs,* of the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report.
- Appendix G, *Hydrology Reports*. This appendix was renamed from "Wastewater Basis of Design" to "Hydrology Reports" and was revised to include the reports referenced in Chapter 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, and Chapter 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems,* of the Draft EIR.
- Appendix J, *Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources.* This appendix was added to include the Cultural Resources Study and Tribal Outreach Letters.
- Appendix K, *Williamson Act Compatibility Plan*. This appendix was added to include the Williamson Act Compatibility Plan.

The Revised Draft EIR was recirculated pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f)(1). The entire document was recirculated, and the County of Alameda, as the lead agency, requested that reviewers submit new comments. Responses to comments on the October 2022 Draft EIR will not be provided in this Final EIR, though they are part of the administrative record. New comments on the recirculated Revised Draft EIR were required to be submitted for response in this Final EIR. Those who previously submitted comments on the October 2022 Draft EIR were encouraged to resubmit their comments.

1.3 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Mosaic Project, the project applicant, proposes The Outdoor Project Camp to develop an outdoor recreation facility in unincorporated Alameda County that would consist of demolishing an existing 7,500-square-foot garage, improving trails and miscellaneous dirt or gravel roads, and constructing the following components: twelve 400-square-foot camping cabins; a two-story, 40-foot-high, 8,500-square-foot central meeting and dining hall; a 1,025-square-foot restroom/shower building; and a two-story, 2,600-square-foot dwelling. A 1,200-square-foot caretaker's unit would remain from existing conditions. The project also includes water storage and treatment tanks along with sewer infrastructure that includes an on-site wastewater system with a leach field dispersal system. Refer to Figure 3-4, *Proposed Project Site Plan*, in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of the Revised Draft EIR for the proposed project's site plan.

1.4 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The Revised Draft EIR analyzes alternatives to the proposed project that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and feasibly attain some of the proposed project objectives. There is no set methodology for comparing the alternatives or determining the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA. Identification of the environmentally superior

alternative involves weighing and balancing all of the environmental resource areas by the County. The following alternatives to the proposed project were considered and analyzed in detail:

- No Project Alternative
- Reduced Capacity Alternative
- Reduced Building Footprint Alternative

Chapter 5, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*, of the Revised Draft EIR, includes a complete discussion of these alternatives and of alternatives that were considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis.

1.5 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the County of Alameda as lead agency related to:

- Whether the Revised Draft EIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the proposed project;
- Whether the benefits of the proposed project override environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance, if any;
- Whether identified mitigation measures should be adopted or modified; and
- Whether there are any alternatives to the proposed project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic objectives.

1.6 AREAS OF CONCERN

The County issued a Notice of Preparation on November 19, 2021, and held a scoping meeting on November 30, 2021, to receive comments. During the 30-day scoping period for this EIR, which concluded on December 19, 2021, responsible agencies and interested members of the public were invited to submit comments as to the scope and content of the EIR. Additionally, as detailed in Section 1.2.2, *Draft EIR*, responsible agencies and interested members of the public were also invited to submit comments pertaining to the environmental analysis presented in the October 2022 Draft EIR, which were then addressed in the Revised Draft EIR. While every environmental concern applicable to the CEQA process is addressed in the Revised Draft EIR, this list is not necessarily exhaustive; rather, it attempts to capture the concerns that are likely to generate the greatest interest based on the input received during the scoping process. The comments received include those focused on the following issues:

- Potential impacts to the safety of on-site and surrounding residents in case of a wildfire.
- Impacts on law enforcement from increased population and students on-site.
- Impacts on water availability for groundwater wells.

- Conflicts with zoning and land use designation.
- Concerns of waste discharge from septic facilities.
- Impacts of farm animals on natural habitat.
- Potential for project, including fire pits, to increase risk of wildfire.
- Evacuation concerns for on-site and off-site residents with increased population within a confined canyon.

1.7 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance.

As determined in the Revised Draft EIR, the proposed project has the potential to generate significant environmental impacts in a number of areas. Pursuant to Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. As shown in Table 1-1, all significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level if the mitigation measures identified in the Revised Draft EIR are adopted and implemented. As described in detail in Chapter 6, *CEQA-Mandated Sections*, of the Revised Draft EIR, the proposed project would have no significant impact on aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, energy, mineral resources, or population and housing due to existing conditions in the project area. Accordingly, these topics were not analyzed further in the Revised Draft EIR.

Table 1-1 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in the Revised Draft EIR and presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified. It is organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapters 4.1 through 4.15. Table 1-1 is arranged in four columns: 1) environmental impact; 2) significance without mitigation; 3) mitigation measures; and 4) significance with mitigation. For a complete description of potential impacts, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapters 4.1 through 4.15.

<u>Underlined</u> text in Table 1-1 represents language that has been added to the impacts and mitigation measures in the EIR; text in ~~strikethrough~~ has been deleted from the EIR.

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES			
AG-1: The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AG-2: The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (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)).	No Impact	N/A	N/A
AG-3: The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
AG-4: The proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AG-5: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to agriculture and forestry resources.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AIR QUALITY			
AQ-1: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-2: The proposed project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards.	S	**AQ-2:** The project construction contractor shall comply with the following the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's best management practices for reducing construction emissions of uncontrolled fugitive dust (coarse inhalable particulate matter [PM_{10}] and fine inhalable particulate matter [$PM_{2.5}$]): ▪ Water all active construction areas at least twice daily or as often as needed to control dust emissions. Watering shall be sufficient to	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water shall be used whenever possible. ▪ Pave, apply water twice daily or as often as necessary to control dust, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. ▪ Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer). ▪ Sweep daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) or as often as needed all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site to control dust. ▪ Sweep public streets daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) in the vicinity of the project site, or as often as needed, to keep streets free of visible soil material. ▪ Hydro-seed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas. ▪ Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (e.g., dirt, sand). ▪ Limit vehicle traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour. ▪ Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. ▪ Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff from public roadways. These measures shall be noted on grading plans. The construction contractor shall implement these measures during ground disturbing activities. The project applicant shall verify compliance that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.	
AQ-3: The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
AQ-4: The proposed project could result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.	S	**AQ-4:** The project applicant shall prepare and implement an Odor Management Plan (Plan) to ensure compliance with BAAQMD Regulation 1, Rule 1-301, Public Nuisance. The Plan shall control odors generated by manure collection and storage from the farm animals to ensure odors would not constitute a public nuisance. The Plan shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Alameda County Community Development Director or their designee prior to occupancy permits. At minimum, the Plan shall include the following: ▪ A sufficient buffer zone shall be implemented between the sensitive receptors and sources of odors ▪ Soiled bedding shall be removed and replaced with new bedding (e.g., straw, wood shavings, wood pellets, etc.) on a daily basis. ▪ Manure spills shall be cleaned upon occurrence. ▪ The moisture content of stockpiled manure shall be minimized to reduce the potential for release of odorous compounds during storage (e.g., use of a tarp to cover stockpiled manure). ▪ Dust suppression measures shall be implemented to prevent the release of odorous compound-carrying fugitive dust.	LTS
AQ-5: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, could cumulatively contribute to air quality impacts in the Air Basin.	S	**AQ-5:** Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-2 and AQ-4.	LTS
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
BIO-1: The proposed project could 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.	S	**BIO-1.1:** Adequate measures shall be taken to avoid inadvertent take of bird nests of native species protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and State Fish and Game Code when in active use. This shall be accomplished by taking the following steps: ▪ If tree removal and initial construction is proposed during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31), a focused survey for nesting raptors and other migratory birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 7 days prior to the onset of tree and vegetation removal in order to identify any active nests on the site and surrounding area within 100 feet of proposed construction. The proposed development area of the	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		project site shall be resurveyed to confirm that no new nests have been established if vegetation removal and demolition has not been completed or if construction has been delayed or curtailed for more than 7 days during the nesting season. ▪ If no active nests are identified during the construction survey period, or development is initiated during the non-breeding season (September 1 to January 31), tree and vegetation removal, building demolition, and project construction may proceed with no restrictions. ▪ If bird nests are found, an adequate setback shall be established around the nest location and vegetation removal, grading, and other construction activities restricted within this no-disturbance zone until the qualified biologist has confirmed that any young birds have fledged and are able to function outside the nest location. Required setback distances for the no-disturbance zone shall be based on input received from the CDFW, and may vary depending on nest location, species, and sensitivity to disturbance. As necessary, the no-disturbance zone shall be fenced with temporary orange construction fencing if construction is to be initiated on the remainder of the proposed development area on the project site. ▪ A report of findings shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted for review and approval by the County prior to initiation of vegetation removal, building demolition, grading and other construction during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31). The report shall either confirm absence of any active nests or should confirm that any young are located within a designated no-disturbance zone and construction can proceed. Following approval by the County, tree removal, building demolition, and construction within the nest buffer zone may proceed. No report of findings is required if vegetation removal and other construction is initiated during the non-nesting season (September 1 to January 31) and continues uninterrupted according to the above criteria. **BIO-1.2:** Adequate measures shall be taken to avoid inadvertent take of special-status bat species if present in trees within the proposed	

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation

		development area on the project site. This shall be accomplished by taking the following steps:
		▪ A qualified biologist shall visually inspect trees to be removed and buildings to be demolished for bat roosts within 7 days prior to their removal. The biologist shall look for signs of bats including sightings of live or dead bats, bat calls or squeaking, the smell of bats, bat droppings, grease stains or urine stains around openings in trees, or flies around such openings. Trees with multiple hollows, crevices, forked branches, woodpecker holes, or loose and flaking bark have the highest chance of occupation and shall be inspected the most carefully.
		▪ If signs of bats are detected, confirmation on presence or absence shall be determined by the qualified biologist, which may include night emergency or acoustic surveys.
		▪ Due to restrictions of the California Health Department, direct contact by workers with any bat is not allowed. The qualified bat biologist shall be contacted immediately if a bat roost is discovered during project construction.
		▪ If an active maternity roost is encountered during the maternity season (April 15 to August 31), the CDFW shall be contacted for direction on how to proceed and an appropriate exclusion zone established around the occupied tree or structure until young bats are old enough to leave the roost without jeopardy. The size of the buffer would take into account:
		  ▪ Proximity and noise level of project activities;
		  ▪ Distance and amount of vegetation or screening between the roost and construction activities; and
		  ▪ Species-specific needs, if known, such as sensitivity to disturbance.
		
		BIO-1.3: Adequate measures shall be taken to avoid inadvertent take of San Francisco dusky-footed woodrats on the project site. This shall be accomplished by taking the following steps:
		▪ A qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct a preconstruction survey for San Francisco dusky-footed woodrats, to determine whether	

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		any stick nests are present in the vicinity of proposed vegetation removal and development. The survey shall be performed within 30 days prior to initiation of vegetation removal and grading. ▪ If any nests are encountered within the limits of proposed grading and development, a trapping and relocation effort shall be conducted outside the breeding season (March 1 through August 31) to ensure any young are not inadvertently lost due to the destruction of the protective nest. ▪ Any nests within the construction zone shall be relocated to locations retained as undeveloped open space and individual woodrats released into their relocated nests. The trapping and relocation effort shall preferably be conducted within 7 days prior to grubbing and vegetation removal to prevent individual woodrats from moving back into the construction zone. **BIO-1.4:** Adequate measures shall be taken to avoid inadvertent take of Alameda whipsnake, California red-legged frog, and western pond turtle during construction. This shall be accomplished by taking the following steps: ▪ A qualified biologist shall be retained by the applicant to oversee construction and ensure that no inadvertent take of Alameda whipsnake, California red-legged frog, or western pond turtle occurs as a result of grading and other habitat modifications to the proposed development area on the project site. ▪ Prior to any grading or grubbing, the qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey to confirm absence of any Alameda whipsnake, California red-legged frog, or western pond turtle in the vicinity of construction and areas to be graded. ▪ The qualified biologist shall train the on-site monitor (such as the construction foreman) in how to identify Alameda whipsnake, California red-legged frog, and western pond turtle, and procedures to follow as part of construction monitoring. The qualified biologist shall visit the site at least once a week during initial construction and confer	

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		with the trained on-site monitor for at least one month until the construction area is stabilized and to confirm that the exclusionary fencing installed to prevent access into areas of disturbance has been properly maintained. ▪ All construction workers shall be trained regarding the potential presence of Alameda whipsnake, California red-legged frog, and western pond turtle prior to initiating any construction, and instructed that these species are to be avoided, that the foreman must be notified if any individuals are encountered, and that construction shall be halted until the qualified biologist arrives and makes a determination on possible presence. ▪ The qualified biologist shall oversee initial vegetation clearing and installation of wildlife exclusionary fencing to prevent Alameda whipsnake, California red-legged frog or western pond turtle from entering the construction area. The wildlife exclusionary fencing material and design shall meet with latest standards called for by the USFWS and CDFW, and shall include one-way funnels to allow for snakes and other small wildlife to exit the fenced construction zone. The exclusionary fencing shall be maintained and remain in place for the duration of construction until the qualified biologist has determined that it is no longer needed. ▪ Vegetation clearing shall be performed by hand and all slash shall be removed from the construction zone to remove any protective cover that could attract snakes and other wildlife. Operation of grading equipment shall not occur until vegetative cover has been completely removed from the fenced construction zone and the qualified biologist has performed a pre-grading survey to confirm absence of any Alameda whipsnake, California red-legged frog, or western pond turtle in the vicinity of construction and areas to be graded. ▪ During the construction phase of the project, the qualified biologist or trained on-site monitor shall check to ensure that the exclusionary fencing is intact. The fenced construction area shall be inspected by the qualified biologist or trained on-site monitor each morning and evening of construction activities for possible presence of Alameda whipsnake,	

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		California red-legged frog, or western pond turtle. This includes checking holes, under vehicles and under boards left on the ground. ▪ During construction, any holes or trenches greater than 6-inches shall be covered with plywood or similar non-heat conductive materials and ramp larger trenches that cannot be readily covered at end of each work day to allow escape of any animals. ▪ Use of monofilament plastic for erosion control or other practices shall be prohibited on the site to prevent possible entrainment. ▪ All food waste shall be removed daily from the site to avoid attracting predators. ▪ If any western pond turtle is encountered within the proposed development area, construction shall be halted until the qualified biologist relocates the individual to secure habitat along Cull Creek. ▪ If any Alameda whipsnake or California red-legged frog are found within the proposed development area, construction shall be halted until they disperse naturally, and the monitor shall immediately notify the qualified biologist in charge and representatives of the USFWS and CDFW. Construction shall not proceed until adequate measures are taken to prevent dispersal of any individuals into the construction zone, as directed by the USFWS and CDFW. ▪ Subsequent recommendations made by the USFWS and CDFW necessary to avoid take of Alameda whipsnake and/or California red-legged frog shall be followed. Only an agency-approved biologist is allowed to handle or otherwise direct movement of Alameda whipsnake or California red-legged frog, and all others shall not handle or otherwise harass the animal(s). The qualified biologist and the on-site monitor shall be aware of all terms and conditions set by USFWS and CDFW on the project, if that becomes necessary.	
BIO-2: The proposed project would not 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 or US Fish and Wildlife Service.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
BIO-3: The proposed project would not have a substantial or adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-4: The proposed project could 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.	S	**BIO-4:** Measures shall be taken to prevent disruption of native wildlife movement opportunities and potential native wildlife nursery habitat. These shall include the following: ▪ Fencing which obstructs wildlife movement shall not cross the Cull Creek channel or form a barrier between the creek and the woodlands to the west of the proposed development area on the project site. ▪ Fencing to control and protect livestock shall be restricted outside the Cull Creek corridor away from the top of bank and shall allow for passage of wildlife around at least one side of the enclosed perimeter. ▪ New lighting shall be carefully designed and controlled to prevent unnecessary illumination of natural habitat on the site, particularly the Cull Creek corridor and undeveloped woodlands to the west of the proposed development area. Lighting shall be restricted to building envelopes and the minimum level necessary to illuminate pathways, parking areas, and other outdoor areas. Lighting shall generally be kept low to the ground, directed downward, and shielded to prevent illumination into adjacent natural areas. Lighting from the Cafeteria/Mess Hall building shall be turned off after staff/employees leave the structure at the end of the day or evening, except the minimum necessary for security purposes. ▪ Dogs and cats shall be confined to the proposed development area or leashed and under voice control at all times to minimize harassment and loss of wildlife along the Cull Creek corridor and undeveloped woodlands to the west. ▪ All garbage, recycling, and composting shall be kept in closed containers and latched or locked to prevent wildlife from using the waste as a food source.	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
BIO-5: The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-6: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
BIO-7: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, would not have a cumulative significant impact in regard to biological resources.	LTS	N/A	N/A
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
CULT-1: The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
CULT-2: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	S	**CULT-2:** If archaeological resources are encountered during excavation or construction, construction personnel shall be instructed to immediately suspend all activity in the immediate vicinity of the suspected resources and the County and a licensed archeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the situation. A licensed archeologist shall be retained to inspect the discovery and make any necessary recommendations to evaluate the find under current CEQA Guidelines prior to the submittal of a resource mitigation plan and monitoring program to the County for review and approval prior to the continuation of any on-site construction activity.	LTS
CULT-3: The proposed project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.	S	**CULT-3:** In the event a human burial or skeletal element is identified during excavation or construction, work in that location shall stop immediately until the find can be properly treated. The County and the Alameda County Coroner's office shall be notified. If deemed prehistoric, the Coroner's office would notify the Native American Heritage Commission who would identify a "Most Likely Descendant (MLD)." The archeological consultant and MLD, in conjunction with the project sponsor, shall formulate an appropriate treatment plan for the find, which	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		might include, but not be limited to, respectful scientific recording and removal, being left in place, removal and reburial on site, or elsewhere. Associated grave goods are to be treated in the same manner.	
CULT-4: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resource.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
GEO-1: The proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause 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; ii) Strong seismic ground shaking; iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; iv) Landslides, mudslides, or other similar hazards.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-2: The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-3: The proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-4: The proposed project could be located on expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), however would not create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-5: The proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
GEO-6: The proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	S	**GEO-6:** In the event that fossils or fossil-bearing deposits are discovered during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. The contractor shall notify a qualified paleontologist to examine the discovery. The paleontologist shall document the discovery, as needed, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the finding under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the project proponent determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the project based on the qualities that make the resource important. The plan shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to implementation.	LTS
GEO-7: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology and soils.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
GHG-1: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that result in a significant impact on the environment.	S	**GHG-1.1a:** The project applicant shall design and construct all new buildings to use all electric energy systems, meaning that electricity is the primary source of energy for water heating; mechanical; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) (i.e., space-heating); cooking; and clothes-drying. Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects within the project site, the project developer(s) shall provide documentation (e.g., site plans) to the County of Alameda Community Development Director or their designee, to verify implementation of the of the design requirements specified above in this mitigation measure. Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the County shall verify implementation of the design requirements specified above.	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		~~**GHG-1.1b:** The project applicant shall purchase 450 voluntary carbon credits. The project applicant shall provide proof of offset credit retirement on the relevant registry – including certificate numbers or a transaction ID that match the quantity purchased – along with a clearly identified purpose and the beneficiary of the retirement – prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for each development phase to the County.~~ ~~Local Prioritization. The project applicant shall prioritize local (within the Northern California region) and in-state credits over national credits. Credits shall be third-party verified by a major registry recognized by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) such as Climate Action Reserve (CAR). If sufficient local and in-state credits are not available, the project applicant shall purchase CARB-conforming national credits registered with an approved registry~~ ~~Purchase of Voluntary Carbon Offsets. The project applicant shall purchase CARB-verified GHG credits to achieve the measure performance standards for each development phase.~~ ~~The project applicant may purchase GHG credits from a voluntary GHG credit provider that has an established protocol that requires projects generating GHG credits to demonstrate that the reduction of GHG emissions are real, permanent, quantifiable, verifiable, enforceable, and additional (per the definition in California Health and Safety Code Sections 38562(d)(1) and (2)). Definitions for these terms are as follows:~~ ~~▪ Real: Estimated GHG reductions should not be an artifact of incomplete or inaccurate emissions accounting. Methods for quantifying emission reductions should be conservative to avoid overstating a project's effects. The effects of a project on GHG emissions must be comprehensively accounted for, including unintended effects (often referred to as "leakage").[1]~~ ~~▪ Additional: GHG reductions must be additional to any that would have occurred in the absence of the Climate Action Reserve, or of a market~~	

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		~~for GHG reductions generally. "Business as usual" reductions (i.e., those that would occur in the absence of a GHG reduction market) should not be eligible for registration.~~ ~~▪ Permanent: To function as offsets to GHG emissions, GHG reductions must effectively be "permanent." This means, in general, that any net reversal in GHG reductions used to offset emissions must be fully accounted for and compensated through the achievement of additional reductions.~~ ~~▪ Quantifiable: The ability to accurately measure and calculate GHG reductions or GHG removal enhancements relative to a project baseline in a reliable and replicable manner for all GHG emission sources, GHG sinks, or GHG reservoirs included within the offset project boundary, while accounting for uncertainty and activity-shifting leakage and market-shifting leakage.~~ ~~▪ Verified: GHG reductions must result from activities that have been verified. Verification requires third-party review of monitoring data for a project to ensure the data are complete and accurate.~~ ~~▪ Enforceable: The emission reductions from offset must be backed by a legal instrument or contract that defines exclusive ownership and the legal instrument can be enforced within the legal system in the country in which the offset project occurs or through other compulsory means. Please note that per this mitigation measure, only credits originating within the United States are allowed.~~ ~~GHG credits may be in the form of GHG offsets for prior reductions of GHG emissions verified through protocols or forecasted mitigation units for future committed GHG emissions meeting protocols. All credits shall be documented per protocols functionally equivalent in terms of stringency to CARB's protocol for offsets in the cap-and-trade program.~~ ~~Prioritization of Emissions Reduction Commitments.~~ ~~The project applicant shall identify GHG credits in geographies closest to the project site first and only go to larger geographies (i.e., California, United States) if~~	

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		~~adequate credits cannot be found in closer geographies, or the procurement of such credits would create an undue financial burden.~~ ~~The project applicant shall provide the following justification for not using credits in closer geographies in terms of either availability or cost prohibition.~~ ~~• Lack of enough credits available in closer geographies (i.e., Northern California).~~ ~~• Prohibitively costly credits in closer geographies defined as credits costing more than 300 percent the amount of the current costs of credits in the regulated CARB offset market.~~ ~~• Documentation submitted supporting GHG credit proposals shall be prepared by individuals qualified in GHG credit development and verification and such individuals shall certify the following.~~ ~~• Proposed credits meet the criteria in California Health and Safety Code Section 38562(d)(1) and (d)(2).~~ ~~• Proposed credits meet the definitions for the criteria provided in this measure.~~ ~~• The protocols used for the credits meet or exceed the standards for stringency used in CARB protocols for offsets under the California cap-and-trade system.~~ GHG-1.2: Site plans submitted to the County shall identify parking stalls with electric vehicle (EV) capable charging stations consistent with the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) voluntary Tier 2 nonresidential measures to provide four electric vehicle (EV) charging stations for the 15 proposed parking spaces, as seen on Table A5.106.5.3.2 of the 2019 CALGreen. Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects within the project site, the project developer(s) shall provide documentation (e.g., site plans) to the County of Alameda Community Development Director or their designee, to verify implementation of the of the design requirements specified above in this mitigation measure. Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy,	

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
		the County shall verify implementation of the design requirements specified above.	
GHG-2: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GHG-3: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to greenhouse gas emissions.	S	**GHG-3:** Implement Mitigation Measures GHG-1.1~~a, GHG-1.1b,~~ and GHG-1.2.	LTS
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
HAZ-1: The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plans.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-2: The proposed project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-3: The proposed project would not, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALTY			
HYD-1: The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-2: The proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
HYD-3: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; iii) 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; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-4: The proposed site is not located in a 100-year floodplain, dam inundation, tsunami, or seiche zone and would not release pollutants due to inundation from a flood hazard.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
HYD-5: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts relating to hydrology and water quality that are cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current, and reasonably foreseeable projects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
LUP-1: The proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LUP-2: The proposed project would/would not, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to land use and planning.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
NOISE			
NOI-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the generation of temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOI-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOI-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people residing or working within two miles of a private airstrip or airport to excessive noise levels.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
NOI-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to noise or vibration.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PUBLIC SERVICES			
PS-1: The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection services.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
PS-2: The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection services.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-3: The proposed project would not combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to fire protection or police protection services.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANSPORTATION			
TRAN-1: The proposed project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRAN-2: The proposed project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRAN-3: The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRAN-4: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRAN-5: The proposed project would not, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to transportation.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES			
TCR-1: The proposed project could 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: (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 (b) 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency will consider the significance to a California Native American tribe.	S	**TCR-1.1:** Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-2: CULT-2**:** If archaeological resources are encountered during excavation or construction, construction personnel shall be instructed to immediately suspend all activity in the immediate vicinity of the suspected resources and the County and a licensed archeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the situation. A licensed archeologist shall be retained to inspect the discovery and make any necessary recommendations to evaluate the find under current CEQA Guidelines prior to the submittal of a resource mitigation plan and monitoring program to the County for review and approval prior to the continuation of any on-site construction activity. **TCR-1.2:** Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-3: CULT-3: In the event a human burial or skeletal element is identified during excavation or construction, work in that location shall stop immediately until the find can be properly treated. The County and the Alameda County Coroner's office shall be notified. If deemed prehistoric, the Coroner's office would notify the Native American Heritage Commission who would identify a "Most Likely Descendant (MLD)." The archeological consultant and MLD, in conjunction with the project sponsor, shall formulate an appropriate treatment plan for the find, which might include, but not be limited to, respectful scientific recording and removal, being left in place, removal and reburial on site, or elsewhere. Associated grave goods are to be treated in the same manner.	LTS
TCR-2: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to tribal cultural resources.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
UTIL-1: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-2: The proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-3: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-6: Implementation of the proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-7: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to utilities and service systems.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance with Mitigation
WILDFIRE			
WF-1: The proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
WF-2: The proposed project could, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.	S	**WF-2:** Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit revised landscape plans as well as a vegetation management plan to the Alameda County Fire Department for review and approval. The project site plan shall be revised, if necessary, to conform to the revised landscaping plan and vegetation management plan.	LTS
WF-3: The proposed project could require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.	S	**WF-3a:** Implement Mitigation Measure WF-2. **WF-3b:** The proposed Fire Safety & Emergency Response Guide shall include education information regarding the wildfire risks associated with vehicle fires. In addition, signage shall be posted at or near the entrance to the project driveway to inform occupants of entering vehicles of current fire danger levels and the dangers of roadway sparks.	LTS
WF-4: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.	LTS	N/A	N/A
WF-5: The proposed project would not, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to wildfire.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

This page intentionally left blank.