

Section 2

New Proposed Project

2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Following the close of the comment period on the Draft SEIR, the City determined that it no longer wanted to move forward with the BART garage and, as a result, the project sponsor reconsidered its proposal. In March 2005, the City of El Cerrito Community Development Department received revised plans for the project site, which included 128 residential units, 158 parking spaces for residents and guests, and a revised daylighting and restoration plan for Cerrito Creek. This revised plan was initially evaluated as the Residential Only Alternative in the Draft SEIR and represents the current development proposal before the City for review (hereinafter referred to as the Residential Only Project).

The proposed Residential Only Project would total approximately 211,596 square feet (including parking) and would occupy about 44 percent of the 131,987-square foot (3.03 acres) project site. This new proposed project would consist of 128 dwelling units with a total of 158 parking spaces. The Residential Only Project would consist of one four-story building and one three-story building above one-level podium parking garages (see Figures 2-1 and 2-2), generally ranging from 45 to 59 feet in height. One building (Building 1) would be located on the northern portion of the project site, directly east of the Copeland's Sports store in the location of the previously proposed BART garage. The second building (Building 2) would be located in the southern portion of the site, immediately north of Cerrito Creek, which is proposed to be daylighted, in the original location of the residential portion of the project. The two buildings would be linked by a pedestrian bridge between the southern wall of Building 1 and the northern wall of Building 2.

The one-level podium garage in Building 1 would have 45 residential parking spaces (2 of which would be handicapped) and 24 guest parking spaces (1 of which would be handicapped). The one-level podium garage in Building 2 would have 89 residential parking spaces (4 of which would be handicapped). The dwelling units would be a mix of for-sale townhouses and flats. Building 1 podium parking structure would be accessible from the southwestern corner of the building and Building 2 podium parking structure would be accessible from the northern side of the building. Thus, the entry/exit into the Building 1 garage would be directly aligned with the entry/exit into the Building 2 garage, providing access between the two parking structures. Bicycle parking and storage area would be located on the south side of Building 2 and motorcycle parking area would be located on the north side of Building 2.

Slipsheet Figure 2-1

Slipsheet Figure 2-2

As part of the Residential Only Project, approximately 180 feet of Cerrito Creek, currently culverted, along the southern border of Building 2, would be daylighted and restored to a natural condition. Daylighting would include an approximately 60-foot creek corridor right-of-way, where 20 feet would be dedicated to bank slopes and 39 feet to the meandering belt, which would include an 11-foot wide active channel. In addition to daylighting the creek, the project sponsor would provide a 10-foot-wide, with 2-foot buffers on each side, multi-use path along the north bank of the creek. The multi-use path would connect to the Ohlone Greenway. Figure 2-1 shows the creek corridor and the multi-use path.

Vehicular access to the Residential Only Project would be provided via Evelyn Avenue in the City of Albany as well as through the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center along the western and northern perimeter of the project site. Emergency vehicle access would be provided via an emergency vehicle access road stretching most of the length of the eastern border of the project site and extending into the interior of the project site between Building 1 and Building 2 (see Figure 2-1). Pedestrian access into the Residential Only Project would be provided through three separate lobby areas; one lobby area on the south side of Building 1 and two lobby areas on the north and south sides of Building 2, respectively. A sidewalk would be provided along the western side of both residential buildings. The sidewalk would connect to three pedestrian crosswalks leading to the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center.

The Residential Only Project would include 35,936 square feet (0.82 acres) of shared open space: 12,616 square feet (0.29 acres) would be on the podium, 15,915 square feet (0.37 acres) would represent the daylighted Cerrito Creek, and 7,405 square feet (0.17 acres) would represent the emergency vehicle access road. The Residential Only Project would also include 50 square feet each of personal open space for 112 of the 128 units. Approximately 23,912 square feet (0.55 acres) of the project site would be landscaped. Most of the landscaped area would be at grade around the perimeter of Buildings 1 and 2.

Figure 2-3 illustrates building elevations, essentially showing how the buildings would appear at each of its facades. Figure 2-4 presents sections of the buildings.

The construction of the Residential Only Project would take approximately 20 months. The daylighting of Cerrito Creek would take about two months to complete and would be expected to take place towards the end of construction of the Residential Only Project.

2.2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

This analysis expands on the Residential Only Alternative impact assessment presented on pages 4-7 through 4-10 of the Draft SEIR. Additionally, the impact assessment compares the impacts of the proposed project from the Draft SEIR to those of the Residential Only Project.

Insert figure 2-3: elevations

Insert figure 2-4: sections

Land Use, Plans, and Zoning

As discussed in the Draft SEIR, page 4-7, the Residential Only Alternative would have had land use impacts similar to the proposed project in that it would not divide a community and not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

As under the proposed project, the Residential Only Project would be consistent with and help achieve the City of El Cerrito's goals of revitalizing the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center area and developing uses that would functionally complement each other. The Residential Only Project would result in 211,596 square feet of floor space including the garage on the 3.03-acre lot. The parking areas of this project would cover 44 percent of the lot area. As with the proposed project, this alternative would provide open space amenities as well as a multi-use path along the restored portion of Cerrito Creek and would, thus, be consistent with the policies regarding provision of amenities for residential uses and along the restored portion of Cerrito Creek.

The Residential Only Project would result in a density of approximately 45 dwelling units (d.u.)/acre.¹ Unlike the proposed project under the Draft SEIR, the Residential Only Project would comply with the maximum density of 45 d.u./acre permitted under the City's Incentives Program. (For a detailed explanation of the City's Incentives Program, please refer to page 3.1-8 of the Draft SEIR). As discussed in the Draft SEIR page 3.1-8, a project processed under the Incentives Program must include desirable features, such as exceptional design, creative design of off-street parking, enhancements to public amenities, environmental benefits such as creek restoration, and similar benefits to the community. Section 19.32.200 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance lists 17 desirable features that would qualify a project to be processed through the Incentives Program. An application for the Incentives Program need not include all of the desirable features listed in Section 19.32.200, and the Planning Commission may approve an Incentives Program permit if a project incorporates some of the desired features. Finally, it is not the Draft SEIR that makes the determination about whether the project is eligible for the Incentives Program; that determination lies with the Planning Commission. The role of the Draft SEIR is to identify the potential impacts associated with a project and to recommend mitigation measures where warranted.

The above discussion notwithstanding, the Residential Only Project would provide several desirable features listed in Section 19.32.200. Specifically, this alternative would provide an environmental benefit by daylighting Cerrito Creek and a recreational benefit by providing a multi-use path that connects to Ohlone Greenway along the restored creek. Furthermore, the Residential Only Project would locate housing close to shopping and transportation centers and, as such, would reduce reliance on automobile usage. During project approval, the Planning Commission will make a determination as to whether the above-described desirable features warrant the exceptions to development standards sought by the project sponsor.

¹ 128 dwelling units / 2.76 acres = 43.68 dwelling units per acre. Pursuant to El Cerrito procedures, per acre calculation excludes existing easements.

The Draft SEIR notes that the residential area around Cougar Field is designated for Low Density Residential and is zoned R-1, Single-Family Residential, which allows up to 9 d.u./net acre. While the El Cerrito single-family residential neighborhood east of the project site allows up to 9 d.u./acre, the neighborhood is separated from the proposed residential development by Cougar Field, the Ohlone Greenway, and BART aerial tracks. Thus, the Residential Only Project would not be directly adjacent to a single-family neighborhood. The Albany residential neighborhood immediately south of the project site consists of a mix of single-family and multi-family housing units, including apartment buildings (zoned R-3, Residential High Density, allowing densities of up to 39 d.u./acre). Given this mix, the Residential Only Project would not be incompatible with the residential uses south of the project site.

Furthermore, unlike the proposed project, the Residential Only Alternative would be consistent with Policies CD2.7 and LU5.5, which require that site design meet accessibility needs of the community, not be exclusively oriented to those who travel by car, provide adequate pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and ensure accessibility for persons with disabilities are available. The Residential Only Project would support these policies, because its design includes a ramp serving people with disabilities and a connection between the proposed multi-use path adjacent to Cerrito Creek and the Ohlone Greenway.

The Cerrito Creek Bay Trail Connector Master Plan (Master Plan), Goal 6, calls for designing segments of the Cerrito Creek Greenway Project according to current best practices that exceed existing local, state, and federal standards. (For information on the Master Plan, see page 3.1-9, of the Draft SEIR). The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) recommends a minimum width of 10 feet for a high-use paved multi-use Class I path, with two feet lateral clearance on each side of the trail and eight feet vertical clearance. The proposed multi-use path would satisfy Caltrans' recommendations and, as such, would be consistent with Goal 6 of the Master Plan. Compared with the proposed project, which did not meet Goal 6 of the Master Plan, the Residential Only Project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Similar to the proposed project, the Residential Only Project would be subject to review and discretionary approval as required by the Zoning Ordinance. The required approvals are listed on page 3.1-16, of the Draft SEIR. The conditional approvals by the City would avoid significant land use impacts resulting from this alternative's inconsistencies with the Zoning Ordinance. It should be noted that the proposed 23,912 square feet (0.55 acres) of landscaping would exceed the required 12,809 square feet (0.29 acres) of landscaping. The 35,936 square feet of shared open space would also exceed the required 19,200 square feet. The Residential Only Project, however, would not meet City parking requirements, which call for 201 parking spaces. The Residential Only Project would provide 158 parking spaces, a 43-space shortfall. Finally, the Planning Commission would permit the Residential Only Project to exceed the maximum allowable height of 35 feet, with a use permit.

General Plan Policies LU1.3 and LU4.5 require that development address quality of life issues, including visual quality, traffic, noise, and air quality. The proposed project was found to be inconsistent with these policies but the potentially significant environmental impacts could be reduced to less than significant if the proposed mitigation measures were adopted. The Residential Only Project

would result in fewer impacts than the proposed project (lower buildings, 1,549 fewer weekday vehicle trips, less BART train noise reflection, and lesser automobile-related air emissions) and be more supportive in achieving Policies LU1.3 and LU4.5 than the proposed project identified in the Draft SEIR.

Overall, the Residential Only Project would result in fewer land use impacts than the proposed project. Land Use Mitigation Measures LU-2.1 through LU-2.3 would no longer be applicable. Cumulative land use impacts of the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project on page 3.1-19 of the Draft SEIR.

Population, Housing, and Employment

The Draft SEIR on page 4-8 presents a discussion of population, housing, and employment impacts associated with the Residential Only Project. The Draft SEIR concluded that the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative impacts as the proposed project.

Visual Quality

The Residential Only Project would further reduce less-than-significant visual quality impacts identified for the proposed project, because building heights and residential density under the Residential Only Project would be less than the proposed project. The proposed project would include buildings with heights ranging from 45 to 68 feet, as opposed to the Residential Only Project, which would include buildings with heights ranging from 45 to 59 feet.² The height of the Residential Only Project is more comparable to the nearest residential structure on Evelyn Avenue which reaches about 35 to 40 feet in height. The Residential Only Project would be one story taller than the existing residential development nearest to the project site on Evelyn Avenue. Views of the project site from other El Cerrito locations would also result in lesser impacts under the Residential Only Project than under the proposed project. As noted above, this alternative would comply with the El Cerrito Incentives Program by not exceeding the maximum allowable density of 45 d.u./acre. Finally, this alternative eliminates the Measure C parking garage which does not lend itself to a visually cohesive design with surrounding uses.

The Residential Only Project would be subject to review and approval by the zoning administrator, administrative design review committee, and design review board “to properly guide the development of the city to insure the health, sale, comfort and general welfare of the citizens of the city”, as described in Chapter 19.36 of the City’s Zoning Code. In order to approve this project, the design review board must confirm that all colors and materials of the exterior surface of buildings, other structures, landscaping, and site design be harmonious and architecturally compatible with their surrounding environment. The board must determine that the proposed building or structure is compatible in its exterior design and appearance with the appearance of other existing structures in the neighborhood that would cause the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.

² MVE & Partners. Electronic communication with EIP Associates, June 29, 2005.

Emphasis is placed upon exterior design with regard to height, bulk and area openings, breaks in the facade facing on a public or private street, line and pitch of roof, and arrangement of structures on the parcel. Additionally, the circulation pattern must be designed to maximize pedestrian safety and minimize traffic congestion. As discussed above, the maximum height limit of 35 feet may be exceeded, provided a use permit is obtained.

The design review process includes public review, possibility for required design change, and public ability to appeal design review board decisions. Building permits are not issued unless approval of the proposed development is granted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 19.36, of the Zoning Code. Business licenses for any activity, operation, or establishment would not be issued unless design review occurs and approval is granted. Therefore, the design review process would mitigate various potential impacts associated with scenic vistas, scenic resources, and existing visual character or quality of the site.

Reference to the *Bowman v. City of Berkeley* case in the impact analysis is included to provide an example of an urban infill project that also deals with a neighborhood concern for aesthetic impacts. The Bowman decision found that “purely aesthetic” impacts generally are not significant for projects in developed areas. The project building in question in the Bowman case generated an outcry from neighbors concerned about the scale of the structure. The Court held that such differences of opinion regarding aesthetics did not amount to a “fair argument” under CEQA, particularly where the building had undergone an extensive design review process. As stated in the decision, “Where a project must undergo design review under local law that process itself can be found to mitigate purely aesthetic impacts to insignificance, even if some people are dissatisfied with the outcome.” It should be noted that the design review process must result in some noticeable change in the design of the project in order to mitigate potential visual impacts. In cases where design review is advisory and may not yield recommended revisions to the plan design, the impacts could remain unchanged. The Draft SEIR states on page 3.3-21 that information from the Bowman decision in combination with other significant factors led to a conclusion of less-than-significant impacts. To reiterate, the Bowman decision says that “purely aesthetic impacts *generally* are not significant for projects in developed areas” and that is why a project specific analysis was completed for the El Cerrito Plaza Mixed-Use Development Project, including visual simulations, site visits by environmental and visual consultants, and shadow analyses. It should also be noted that the building in question in the Bowman case and the proposed project buildings are required to undergo extensive design review, as discussed above. The inclusion of the Bowman decision is not meant, in and of itself, to explain the conclusions provided in the Draft SEIR, which are made clear with the disclosure of information from various site-specific studies and acknowledgement of stringent design review criteria.

Views from the Cerrito Creek Greenway. The Residential Only Project would result in the same beneficial impact as the proposed project because it would replace existing views of an undeveloped parking lot with views of an architecturally interesting design as well as landscaping (see pages 3.2-18 through 3.3-19 of the Draft SEIR). Views north of the Cerrito Creek Greenway looking toward the project site would include the daylighted creek and various California native trees, shrubs, grasses, and vines planted in the creek corridor. Views of the project site from the Cerrito Creek Greenway would

include a Class 1 asphalt bicycle/pedestrian path and planting area in front of the residential structure. There would be a pedestrian entry to podium level from this bike trail. As part of the pedestrian entry from this vantage point would be a quasi-public open space that would connect the residential units and the Cerrito Creek Greenway, which would be gated during evening hours.

Views from Evelyn Avenue. Building 2 of the Residential Only Project would be visible from Evelyn Avenue. Occupants of the adjacent three-story apartment building fronting Brighton Avenue and backing the project site have a close, direct, and unobstructed view of the site. The eastern portion of this view would be similar to the view described above from the Cerrito Creek Greenway. Along its southern perimeter, the proposed project would rise to about 50 feet in height, which would replace views of the undeveloped surface parking lot of the site. The proposed 59-foot tower would also be visible from Evelyn Avenue. Building 1 would not be visible from this area. Figure 2-5 presents an existing view northward toward the project site from Evelyn Avenue, as well as a simulation including Building 2 of the proposed Residential Only Project superimposed onto the existing view.

Although the proposed residential structures would demonstrably alter views from Evelyn Avenue, the resulting change is not considered significantly adverse, because (1) the 46- to 59-foot-tall structures would be comparable in scale to existing development along Evelyn Avenue, which is approximately 35 to 40 feet tall near the southern portion of the project site, (2) the structure would include articulation that would reduce the massing of the buildings, (3) the proposed design of the structures would reflect a contemporary Italianate character, similar to Italianate architectural styles applied within various urban cores in the San Francisco Bay, (4) the daylighting of the creek would improve foreground views, and (5) the building would be set back approximately 60 feet from the Albany border.

Views from the Ohlone Greenway Recreational Trail. The Residential Only Project would result in the same beneficial visual impact as the proposed project. According to General Plan Policy CD3.9, the Ohlone Greenway should have entries, yards, patios, and windows facing Ohlone Greenway. The policy discourages blank walls, backs of buildings, and large parking lots next to Ohlone Greenway. Currently, there is a large parking lot next to Ohlone Greenway. Beyond the large parking lot are rear views of El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center buildings, which have blank walls, except for truck loading and unloading areas. All of these characteristics are discouraged by the General Plan next to the Ohlone Greenway. As discussed on page 3.3-21 of the Draft SEIR, enhancement of the Ohlone Greenway's aesthetics and ambience would be accomplished through the proposed architectural design of the buildings, including windows, entries, access to pedestrian pathways, landscaped areas facing the Ohlone Greenway, and daylighting of Cerrito Creek. Near the northern end of the project site, parallel to Building 1, views along the Ohlone Greenway would include a few large canopy trees, two rows of small flowering trees, and an approximately 15-foot wide linear turf area. Also, along the Ohlone Greenway, at the approximately 50-foot corridor between the two project buildings, would be additional trees, a concrete pathway, a gravel pathway, and an aerial walkway. Toward the southeastern corner of the project site, parallel to Building 2, views along Ohlone Greenway would include a few large canopy trees, two rows of flowering trees, turf area, planting area, a concrete

ALL ON ONE PAGE

Insert new Figure 2-5a: existing photo of project site along Evelyn Avenue

and

Insert new Figure 2-5b: photosimulation of proposed project looking down Evelyn Avenue

pathway and an asphalt path that connects to the greenway, and a public open space providing outdoor seating and interpretive signage. Just south of the multi-use path would be the daylighted and restored Cerrito Creek. A field reconnaissance by the City's EIR consultant shows that homes along the pedestrian trail are heavily screened at the lot line, as depicted in Figure 2-6.

Additionally, the height of the Residential Only Project would be reduced compared to the proposed project. While views of the sky would be diminished to the west of Ohlone Greenway, open space, sky, and hillside views would remain looking east from the Ohlone Greenway; therefore, a sense of open space would be partially maintained.

Views from Cougar Field and Nearby Residents. The Residential Only Project would result in the same visual impact to views from Cougar Field and nearby residents as presented in the Draft SEIR for the proposed project. As discussed on page 3.3-11 of the Draft SEIR, "viewers east of the BART tracks and Cougar Field have low viewer sensitivity, except occupants of three residences along Behrens Street." Therefore, the proposed structures, which are one story lower in the Residential Only Project than the proposed project, would comprise a moderate element in the visual character as viewed from these locations. Two homes, located at 139 and 135 Behrens Street, and possibly the west-facing upstairs windows of 131 Behrens Street would have views of the project site. All other residences in this area are screened at the back lot lines, or are screened by existing buildings on the Cougar playfield, so that views westward are obscured.

Figure 2-7 is an aerial view showing the portion of Behrens Street residences with potential views of the project site from their homes or backyards. There are roughly 16 homes facing the site that have a lot line facing Cougar Field. Figure 2-8 is a view looking toward the homes (eastward) from the west side of Cougar Field. This figure shows all potential viewers of the project site in the Behrens Street area. If the viewer/viewpoint cannot be seen due to landscaping, fencing, or other screening, then those locations correspondingly cannot see the site. No other views from Behrens Street and the vicinity could have views of the site except for those with potential views over Cougar Field, and views from homes on the Ohlone Greenway pedestrian trail. Homes along the aerial BART tracks facing the site on Coronado Street are all completely screened on the rear, west-facing lot lines. Other views in the area would be blocked by intervening homes. It is possible that views also exist from small portions of some yards not identified, but these would need to be documented from within the yards themselves, as they are not apparent in field records.

The Draft SEIR acknowledges that the proposed structures would obstruct views of Mt. Tamalpais on page 3.3-22. However, as illustrated in Figure 2-9a & b, the vantage point of Cougar Field and residences on Behrens Street represents the worst case scenario for visual losses of Mt. Tamalpais in the area. Considering the relatively low number of viewers with visual loss of Mt. Tamalpais, the preservation of views of the Albany Hills, the continued dominance of the sky in views looking westward, and the partial and intermittent quality of these view, the impact is considered less than significant. As discussed on pages 3.3-22 and 3.3-24 of the Draft SEIR, residences west of Ashbury Avenue and east of the project site would not be affected by the proposed project because their views

Insert Figure 2-6: views along Ohlone Greenway, previously Figure 3-3

Figure 2-7: aerial photo, previously Figure 3-1

Insert Figure 2-8: viewpoints along Behrens, previously Figure 3-2

BOTH FIGURES ARE ON 1 PAGE ONLY

Insert new Figure 2-9a: existing photo across Cougar Field

And

Insert new Figure 2-9b: visual simulation of proposed project across Cougar Field

of the project site are already obstructed. The proposed project would also have less-than-significant impacts on Albany Hill views for residents east of Ashbury Avenue. The same conclusion would apply to the Residential Only Project. It is important to note that the Residential Only Project would result in lower building heights than the proposed project in the Draft SEIR.

Scenic Resources. The Draft SEIR page 3.3-25 states that the proposed project would occur within an undeveloped paved surface parking lot wherein no scenic resources, such as large trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings occur. Therefore, the proposed project would not damage scenic resources. The same conclusion would apply to the Residential Only Project since it would be located on the same project site.

External Lighting. As is the case for the proposed project, the Residential Only Project would be subject to design review, per Sections 19.16.270 and 19.24.170 of the Zoning Ordinance. The design review board and building plan checker would prevent potential off-site light spillage and glare impacts from external lighting.

Glare from Vehicles. The Draft SEIR determined that light and glare impacts originating from vehicles parked in the BART parking garage would result in a potentially significant impact. Since the Residential Only Project does not include the construction of a BART parking garage, this impact is no longer applicable. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure VQ-3.1 would no longer apply.

Shadows. The shadow analysis for the proposed project would be equally applicable to the Residential Only Project. While shadow lengths are greatest early in the morning and during sunset, when the sun is closest to the horizon, shadow impacts are most noticeable during the hours between 10:00 am and 3:00 pm. These hours are when sunlight is greatest and its loss due to shadows cast by new development would be most adverse. Later in the afternoon, existing shadows from the aerial BART tracks fall on the Ohlone Greenway and potential project shadows would not add significant shade.

During the morning hours, from sunrise to around 11:30 am, the project buildings would create minimal shade, ranging from about 1 to 5 meters (3 to 15 feet) extending west and northwest of the site toward the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center, particularly the Copeland Sports store building. There are no shadow sensitive resources to the west or north of the project site. Afternoon shadows would extend eastward, in the direction of the Ohlone Greenway, and is discussed below.

Building 1. Most of the shade from this building is generally to the north, toward the rear portion of the Albertson's store in El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center. The Ohlone Greenway pedestrian path is about 40 feet east of the Building 1 eastern wall. The Ohlone Greenway bike path is about 65 feet east of the Building 1 eastern wall. Most shade the east of the site would affect the turf area and rows of flowering trees, which create an approximately 40-foot buffer between the building's eastern wall and the pedestrian path. Winter months have the most significant shade effects. From about 1:00 pm to 3:30 pm, the project's shadow would extend about 1 to 8 meters (about 3 to 25 feet) in a northeasterly direction, but would not reach the Ohlone Greenway. There would be no shade to the south, which would be the location of Building 2. Spring shadow impacts are comparable to fall shadow impacts.

During spring and fall, from 1:00 pm to 3:30 pm, shadows would extend about 1 to 5 meters (about 3 to 15 feet) in an easterly direction. There would be no shade to the south, which would be the location of Building 2. Shadows during the summer would create the least impacts during the afternoon hours. This is also a time of year that would be expected to incur the most use of outside areas, such as the Ohlone Greenway and the improved Cerrito Creek Greenway. From between 1:00 pm and 3:30 pm, there would be about 1 to 3 meters (3 to 10 feet) of shade in an easterly direction, meaning that the shadow would not reach the Ohlone Greenway. There would be no shade to the south, which would be the location of Building 2.

Building 2. Most of Building 2's shade would be to the north, toward Building 1. The Ohlone Greenway bike path is about 70 feet east of the building's eastern wall. The Ohlone Greenway pedestrian path is about 45 feet east of the building's eastern wall. Most shade that would occur to the east of the site would affect the linear turf area and rows of flowering trees, which create an approximately 45-foot buffer between the building's eastern wall and the Ohlone Greenway pedestrian path. Winter months would have the most noticeable shade effects. From about 1:00 pm to 3:30 pm, the project shadow stretches about 2 to 12 meters (6 to 38 feet) in a northeasterly direction, meaning neither the bike path or pedestrian path would be affected. There is no shade to the south, toward the Cerrito Creek Greenway. Spring shadow impacts are similar to those in the fall. From 1:00 pm to 3:30 pm, there would be about 1 to 4 meters (3 to 13 feet) of shadow extending in an easterly direction. There is no shade to the south, toward the Cerrito Creek Greenway. Shadows occurring during the summer, as opposed to other seasons, would have the least impact on the area east of the project site, which includes the Ohlone Greenway. From about 1:00 pm to 3:30 pm, shade extends about 1 to 3 meters (3 to 15 feet) east and slightly north. There would be no shade to the south, toward Cerrito Creek.

Therefore, the most significant shade effects would occur in the afternoon during the winter months and would result in a shadow length of 25 feet east for Building 1 and 38 feet east for Building 2. Both buildings have a turf and flowering tree buffer that extends eastward for about 40 to 45 feet. The Ohlone Greenway pedestrian pathway runs along the edge of the buffer, generally 40 to 45 feet away from the buildings' eastern walls. No shadows would extend past this length for either Building. Therefore, there would be no new shade on the Ohlone Greenway pedestrian pathway or the Ohlone Greenway bike path during any time of the year during afternoon hours (1:00 pm to 3:30 pm).

Based on the above assessment, the Residential Only Project would not significantly affect shadow sensitive resources.

Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative visual quality impacts of the Residential Only Project would result in the same beneficial impact identified for the proposed project.

Transportation

As discussed on page 4-8 of the Draft SEIR, the Residential Only Project would result in similar freeway operations, pedestrian traffic, bicycle and vehicular parking, and bicycle and vehicular circulation impacts as the proposed project. The Residential Only Project would not contribute to

impacts at any study intersection and no unsignalized intersections would be expected to meet peak hour warrants as a result of traffic generated by this alternative. The overall impact on study intersections under this alternative would be less than under the proposed project.

Local Circulation. The Residential Only Project would generate 824 daily trips and 67 AM and 78 PM peak hour trips. (This represents a 1,549 reduction in weekday trips compared to the proposed project.) These trips would be divided between inbound and outbound traffic and could be expected to occur throughout the peak hour. As a result, the Residential Only Project is estimated to generate one additional trip per minute at the project site itself and less than one trip per minute at both the intersection of Evelyn Avenue and Brighton Avenue and Talbot Avenue and Brighton Avenue, because the inbound and outbound trips would be divided between these two one way streets. At other study locations and throughout the area, the traffic would be less concentrated and would thus result in lesser impacts.

During other periods, such as weekends or, for example, afternoon school pick up, the amount of project-generated traffic would be even less than that during the peak period. In the vicinity of the nearest schools, the project would be expected to generate less than one vehicle every three or four minutes. This amount of traffic is negligible with respect to circulation, pedestrian, or bicycle impacts. It should be noted that the traffic analysis in the Draft SEIR focuses on the “peak hour;” that is, that period of the day when the project and the majority of surrounding uses generate the greatest number of trips. This peak period is different than the peak hour for school traffic, so that the peak hour traffic from residential development at the project site would not appreciably affect vehicular, pedestrian, or bicycle traffic around the schools. Thus, the Residential Only Project would have less-than-significant traffic impacts, similar to the proposed project.

Parking. The Residential Only Project would include 158 parking spaces. The proposal includes 55 single bedroom facilities and 73 two bedroom and townhouse units. Under City of El Cerrito zoning requirements, this development program would require 201 parking spaces. The Residential Only Project would, therefore, result in a shortfall of 43 spaces. This parking supply deficit would normally be considered a significant impact (as with the proposed project); however, the City has the option of finding the parking supply acceptable if the project qualifies for the City’s Incentives Program. For this reason, and because the child care facility is not part of the Residential Only Project, Mitigation Measure TR-6.1 and TR-6.2 in the Draft SEIR are not applicable to the Residential Only Project.

TIRE Index. The TIRE index is a tool that can be used to shed light on the effect of traffic volumes on residential environments. The TIRE index works by measuring the proportion of the increase in daily traffic volumes that result from a proposed project. The notion of proportionality is essential, because the impact being addressed is not sensitive to a fixed level of capacity; the effect of capacity is covered by LOS analysis. Instead, the use of the TIRE index is an effort to understand how a project will change people’s perceptions of traffic. The criteria used to determine if there is an impact is stated in the Draft SEIR and is consistent with the 1997 EIR for the Plaza Redevelopment Project; namely, an increase in the TIRE index of 0.1 or greater would be considered a significant impact.

In general terms, where existing traffic is low and the contribution of new traffic is proportionally high, there is more likely to be an impact. This is because people’s perceptions of the change are likely to be piqued under such circumstances. Conversely, where existing traffic is high and the new traffic is proportionately low there is less likely to be an impact. That is because residents will not perceive the change readily.

Absolute measures of traffic level, such as “high,” “very high” or “severe,” are useful for information, but they are not indicative of a project impact because there is no nexus between those conditions and the project contribution to any change in perception.

Under the Residential Only Project, the project would not trigger significant TIRE index impacts and thus mitigation is not required. This result is in contrast to that of the previous mixed use proposal with a BART garage and a child care facility, where a significant impact was identified. Consequently, Mitigation Measure TR-3.1 of the Draft SEIR is not applicable to the Residential Only Alternative. The TIRE index analysis of the Residential Only Project is shown in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1
2004 No Project and 2004 with Residential Only Project TIRE Index Analysis

Segment Street	2004 No Project Condition		2004 with Project Condition		Change in TIRE index
	Volume	TIRE index	Volume	TIRE index	
Kains Avenue north of Brighton	1,305	3.116	1,307	3.12	0.001
Cornell Avenue north of Brighton	1,954	3.291	1,959	3.29	0.001
Talbot Avenue north of Brighton	1,167	3.067	1,431	3.16	0.089
Evelyn Avenue north of Brighton	1,261	3.101	1,520	3.18	0.081
Brighton east of San Pablo	6,025	3.780	6,329	3.80	0.021

Source: Dowling Associates, Inc., 2004.

Cumulative Impacts. Under the cumulative scenario with the Residential Only Project, all study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels, the same finding made for cumulative conditions with the earlier proposed project.

Near Term Impacts with Albany Street Closures. Closure of the Albany streets would redistribute background and project traffic that currently exits the Plaza to the south. This shift in traffic would result in more traffic at existing intersections and significant near term and cumulative LOS impacts at the Richmond/Fairmont and San Pablo/Carlson intersections. The Draft SEIR identifies mitigation measures that would mitigate these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Noise

Construction Activity. The Residential Only Project would result in construction activity at the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center. The construction activity would disturb sensitive land uses on and near the project site. As is the case for the proposed project, Residential Only Project would result in a

potentially significant construction-related noise impact. Because of Mitigation Measure NO-1.1 and the temporary nature of construction noise, this noise impact is regarded as less than significant.

Exposure to BART Train Noise. The Residential Only Project would expose new residences at the project site to high levels of BART train noise. This is considered a significant impact. Furthermore, noise generated by the commercial activity at the existing retail commercial facilities, such as truck deliveries, could adversely impact residents of the proposed Residential Only Project. Thus, the Residential Only Project would result in the same potentially significant impact as the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NO-2.1, however, would reduce the above-described impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The Residential Only Project does not include a child care facility. Accordingly, noise impacts relating to this facility in the proposed project would no longer apply and Mitigation Measure NO-4.1 would not be necessary under the Residential Only Project.

Reflection of BART Train Noise. As discussed on page 3.5-13 of the Draft SEIR, the Residential Only Project would result in an expansive, monolithic wall, which could reflect BART train noise into the residential areas and the Albany Middle School facilities on Cougar Field east of the project site. This potentially significant impact identified in the Draft SEIR applies both to the proposed project and the Residential Only Project; however, with the latter proposal, the design of Building 1 would be less likely to reflect noise than the design for the Measure C parking structure. Any increase in noise level due to reflection of BART noise from the eastern building facade of the Residential Only Project would be 2 dBA or less. This is based on analyses involving similar situations with transportation noise from motor vehicles and rail transit reflected from large walls. With the proposed multi-family building, the sound from BART would travel to the building façade and be reflected back. In this process, it is attenuated because of normal “spreading losses” before coming back to where it was emitted. The sound is then attenuated further just as is the direct sound from the trains. Furthermore, both the BART structure and the train itself will provide some shielding of the reflected sound. Hence, a conservative estimate of 2 dBA increase at most is projected for the case with no mitigation. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NO-5.1 and NO-5.2 from the Draft SEIR would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Increased BART noise (1 dBA or less) due to reflection from the eastern building facade, with mitigation, would be undetectable and would not make it significantly harder for announcers at Cougar Field to be heard, nor would teachers at Albany Middle School notice a difference, nor would the teen center or joggers using Cougar Field suffer. A 1 dBA or lesser increase in BART noise due to reflection from the proposed multi-family residential project (of the Residential Only Project), would not threaten the mental and physical development of the Albany Middle School students any more than the existing condition does.

The users of Ohlone Greenway would be no more affected by reflected BART noise, and less so with the mitigation provided, than when they are opposite the apartment building adjacent to the southeast corner of the Plaza. There is no evidence that this situation presents a significant impact.

Change in Ambient Traffic Noise. The Draft SEIR, page 3.5-14, determined that the proposed project would result in more automobile traffic on nearby City streets than exists today. However, the increase would not be so substantial as to result in significant changes in ambient noise levels. The same conclusion would apply to the Residential Only Project. However, it is important to note that this alternative would generate 1,549 fewer weekday daily trips than the proposed project and, as such, would result in a lower magnitude of impacts than the proposed project.

Garage Noise. The Draft SEIR on pages 3.5-14 and 3.5-15 identifies a potentially significant noise impact on adjacent residences and a less-than-significant noise impact on Ohlone Greenway and Cougar Field users resulting from the automobiles using the proposed Measure C BART parking garage. Under the Residential Only Project, the BART parking garage would not be constructed. Accordingly, this impact and the associated Mitigation Measure NO-7.1 would not apply.

Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative noise impacts of the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project.

Air Quality

Construction Activity. The Residential Only Project would result in construction activity at the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center. The construction activity could cause emissions of dust or contaminants from equipment exhaust that could contribute to existing air quality violations or expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. As with the proposed project, this would be considered a temporary but potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1.1 and AQ-1.2 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Regional and Local Air Emissions. The Draft SEIR determined that the proposed 97 dwelling units, the 500-space parking garage, creek daylighting, and a child care facility would not exceed the significance threshold of 80 pounds/day of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. Thus, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant air quality impact as it relates to substantially contributing to an existing regional air quality problem. Furthermore, with the additional traffic generated by the proposed project, the ambient air quality standards for CO would not be exceeded at any intersection within the vicinity of the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center. The Residential Only Project would result in a reduced project and 1,549 fewer weekday vehicle trips than the proposed project. Therefore, the magnitude of these air quality impacts under the Residential Only Project would be lower than under the proposed project.

Toxic Air Contaminants. As is the case under the proposed project, the Residential Only Project would not place a source of toxic air contaminants (TAC) or objectionable odors near sensitive land uses. Thus, the Residential Only Project would result in a less-than-significant TAC or objectionable odors impact.

Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative air quality impacts of the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

The Residential Only Project impacts would be similar to the proposed project because the residential development would be located on the same site and would require similar ground disturbance. Mitigation Measure CR-2.1, which reduces potentially significant impacts to prehistoric archaeological resources or human remains to a less-than-significant level would continue to apply.

Cumulative cultural resources impacts of the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project.

Biological Resources

The Draft SEIR determined that the proposed project would result in potentially significant biological resources impacts as they relate to disturbing nesting birds, spread of non-native species to the restored portion of Cerrito Creek, and degradation of the riparian and aquatic habitats due to increased human presence. The Residential Only Project would result in the same impacts. Thus, Mitigation Measures BR-1.1 through BR-3.2 would continue to apply. As is the case under the proposed project, the daylighting and restoration of Cerrito Creek is considered a beneficial impact.

Cumulative biological resources impacts of the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Geology, soils, and seismicity impacts for the Residential Only Project would be the same as those identified for the proposed project because the site location would not change. The Draft SEIR found that all geology, soils, and seismicity related impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the Draft SEIR finding that the proposed project in combination with other pending developments would result in less-than-significant cumulative geo-seismic impacts also applies with the Residential Only Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Residential Only Project would result in the same hydrology and water quality impacts as the proposed project because the site location, the anticipated level of runoff, and the runoff characteristics would not change substantially. The Draft SEIR found that the proposed project would have less-than-significant and no impact on hydrology and water quality. The Residential Only Project would likewise not contribute to cumulatively considerable adverse hydrology and water quality impacts.

Hazardous Materials

The Draft SEIR on page 3.11-8 found that management of hazardous materials in accordance with applicable laws would ensure that impacts from accidental releases would be less than significant. The Residential Only Project would also be required to comply with applicable laws governing the handling

of hazardous materials and, thus, would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed project.

Cumulative hazardous material impact of the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project.

Utilities

The Draft SEIR on page 3.12-6 determined that the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The same would be true for the Residential Only Project.

The proposed project would generate water demand of approximately 24,414 gallons per day (gpd). The Residential Only Project would result in 31 more dwelling units than the proposed project. Since residential land uses generally have a higher demand than other land uses, the Residential Only Project would result in a higher water demand. Specifically, tenants living in 128 dwelling units would generate a water demand of 32,000 gallons per day (gpd), or 7,586 gpd more than the proposed project.³ East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) has been notified of the change in the project and on April 22, 2005 issued a new 'will serve' letter for the Residential Only Project. Accordingly, this alternative would have sufficient water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources and would not require the expansion or construction of new facilities, other than local lines to connect to the EBMUD facilities.

The wastewater flow associated with the Residential Only Project is anticipated to be 90 percent of the water demand, or 28,800 gpd. This is 6,827 gpd greater than the wastewater flow under the proposed project. The EBMUD wastewater treatment plant has sufficient capacity to accommodate the wastewater flow resulting from the Residential Only Project (see Draft SEIR on page 4-9). Furthermore, the sewer main on Fairmount Avenue has sufficient capacity to accommodate the wastewater flow generated by the Residential Only Project. Thus, this alternative would also result in less-than-significant wastewater impacts, similar to the proposed project.

The Residential Only Project would increase the City of El Cerrito population by an estimated 291 people.⁴ California Integrated Waste Management Board estimates that each person in jurisdictions within the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority generate 1.5 pounds of solid waste per day. Thus, residents of this alternative would be expected to generate approximately 437 pounds of solid waste per day.⁵ This is 245 pounds less than under the proposed project because the Residential Only Project does not include the child care facility, which accounted for 52 percent of the waste generated by the proposed project. The Draft SEIR on page 3.12-9 determined that the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant solid waste impact because the Potrero Hills Landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate solid waste through 2035. Since the Residential Only Project would result in less solid waste, it too would result in a less-than-significant solid waste impact.

³ 128 dwelling units x 250 gpd = 32,000 gpd.

⁴ 128 dwelling units x 2.27 persons per household = 290.56 people.

⁵ 291 people x 1.5 pounds = 436.5 pounds.

As with the proposed project, the Residential Only Project would comply with energy conservation standards and would be adequately served by PG&E and, therefore, would result in less-than-significant energy impacts.

Cumulative water, wastewater, solid waste, and energy impacts of the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project.

Public Services

The Residential Only Project would result in approximately 291 new City of El Cerrito residents. Using the existing ratio of 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 population, this alternative would require additional 0.44 firefighters in order to maintain the existing accepted level of service.⁶ As discussed in the Draft SEIR on page 3.13-8, additional firefighters could be accommodated at existing facilities. Thus, the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant fire protection impact as the proposed project.

Using the existing ratio of 1.3 officers per 1,000 daytime population, the population associated with the Residential Only Project would require an additional 0.38 police officers in order to maintain the existing acceptable level of service.⁷ The total daytime El Cerrito population with this alternative would be 27,826.⁸ As discussed in the Draft SEIR on page 3.13-9, the analysis assumes that El Cerrito Police Department (ECPD) would not be able to hire additional officers to serve the new residents. Assuming ECPD would retain its existing staff of 37 officers, the population of the Residential Only Project would result in a ratio of 1.3 officers per 1,000 daytime population.⁹ Since the existing officer per 1,000 daytime population ratio is also 1.3, this alternative would result in a negligible change in the acceptable police service ratio. The Draft SEIR on page 3.13-9 reached the same conclusion for the proposed project.

Using the student-yield factors from the City of El Cerrito General Plan EIR, the residents of the Residential Only Project would result in approximately 28, 5, and 10 new elementary, middle, and high school students, respectively. Thus, this alternative would result in 6, 1, and 3 more elementary, middle, and high school students than the proposed project in the Draft SEIR. El Cerrito High School exceeds its capacity of 1,256 students by approximately 20 percent and, as such, would not have sufficient room to accommodate the 10 new high school students generated by this alternative. As discussed in the Draft SEIR on page 3.13-12, Section 65996 of the state Government Code explains that payment of school impact fees enabled by the *Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act* of 1998 is deemed to constitute full and complete mitigation for school impacts. The WCCUSD has enacted development fees in accordance with the *Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act* and levies these fees on development projects within its service area. Accordingly, the project sponsor is required to pay \$3.88 per square foot of residential development for the purposes of school improvements. As is the case for

⁶ 291 new City residents / 1,000 x 1.5 firefighters per 1,000 population = 0.44 new firefighters.

⁷ 291 people / 1,000 x 1.3 officers per 1,000 population = 0.38 officers.

⁸ 27,535 existing El Cerrito daytime population + 291 daytime population generated by the Residential Only Project = 27,826.

⁹ 37 sworn police officers / (27,826 / 1,000) = 1.3 police officers per 1,000 daytime population.

the proposed project, fulfillment of this requirement would mitigate the Residential Only Project impacts on schools.

City of El Cerrito General Plan Policy PR1.3 recommends using a level of service standard of five acres of publicly owned parkland per 1,000 residents as the minimum requirement for recreation and open space land. At five acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, the Residential Only Project would be required to provide 1.5 acres of recreational land or a combination of park in-lieu fees and on-site facilities in order to comply with General Plan policies pertaining to parks and open space. The Residential Only Project would provide approximately 15,915 square feet (0.37 acres) of new publicly owned recreational land by daylighting Cerrito Creek and constructing the associated multi-use path. Since the acreage does not fully meet the requirements of Policy PR1.3, the project sponsor would be required to make up the difference with park in-lieu fees pursuant to Policy PR1.12. As is the case for the proposed project, payment of the required fees in combination with the on-site open space would mitigate the Residential Only Project's park/open space impacts. The project sponsor intends to seek relief from this provision from the City Council in exchange for daylighting the creek and providing extensive public open space.

Cumulative fire and police services, school, and recreational impacts of the Residential Only Project would result in the same less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project.

Summary

A summary table (Table 2-2), comparable to the one prepared for the proposed project in the Draft SEIR, is provided on the following pages for the Residential Only Project.

**Table 2-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
Land Use, Plans, and Zoning			
LU-1. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	None Required.	
LU-2. The proposed project would be consistent with applicable revitalization goals for the project area.	LTS	None Required.	
LU-3. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	NI	None Required.	
LU-4. The proposed project, along with the Mill & Lumber and 6420 Fairmount Avenue Projects, would intensify development, including residential development, within an area targeted for intensified development by the City and Redevelopment Agency and would thus, cumulatively contribute to the implementation of redevelopment goals.	LTS	None Required.	
Population, Housing, and Employment			
PH-1. The population increase resulting from the proposed project is within the 1999 <i>El Cerrito General Plan</i> anticipated population growth by 2020 and, therefore, would result in a less-than-significant population growth impact.	LTS	None Required.	
PH-2. The proposed project would further City of El Cerrito Land Use and Housing Element Policies that support Transit-Oriented Development.	B	None Required.	
PH-3. The proposed project would not displace existing housing or a substantial number of people and, therefore, would result in no impact.	NI	None Required.	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Residential Only Project

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
PH-4. The development under the proposed project, along with the Mill & Lumber and 6420 Fairmount Avenue Projects, would be within the City growth projections of the 1999 <i>General Plan</i> . Consequently, cumulative effect on population would be less than significant.	LTS	None Required.	
Visual Quality			
VQ-1. The proposed project would not significantly affect vistas or visual character as seen by viewers to the north, west, south, or east of the site.	LTS	None Required.	
VQ-2. The proposed project would not damage scenic resources and would add creek views to the site.	B	None Required.	
VQ-3. The proposed project would result in a less-than-significant external lighting impact because it would comply with City Resolution 82-9 and would be subject to the City's design review process.	LTS	None Required.	
VQ-4. In combination with nearby anticipated development, the proposed project would improve blight conditions in the vicinity and thus, result in a cumulatively beneficial impact.	B	None Required.	
Transportation			
TR-1. Project traffic would not adversely affect freeway operations.	LTS	None Required.	
TR-2. Project traffic would not contribute to near term impacts at any study intersection. No unsignalized intersections are expected to meet peak hour warrants as a result of project traffic in the near term analysis scenario.	LTS	None Required.	
TR-3. The proposed project would affect the residential quality of life along local streets in the City of Albany but not to a significant degree.	LTS	None Required.	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
TR-4. Although on-site pedestrian facilities are adequate, the proposed project would add pedestrian traffic to the Ohlone Greenway crossing at Fairmount Avenue where deficient lines of sight are already a concern but would be mitigated by the eastbound STOP sign on Fairmount Avenue at the Ohlone Greenway crossing.	LTS	None Required.	
TR-5. The proposed project site plan does not indicate bicycle parking, other than a bike rack along the multi-use path, and would not be expected to serve future bicycle parking demand.	S	<i>TR-5.1 Provide Bicycle Parking.</i> The project sponsor shall identify areas suitable for bike parking accessible to guests of the project residents. Additionally, bike parking shall be made available within the project garages for residents to use.	LTS
TR-6. The projected parking demand from the residential units may exceed the on-site parking supply, resulting in residents parking at the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center. If the project qualifies for the City's Incentive Program as intended by the project sponsor, the City may find the parking supply acceptable.	LTS	None Required.	
TR-7. The area at the rear of the Albertsons/Savon store does not have traffic markings or controls. However, the limited number of trips generated by the proposed project would not result in unsafe traffic movements.	LTS	None Required. IMPROVEMENT MEASURE. Stripe area behind Albertson's & Ross to clearly delineate loading zones and an emergency access drive.	
TR-8. The proposed project would increase traffic in the vicinity of major pedestrian and bicycle circulation facilities that are part of the approved Cerrito Greenway Project improvements.	LTS	None Required.	
TR-9. Cumulative 2025 with Project Conditions would result in the intersection of Richmond Street and Fairmount Avenue operating at LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours.	S	<i>TR-9.1 Signalize Richmond Street and Fairmount Avenue.</i> The City of El Cerrito shall eliminate the STOP signs at Richmond Street and Fairmont Avenue including the STOP sign planned at the crosswalk to the El Cerrito Plaza BART Station platform. Each of these shall be replaced by signal controls. Additional signal indications shall be placed controlling outbound movements	LTS

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation		
		from the passenger loading lanes running along the east side of the El Cerrito Plaza Bart Station platform. This leg and Richmond Street would be operated on a split phase. Although the impact is not experienced until background traffic reaches cumulative levels, the signal shall be installed with the project and funded by the project sponsor. This would maximize the benefit of the signal by eliminating the need for monitoring and avoiding any interim period where the impact goes unaddressed.			
Noise					
NO-1. Construction of the proposed project would disturb sensitive land uses on and near the project site. This would be a temporary, but potentially significant impact.	PS	<p><i>NO-1.1 Implement Feasible Construction Noise Controls.</i> The following construction noise and reduction requirements shall be included in the construction contracts for the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. limit construction hours to between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays unless night work is reviewed and authorized by the Building Official; b. require use of construction equipment with noise reduction devices, such as mufflers, which are in good condition; c. erect temporary plywood walls along portions of the construction sites facing existing residences. The height of the temporary plywood walls would be designed so that a direct line-of-sight is eliminated (i.e., up to 15 feet high for residences east and south of the project site); d. minimize the use of impact tools to the extent possible, and locate stationary noise sources away from residential areas; and e. require use of acoustic shielding with such equipment when feasible and appropriate. 	LTS		
Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact	(SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact	(PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact	(LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact	(B) Beneficial Impact	(NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
NO-2. New multi-family residences proposed for the project site would be exposed to high levels of BART train noise.	S	<p><i>NO-2.1 Implement Interior Noise Level Reduction in Building Design.</i> The City shall require the project sponsor to retain a qualified acoustician to perform site-specific noise measurements and a detailed acoustical analysis of the interior noise levels for the project's residential units prior to issuance of a building permit. The acoustical analysis shall take into account the specific character of BART train noise and any other local noise sources (e.g., the parking garage, mechanical equipment, and delivery trucks) where the exterior ambient noise level exceeds 60 L_{dn}. The project sponsors shall reduce interior noise to 45 L_{dn} by implementing one or more of the following recommended mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Noise mitigating, acoustically tested windows shall be required in conjunction with a properly insulated exterior wall sufficient to reduce BART train noise. As per Title 24 of the CAC, a mechanical ventilation system would need to be provided for all units that must have their windows closed in order to meet the 45 L_{dn} maximum. Given the high levels of BART noise, the window design must be tested by a certified acoustical testing laboratory. b. Where feasible, buildings shall be oriented so windows do not directly face BART tracks. Some or all windows not directly facing BART may still need to be acoustically rated to provide more noise reduction than would be available with standard construction. 	LTS
NO-3. Nuisance noise at nearby proposed residences could occur as a result of operational activities at the existing retail/commercial businesses at the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center.	PS	Implementation of Mitigation Measure NO-2.1 would reduce potential noise impacts related to operational noise from existing retail/commercial businesses to a less-than-significant level.	LTS

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
NO-4. The residential building design may result in an expansive, monolithic wall close to the BART tracks that could reflect BART train noise into the residential areas and the Albany Middle School facilities on Cougar Field east of the project.	PS	<p><i>NO-4.1 Implement Residential Architectural Design Features.</i> Within 100 feet of the BART tracks, the proposed residential units shall be designed with non-monolithic walls that incorporate architectural or physical breaks in the design of the wall(s). Physical breaks diffuse or scatter the reflected sound, whereas a monolithic wall reflects all of the incident sound. A building design shall be selected that does not reflect a substantial amount of noise from BART trains. A reasonable design goal is to limit increases in BART train noise to no more than 1 dBA for residences within 500 feet of the eastern property line of the project site. Data on the adequacy of this design shall be submitted by the project sponsor prior to review by the Design Review Board and issuance of a building permit.</p> <p><i>NO-4.2 Use Sound Absorptive Treatment for Walls Facing BART Tracks.</i> If Mitigation Measure NO-4.1 above is infeasible, the project sponsor shall apply appropriate sound absorptive treatment to those walls close to and facing the BART tracks. An absorption treatment shall be selected that minimizes reflection of BART train noise. Since absorption is more effective at reducing noise levels, a reasonable design goal is to limit increases to no more than 1 dBA for residences within 500 feet of the eastern property line of the project site. Data on the adequacy of the absorptive treatment shall be submitted by the project sponsor prior to review by the Design Review Board and issuance of a building permit.</p>	LTS
NO-5. The project would result in more automobile traffic on nearby city streets than exists today. Traffic volume on local residential streets would increase, but not so substantially that significant changes in ambient noise levels would result.	LTS	None Required.	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
NO-6. Traffic generated from the proposed project, in combination with other development projects, would not have cumulative noise effects.	LTS	None Required.	
Air Quality			
AQ-1. Construction activities associated with site development could cause emissions of dust or contaminants from equipment exhaust that could contribute to existing air quality violations or expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. This would be a temporary but potentially significant impact.	PS	<p><i>AQ-1.1 Implement Recommended Dust Control Measures.</i> To reduce particulate matter emissions during project construction phases, the project sponsor shall require the construction contractors to comply with the dust control strategies developed by the BAAQMD. The project sponsor shall include, in construction contracts, the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Cover all trucks hauling construction debris from the site; b. Water all exposed or disturbed soil surfaces at least twice daily; c. Use watering to control dust generation during break-up of pavement; d. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved parking areas and staging areas; e. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved parking areas and staging areas during the earthwork phases of construction; f. Provide daily clean-up of mud and dirt carried onto paved streets from the site; g. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.); h. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph; i. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; and 	LTS

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
AQ-2. The proposed project would not exceed the significance threshold of 80 pounds/day of ROG, NO _x and PM ₁₀ . Therefore, air emissions would not contribute substantially to an existing regional air quality problem.	LTS	None Required.	
AQ-3. With the addition of project traffic to nearby roadway intersections, the ambient air quality standards for CO would not be exceeded at any intersection within the vicinity of the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center.	LTS	None Required.	
AQ-4. Development of the proposed project would not place a source of TACs or objectionable odors near sensitive land uses.	LTS	None Required.	
AQ-5. The proposed project's contributions to cumulative air emissions would not result in a significant cumulative air quality impact.	LTS	None Required.	
Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact	(SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact	(PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact	(LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact
		(B) Beneficial Impact	(NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
Cultural Resources			
CR-1. The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on historic resources.	LTS	None Required.	
CR-2. The proposed project would have a potentially significant impact on prehistoric archaeological resource or human remains that could be discovered during construction.	PS	<p><i>CR-2.1 Protocol and Procedures for Encountering Archaeological Resources.</i> The following provisions shall be incorporated into the grading and construction contracts to address the potential to encounter currently unknown cultural resources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If potential historical or unique archaeological resources are discovered during construction, all work in the immediate vicinity shall be suspended and alteration of the materials and their context shall be avoided pending site investigation by a qualified archaeological or cultural resources consultant retained by the project sponsor. The immediate vicinity wherein work shall be suspended shall be approximately 50 feet from the discovery or within an appropriate distance to be determined by the retained archaeologist or consultant. Construction work shall not commence again until the archaeological or cultural resources consultant has been given an opportunity to examine the findings, assess their significance, and offer proposals for any additional exploratory measures deemed necessary for the further evaluation of and/or mitigation of adverse impacts to any potential historical resources or unique archaeological resources that have been encountered. b. If the find is determined to be a historical or unique archaeological resource, and if avoidance of the resource would not be feasible, the archaeological or cultural resources consultant shall prepare a plan for the methodical excavation of those portions of the site that would be adversely affected. 	LTS

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>The plan shall be designed to result in the extraction of sufficient volumes of non-redundant archaeological data to address important regional research considerations. The work shall be performed by the archaeological or cultural resources consultant, and shall result in detailed technical reports. Such reports shall be submitted to the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center. Construction in the vicinity of the find shall be accomplished in accordance with current professional standards and shall not recommence until this work is completed.</p> <p>c. The project sponsor shall assure that project personnel are informed that collecting significant historical or unique archaeological resources discovered during development of the proposed project is prohibited by law.</p> <p>d. If human remains are discovered, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the discovery site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the project sponsor has complied with the provisions of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e). In general, these provisions require that the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are found to be Native American, the County Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The most likely descendant of the deceased Native American shall be notified by the City and given the chance to make recommendations for the remains. If the City is unable to identify the most likely descendent, or if no recommendations are made within 24 hours, remains may be reinterred with appropriate dignity elsewhere on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance. If recommendations</p>	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation		
		are made and not accepted, the Native American Heritage Commission will mediate the situation.			
CR-3. The proposed project would have no impact on a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.	NI	None Required			
CR-4. The proposed project, along with the 6420 Fairmount Avenue Project, would have less-than-significant cumulative impacts on historic resources.	LTS	None Required.			
Biological Resources					
BR-1. Removal of trees containing nests or eggs of migratory birds, raptors, or any bird species during the nesting season could result in “unlawful take.” This impact would be considered potentially significant.	PS	<p><i>BR-1.1 Conduct Pre-construction Surveys for Nesting Birds and Implement Protective Measures if Identified.</i> The removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation shall be avoided during the February 1 through August 31 bird nesting period to the extent possible. If no vegetation or tree removal is proposed during the nesting period, no surveys shall be required. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting period, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified wildlife biologist to conduct a survey for nesting birds no sooner than 14 days prior to the start of removal of trees, shrubs, grassland vegetation, buildings, grading, or other construction activity. Survey results shall be valid for 21 days following the survey; therefore, if vegetation or building removal is not started within 21 days of the survey, another survey shall be required. 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.</p> <p>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</p>	LTS		
Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact	(SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact	(PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact	(LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact	(B) Beneficial Impact	(NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
BR-2. Landscape plantings of invasive, non-native species could spread into the newly restored Cerrito Creek riparian corridor, hindering restoration efforts and degrading wildlife habitat. This impact would be considered potentially significant.	PS	<p>young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts.</p> <p><i>BR-2.1 Use Native Species in Landscaping Along Cerrito Creek Daylighting.</i> The construction contract for landscaping the proposed project shall include a Creek Restoration Plan, including, among other things, specifications for plant species compatible with efforts to restore Cerrito Creek in the project area. A list of undesirable, invasive, non-native, exotic plants that should be avoided in landscaping shall be obtained from the California Native Plant Society for use in selecting appropriate plant species. This list shall be used in combination with Table 3.8-1, which lists those plants currently being used in the Cerrito Creek restoration effort to identify plant materials native to the Bay Area for landscaping that would eliminate the introduction of exotic plant species and the possibility of unfavorable competition with native plant species. The list of recommended plant materials shall be incorporated into the Creek Restoration Plan.</p>	LTS
BR-3. Increased human presence and litter in the vicinity of Cerrito Creek could result in degradation of its riparian and aquatic habitats. This impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	<p><i>BR-3.1 Maintain a Creek Buffer Zone.</i> A minimum 12-foot setback from the top-of-bank shall be incorporated into the design of the proposed project. The project sponsor shall consult with the CDFG to establish appropriate creek setbacks if a 12-foot setback would not be feasible. Impermeable surfaces and buildings would be prohibited within this buffer zone, although a meandering multi-use path would be permitted. If feasible, the paths should be designed with permeable surfaces. The buffer zone, around the path, shall be planted with native species at appropriate densities and in similar proportions as the adjacent recently restored portion of Cerrito Creek next to the project site. The species planted shall be from the List of Plant Species Used in the Cerrito Creek Restoration, provided in Table 3.8-1. Two educational signs shall</p>	LTS

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		be provided along the 180-foot stretch of the daylighted creek informing the public of the sensitive riparian habitat and discouraging people from accessing the creek except in certain designated locations to be determined in consultation with CDFG).	
		<i>BR-3.2 Ensure Periodic Creek Cleanup.</i> To mitigate for increased levels of construction and operational litter in Cerrito Creek, the project sponsor, or whomever has legal responsibility for the creek in the future, shall be responsible for periodic clean-up of the creek channel. In addition, during construction, the construction contractor shall be responsible for keeping litter out of the creek. Following construction, the creek shall be cleaned of litter and garbage on a bi-monthly basis.	
BR-4. Creek daylighting and restoration efforts would result in a 180-foot restored portion of Cerrito Creek. This impact is considered beneficial.	B	None Required.	
BR-5. The proposed project would not result in any adverse cumulative impact on biological resources.	LTS	None Required.	
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity			
GEO-1. The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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.	LTS	None Required.	
GEO-2. The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic groundshaking.	LTS	None Required.	
Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact	(SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact	(PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact	(LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact
			(B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
GEO-3. The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.	LTS	None Required.	
GEO-4. The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.	LTS	None Required.	
GEO-5. The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	None Required.	
GEO-6. The 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	None Required.	
GEO-7. The project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-A of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property.	LTS	None Required.	
GEO-8. The project would not be located on 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.	NI	None Required	
GEO-9. The proposed project would not create cumulatively considerable soils, geology, and seismicity impacts.	LTS	None Required.	

Hydrology and Water Quality

HY-1. The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	LTS	None Required.	
--	-----	----------------	--

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Residential Only Project

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
HY-2. The proposed project would not 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 groundwater table.	LTS	None Required.	
HY-3. The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area, including 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.	LTS	None Required.	
HY-4. The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate and amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.	LTS	None Required.	
HY-5. The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantially additional sources of polluted runoff.	LTS	None Required.	
HY-6. The proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	None Required.	
HY-7. The proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map.	NI	None Required.	
HY-8. The proposed project would not place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area.	NI	None Required.	
HY-9. The proposed project would not 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.	NI	None Required.	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
HY-10. The proposed project would not be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	LTS	None Required.	
HY-11. The cumulative runoff and flooding effects of the proposed project along with other development projects would be less than significant, because the projects individually and collectively would not substantially change existing runoff characteristics.	LTS	None Required.	
Hazardous Materials			
HM-1. Routine use or accidental release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during operations of the proposed project could expose people or the environment to these materials. However, management of hazardous materials shall comply with applicable laws so that the impact from accidental releases is considered less than significant.	LTS	None Required.	
HM-2. Project-related hazardous materials use under the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative human and environmental health and safety issues, including hazardous waste generation and disposal.	LTS	None Required.	
Utilities			
UT-1. The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	None Required.	
UT-2. The proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources and, therefore, would result in a less-than-significant water supply impact.	LTS	None Required. IMPROVEMENT MEASURE. The following set of improvement measures would minimize proposed project related impacts. <i>UT-2.1 Implement Water Conservation Measures.</i> The project sponsor shall include methods of water conservation in the proposed project's buildings and landscaping. These methods shall	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		include, but not be limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Install water-conserving dishwashers and washing machines, and water-efficient centralized cooling systems; b. Install water-saving devices such as water-efficient toilets, faucets, and showerheads; c. Design landscaping with drought-resistant and other low-water-use plants; d. Install water-conserving irrigation systems (e.g., drip irrigation and automated irrigation systems); and e. Set automatic irrigation systems to irrigate during early morning or evening hours to minimize water loss due to evaporation and reset to water less in cooler months and during rainfall season. 	
UT-3. The proposed project would not require construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant wastewater impact.	LTS	None Required.	
UT-4. The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and, therefore, would result in a less-than-significant solid waste impact.	LTS	None Required.	
UT-5. The proposed project would comply with energy conservation standards and would be adequately served by PG&E and, therefore, would result in less-than-significant energy impacts.	LTS	None Required.	
UT-6. The proposed project, in combination with the Mill & Lumber Project and the Fairmount Avenue Project, would have sufficient water	LTS	None Required.	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
supplies available from existing entitlements and resources. Accordingly, the proposed project in combination with other foreseeable development would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact.			
UT-7. The wastewater treatment plant and the sewer collection system have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional wastewater flow from the cumulative El Cerrito development. Accordingly, the proposed project in combination with other foreseeable development would result in a less-than-significant cumulative wastewater impact.	LTS	None Required.	
UT-8. The proposed project, in combination with the Mill & Lumber Project and the Fairmount Avenue Project, would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the solid waste generated by all three projects. Therefore, the proposed project in combination with other foreseeable development would result in a less-than-significant cumulative solid waste impact.	LTS	None Required.	
UT-9. The proposed project, in combination with the Mill & Lumber Project and the Fairmount Avenue Project, would comply with energy conservation standards and would be served by PG&E and, therefore, would result in a less-than-significant cumulative energy impact.	LTS	None Required.	

Public Services

PS-1. Since the proposed project would not necessitate the expansion of existing or construction of new El Cerrito Fire Department facilities in order to maintain the existing acceptable level of service, it would result in a less-than-significant fire protection impact.

LTS None Required.

IMPROVEMENT MEASURES. The following set of improvement measures would minimize proposed project-related impacts.¹⁰

PS-1.1 El Cerrito Fire Department Review of the Proposed Project. ECFD shall review the proposed project to determine the

¹⁰ A variation of this set of improvement measures was stipulated in the 1994 Redevelopment Plan SEIR and 1997 Redevelopment Project IS.

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
<p>PS-2. Since the proposed project would not necessitate the expansion of existing or construction of new El Cerrito Police Department facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, it would result in a less-than-significant law enforcement impact.</p>	LTS	<p>need for specialized ECFD staff training, facilities, and equipment to serve the new high rise development (four or more stories) and large footprint structures. Development review of the proposed project shall be closely coordinated with ECFD to ensure that design measures are implemented (e.g., stand pipe, sprinklers, electronic alarm, and other protection systems) to augment ECFD services.</p> <p>None Required.</p> <p>IMPROVEMENT MEASURES. The following set of improvement measures would minimize proposed project-related impacts.</p> <p><i>PS-2.1 El Cerrito Police Department Review of the Proposed Project.</i> The El Cerrito Police Department shall review the proposed project to determine the need for additional security measures. Recommendations made by ECPD shall be incorporated, to the extent feasible, into the proposed project.</p> <p><i>PS-2.2 Design New Residential Development and Daylighting of Cerrito Creek Employing “Defensible Space” Concepts to Deter the Potential for Criminal Activity.</i> The project sponsor shall incorporate the following crime prevention design features into the proposed project design:¹¹</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide exterior lighting for visibility at night on streets, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and possible entrapment spots; b. Provide adequate light for nighttime use of paths to and from 	

¹¹ Crime prevention design features were selectively chosen from Environmental Monitor, *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: Concepts and Measures for Use in Land Development in San Diego*, 1998.

¹² Crime prevention design features for parking garages were selectively chosen from a National Institute of Justice publication, *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design in Parking Facilities*, Mary S. Smith, Vice President and Director of Parking Consulting and Study Services for Walker Parking Consultants, 1996.

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>the entrances and exits of buildings;</p> <p>c. Install peepholes in the doors to each dwelling unit for viewing people seeking entrance;</p> <p>d. Use open landscaping and see-through fences instead of solid walls or hedges for boundaries where privacy or environmental noise mitigation is not required;</p> <p>e. Trim creek side vegetation to prevent excessive enclosure of areas that could be used for hiding while maintaining sufficient canopy cover to provide suitable habitat for animals.</p> <p>f. Provide keys, entry card, or access codes to residents or occupants;</p> <p>g. Use open fences, e.g., vertical wrought iron or decorative iron, that are easier to see through, harder to climb, and less susceptible to graffiti; and</p> <p>h. Use graffiti-resistant paint or anti-graffiti coatings on walls, benches, light poles, and signs.</p> <p>i. Provide adequate additional lighting for visibility and security along Ohlone Greenway and the adjacent emergency vehicle access road.</p> <p><i>PS-2.3 Design the Podium Level Parking Garage with Security Measures to Deter the Potential for Criminal Activity.</i> Project sponsor, to the extent feasible, shall provide the following crime prevention design features:¹²</p> <p>a. Provide a lighting system for public areas that is reliable, easy to maintain, able to withstand the elements, and protected from vandalism;</p> <p>b. Increase natural surveillance of the site and common areas by</p>	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the
Residential Only Project**

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
		<p>maximizing the openness of these areas and enabling site occupants to have direct views of these areas;</p> <p>c. Locate attendant booths, parking offices, and security stations where attendants can directly monitor activity;</p> <p>d. Avoid dead-end parking areas as well as nooks and crannies in the general design of parking facilities;</p> <p>e. Plant and maintain shrubbery proposed around the buildings in a manner to eliminate hiding places;</p> <p>f. Design stairwells and elevator lobbies to be as open as the code permits;</p> <p>g. Close off potential hiding places below stairs;</p> <p>h. Provide signs and graphics to help orient patrons and allow them to move quickly in and out of the parking facility.</p> <p><i>PS-2.4 Provide Design Features for Emergency Situations.</i> The project sponsor shall provide emergency indicator beacons and call boxes for public safety purposes.</p> <p><i>PS-2.5 Provide Video Surveillance.</i> The project sponsor shall provide 24-hour video security cameras that would have full coverage of the parking areas and along the Ohlone Greenway.</p>	
PS-3. The proposed project would generate 28, 5, and 10 new elementary, middle and high school students, respectively, in the City of El Cerrito. Currently, El Cerrito High School does not have the necessary capacity to accommodate 10 additional students. However, payment by the project sponsor of the required school impact fees would mitigate the proposed project's school impact to less than significant.	LTS	None Required.	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Residential Only Project

Impacts	Impact Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Impact Significance With Mitigation
PS-4. The population increase resulting from the proposed project would not cause the City to fall below the acceptable level of service for parks and recreational facilities. As a result, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on parks and recreational facilities.	LTS	None Required.	
PS-5. Since the proposed project, in combination with other foreseeable El Cerrito development, would not necessitate the expansion of existing or construction of new El Cerrito Fire Department facilities in order to maintain the existing acceptable level of service, it would result in a less-than-significant cumulative fire protection impact.	LTS	None Required.	
PS-6. Since the proposed project, in combination with other City development, would not necessitate the expansion of existing or construction of new El Cerrito Police Department facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, it would result in a less-than-significant cumulative law enforcement impact.	LTS	None Required.	
PS-7. Currently, El Cerrito High School does not have the necessary capacity to accommodate 21 additional students that could be generated by cumulative El Cerrito development. The proposed project would account for approximately 33 percent of the 21 students and would be considered to have a cumulatively considerable school impact. However, payment of school impact fees would reduce each project's impact to less than significant and, thus, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	None Required.	
PS-8. The proposed project, in combination with other development, would not cause acceptable park and recreational service ratios to be exceeded. Consequently, the cumulative impacts on parks would be less than significant.	LTS	None Required.	

Legend: (S) Significant Adverse Impact (SU) Significant, Unavoidable Adverse Impact (PS) Potentially Significant Adverse Impact (LTS) Less than Significant Adverse Impact (B) Beneficial Impact (NI) No Impact