INITIAL STUDY
AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Chinese for Christ Church Worship Facility

Prepared For:

Alameda County Community Development Agency

Planning Department

224 W. Winton Avenue, Rm 111

Hayward, CA 94544

Prepared By:

Lamphier -Gregory

1944 Embarcadero

Oakland, CA 94606

September 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figures

Attachments

Introduction

This document serves as the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Chinese for Christ Church worship facility ("Project"). Per CEQA Guidelines (Section 15070), a Mitigated Negative Declaration can be prepared to meet the requirements of CEQA review when the Initial Study identifies potentially significant environmental effects, but revisions in the Project would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where no significant effects would occur.

This document is organized in three sections as follows:

- **Introduction and Project Description**. This section introduces the document and discusses the Project description including location, setting, and specifics of the lead agency and contacts.
- **Mitigated Negative Declaration**. This section lists the impacts and mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study, and proposes findings that would allow adoption of this document as the CEQA review document for the proposed Project.
- **Initial Study**. This section discusses the CEQA environmental topics and checklist questions and identifies the potential for impacts and proposed mitigation measures to avoid these impacts or reduce their severity to less than significant levels.

Public Review

The Initial Study and Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration will be circulated for a 30-day public review period, commencing September 25, 2017 and ending on October 21, 2017. Written comments may be submitted during this public comment period to the following address:

Damien Curry, Planner
Planning Department
224 W. Winton Avenue, Rm 111
Hayward, CA 94544
Phone: 510.670.5400
Fax: 510.785.8793
Damien.curry@acgov.org

Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration does not constitute approval of the Project itself, which is a separate action to be taken by the approval body. Approval of the Project can take place only after the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been adopted.

Project Information

Project Entitlements

Development of the Project will require approval of a Site Development Review, Conditional Use Permit, and a Parking Variance from the County of Alameda (Planning Department Case PLN 2016-00155).

Lead Agency

Alameda County Community Development Agency
Planning Department
224 W. Winton Avenue, Rm 111
Hayward, CA 94544

Contact Person

Damien Curry, Planner
Phone: 510.670.5400
Fax: 510.785.8793
Damien.curry@acgov.org

Project Sponsor

Chinese for Christ Church
22416 Meekland Ave.
Hayward, CA 94541

Project Location

159 Smalley Ave.
Hayward, CA 94541

General Plan Designation

Medium Density Residential (MDR)

General Commercial (GC) for APN 431-16-74-2

Zoning

RS-DV Residential Suburban, Density Variable

PD-1803 for APN 431-16-74-2

Assessor's parcel numbers

APNs 431-16-53 and 431-16-52 (combining), 431-16-51, 431-16-74-2 and 431-16-78.

Executive Summary

Project

The Project proposes construction of a new sanctuary building on Smalley Ave, to be located approximately 300 feet east of Meekland Avenue. The Project encompasses five parcels on the block bordered by Meekland Avenue to the west, Smalley Avenue to the north, A Street to the South, and residences to the east (see Figure 1). Two parcels where the new worship facility will be constructed will be combined through a lot merger Boundary Adjustment; two parcels adjacent to the site will provide additional parking immediately west of the sanctuary site, and a single parcel will provide satellite parking at the northeast corner of A Street and Meekland Avenue. All of the parcels are owned by the Chinese for Christ Church ("the Church"). Two of five existing Church buildings will be demolished as part of the project. In addition, a leased mobile trailer that provides administrative space for the Church will be returned to the lessor. The sanctuary site is accessed at only one location from Smalley Avenue to the north. The topography of the site is generally flat.

CEQA Findings

The County of Alameda has determined that with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in this Mitigated Negative Declaration, the proposed Project will not have any significant effects on the environment. If this Mitigated Negative Declaration is adopted by the County of Alameda, the requirements of CEQA will be met by the preparation of this Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Project will not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. This decision is supported by the following findings:

a. The Project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. It does not reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history, since there is no identified area at the Project site which is habitat for rare or endangered species, or which represents unique examples of California history or prehistory. The Project does not have any significant, unavoidable adverse impacts. Implementation of specified mitigation measures will avoid or reduce the effects of the Project on the environment and thereby avoid any significant impacts.

b. The Project does not involve impacts which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable, because the Project will incorporate mitigation measures to avoid significant impacts of the Project in the context of continued growth and development in the County of Alameda.

The Project does not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, because all adverse effects of the Project will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels.

Project Site, Location and Applicable Land Use Policy

Project Site

The Project proposes construction of a new sanctuary building on Smalley Ave, to be located approximately 300 feet east of Meekland Avenue. The Project encompasses six parcels on the block bordered by Meekland Avenue to the west, Smalley Avenue to the north, A Street to the South, and residences to the east (see Figure 1). Two parcels where the new worship facility will be constructed will be combined through a lot merger Boundary Adjustment; two parcels adjacent to the site will provide additional parking immediately west of the sanctuary site, and a single parcel will provide satellite parking at the northeast corner of A Street and Meekland Avenue. All of the parcels are owned by the Chinese for Christ Church ("the Church"). Two of five existing Church buildings will be demolished as part of the project. In addition, a leased mobile trailer that provides administrative space for the Church will be returned to the lessor. The sanctuary site is accessed at only one location from Smalley Avenue to the north. The topography of the site is generally flat.

Surrounding Land Uses

Smalley Avenue is residential directly across the street (north) from the Church and to the east of the Church on both sides, including single and multi-family dwellings. Meekland Avenue in the vicinity of the project site has a mix of residential and commercial uses, with a high local concentration of auto-related services (see Figure 2).

Land uses close to the site are as follows:

- *North:* Across Smalley Avenue north of the site is a neighborhood of mixed single and multi-family residences.
- *South:* The south fence line of the Church at the Project site is adjacent to 2-story multi-family residential buildings that front onto A Street.
- *East:* Single and multi-family residential development.
- *West:* Various small commercial land uses on Meekland Avenue, heavily concentrated on automobile services. There is a casual restaurant located adjacent north of the proposed satellite parking lot on Meekland.

General Plan and Zoning

The General Plan land use designations for the Project site are Medium Density Residential (MDR) and for the satellite parking lot General Commercial (GC) (see Figure 3). The sanctuary site is classified into the RS-DV (Suburban Residential, Density Variable) District, with the parking lot site classified into a PD (Planned Development) District allowing for commercial uses with an approved Site Development Review (SDR). The Church has been operating under a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at this location since the 1980s. The CUP was granted by the Board of Zoning Adjustments for operation of a community facility, pursuant to Alameda County Municipal Code (ACMC) Ordinance 17.12.040. This CUP will be renewed as part of the entitlements for the proposed Project.

Description of Project

Chinese for Christ Church (CFCC, Applicant) is requesting approval of its application for Site Development Review, Conditional Use Permit, Variance, and Boundary Adjustment, to allow for construction of a new worship facility and accompanying parking on three parcels (of the six that comprise existing Church-owned property) at Meekland and Smalley Avenues in unincorporated Alameda County, California. The Project proposes to construct the new building on a single parcel formed by joining two existing parcels (APNs 431-16-53 and 431-16-52). Two existing houses onsite that had been repurposed for administrative uses by the Church will be demolished. The new worship facility will seat 325 worshipers in its sanctuary. Fifty-one (51) parking spaces will be provided onsite, with an additional 32 spaces being provided at an existing Church-owned parking lot ("satellite lot") located a few hundred feet away (APN 431-16-74-2). Pedestrian access to the new worship facility for worshipers who park at the satellite lot will be facilitated by constructing a pedestrian walkway between two existing Church buildings fronting Meekland Ave. Because the parcel containing the new sanctuary cannot provide the required parking spaces, a Variance request has been submitted by the Applicant.

Detailed Project Description

Demolition and Site Preparation

Development of the Project would begin with demolition of the two existing permanent structures (totaling ~1760 square feet) and removal of the mobile trailer onsite (1452 square feet). Hazardous materials (e.g., asbestos-containing materials and/or lead based paint) will be removed in accordance with all legal requirements. Construction debris will be recycled to the extent possible. Excavation and grading activities would occur to a maximum cut depth of approximately 2 feet, and include approximately 1,500 cubic yards of soil export.

New Construction

The Project would construct a two-story, 30-ft high building housing the Church sanctuary, classroom, gathering, and administrative space (see Figure 6—Floor Plan). The building would be Construction Type II-B: Unprotected Non-Combustible, with steel frame with metal stud infill, slab on grade.

The building would include the following uses:

Table 1.—Building Floor Plan

Use	Square Footage
First Floor	
Sanctuary (congregant seating, worship platform, backstage, baptism, cry room)	4,555
Gathering	1,447
Classrooms (including AV)	1,356
Administrative/Offices	1,214
Other (circulation, restrooms, storage, stair, elevator)	1,250
Second Floor	
Classrooms	2,464
Other (restrooms, storage, circulation)	673
TOTAL GROSS FLOOR SPACE	**12,959**

The Project's construction activities would span an estimated 12 to 18 months and would occur in one phase. General construction activities will only occur between the hours of 7:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, except that heavy equipment activities for mass site grading and improvements will be further limited to 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday thru Friday only, and will be prohibited on all weekend days and County holidays (see Mitigation Measure Noise-2). However, one recommended mitigation for Noise impacts from the use of vibratory rollers in paving operations is to use this equipment during weekdays from 9am-6pm, which avoids exposing nearby residents to the most intrusive disturbance on the weekend.

- Demolition of the existing structures is estimated to take approximately 1 month.
- Subsequent grading, excavation, and foundation preparation activities would occur over approximately one month. Construction equipment would include scrapers, loaders and dump trucks, all assumed to use rubber tires.
- The majority of the remaining schedule would include exterior construction phases including foundations, framing and roofing. The proposed structure would utilize wood frame construction with concrete slab-on-grade floors. No fixed crane or tracked equipment is anticipated, and no pile driving is necessary. Interior construction of the worship facility would follow.

Final phases of the Project would include final fine grading of the lot, paving of parking areas, pedestrian access improvement, and applying exterior coating (paint).

Traffic, Circulation and Parking

The proposed new worship facility will seat 325 worshipers, thereby requiring 81 parking spaces (parking requirements for churches are found in ACMC Table 17.52.920). The Church proposes to utilize the 36 existing spaces at the combined parcel at 159-161 Smalley that would surround the new facility on the south and east. In addition, the Joy House at 149 Smalley (owned by the Church) is planned for demolition and replacement with 15 spaces. The Church has proposed using 32 existing parking spaces on its parcel at 100 A Street to meet the remaining parking requirement. Because the parcel on which the building will be constructed will not accommodate the required number of parking spaces, a variance from the ACMC will be required. The Project proposes to provide the required number of vehicle spaces on three other parcels owned by the Church. Congregants who park in the lot at 100 A Street will use the public sidewalk and the new pedestrian walkway proposed from Meekland Ave. to access the worship facility (approximately $1/10^{th}$ of a mile from the entrance to the proposed sanctuary building).

Vehicle access to the Project site would continue to be from Smalley Avenue along the site's northern boundary. A replacement curb cut will be created on Smalley. Pedestrian access to the site will be from a pathway improvement that begins at the sidewalk between the existing Church buildings at 22442 Meekland and 22416 Meekland and extends to the new sanctuary (approximately 260'). No other exterior ingress or egress would be provided to the site.

Parking would be provided through the following:

- 36 spaces provided onsite (3 accessible)
- 15 spaces provided at the adjoining parcel
- 32 spaces provided at the existing surface parking lot at 100 A Way

Open Space and Landscaping

Site landscaping will occupy approximately 3,606 sf.[1] One existing tree, adjacent to the structure to be demolished at 149 Smalley, will be removed. The Project includes planting 19 new trees, including 10 Saratoga Bay Laurel, 3 Maidenhair (gingko biloba), 2 Coast Live Oak, and 5 Crape Myrtle (see Figure 7—Landscaping Plan). All trees except the Maidenhair are low water use, as categorized by Water Use Classification of Landscape Species.[2] In addition, over 350 shrubs are proposed, of which 59% would be low water use shrubs; the remainder would be moderate water users. Site landscaping will be compliant with the County's Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance.

Utilities

The Project will provide connections to all required utilities, including sanitary sewer, sanitary sewer/wastewater treatment, water supply, and storm drainage. A stormwater control plan has been prepared for the project, which includes a bioretention area inside the building fence line along Smalley Avenue. This plan is presented in Figure 8.

In addition, the Project will be required to implement measures consistent with the County's Community Climate Action Plan. These include but are not limited to:

- **Energy Performance**: Use building materials containing recycled content
- **Water Use**: Reduce potable water use for landscape irrigation by 60 percent of the baseline initial requirements for plant installation and establishment (Section 5.304) as identified in Section A5.304.4 Tier 1 of the 2010 CALGreen.

Project Approvals

Alameda County

- Site Development Review for structure and use of satellite parking
- Conditional Use Permit for church use
- Variance for reduced on-site Parking
- Boundary Adjustment
- Grading & Building Permits

Other Agencies

- State Water Resources Control Board (approval of NPDES General Permit and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan)

[1] Landscaping details given here do not include plantings around the 15 parking spaces created at former 149 Smalley address.

[2] Landscape Plan, Figure 7.

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Project Description, Location, and Setting

This Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the Chinese for Christ Church Worship Facility Project. See the Introduction and Project Information section of this document for details of the Project.

Potentially Significant Impacts Requiring Mitigation

The following is a list of potentially significant Project impacts and the Mitigation Measures recommended to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Refer to the Initial Study Checklist section of this document for a more detailed discussion.

Potential Impact	Mitigation Measures
Air Quality: Construction Emissions Impact: Construction of the Project would result in emissions and fugitive dust. While the Project is below the size at which significant impacts are anticipated, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District recommends implementation of construction mitigation measures to reduce construction-related criteria pollutant and fugitive dust emissions for all projects. These basic measures are included in Mitigation Measure Air -1 below and would further reduce construction-period criteria pollutant impacts.	
	Mitigation Measure Air -1: Standard Construction Best Management Practices. The contractor shall implement the following BAAQMD-recommended Best Management Practices: 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. 5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible as well, after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. 6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. 7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

Potential Impact	Mitigation Measures
	8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
Air Quality: Construction Exposure Impact: Construction activity would use diesel-powered equipment and therefore result in the emission of diesel particulate matter including fine particulate matter, which are considered toxic air contaminants and a potential health risk. While the construction period would be shorter than that which generally could result in significant health risks to nearby sensitive receptors, due to the proximity of residences to the Project site, potential health risks due to construction-period emissions impacts would be minimized through implementation of construction management practices detailed in Mitigation Measure Air-2.	
	Mitigation Measure Air-2: Construction Emissions Minimization Practices. The project shall demonstrate compliance with the following Construction Emissions Minimization Practices prior to issuance of demolition, building or grading permits: 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horse power (hp) and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements: a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited; b) All off-road equipment shall have: i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS). c) Exceptions: i. Exceptions to 1(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the County that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. ii. Exceptions to 1(b)(ii) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the County that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the County that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to 1(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of 1(c)(iii). iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to 1(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, including a Tier 2 engine standard and the following emissions control/alternative fuel in order of preference if available: 1) ARB Level 2 VDECS, 2) ARB Level

Potential Impact	Mitigation Measures
	2 VDECS, or 3) Alternative Fuel.
Archaeological Resources, Paleontological Resources, Tribal Cultural Resources, and/or Human Remains. It is possible that construction work associated with the Project could disturb as-yet unknown archaeological resources, paleontological resources, tribal cultural resources and/or human remains.	
	Mitigation Measure Cultural -1: Halt Construction/Assess Significance of Find/Follow Treatment Plan. Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities (including clearing vegetation and demolition procedures), the developer or contractor shall inform all supervisory personnel and all contractors whose activities may have subsurface soil impacts of the potential for discovering archaeological resources, paleontological resources, tribal cultural resources and/or human remains, and of the procedures to be followed if these previously unrecorded cultural resources are discovered. These procedures shall include: 1. Halting all ground-disturbing activities within 100 feet of the area where a potential cultural resource has been found; 2. Notifying a qualified archaeologist of the discovery; and 3. Following a treatment plan prescribed by the appropriate professional if the cultural resource is deemed significant, in accordance with federal or state law. In the event cultural resources as defined above are encountered during ground disturbing activities, the developer shall, subject to approval by the County of Alameda, retain an on-call archaeologist to review the excavation work, assess the significance of the potential cultural resource and prescribe a treatment plan. The archaeologist will consult with a paleontologist or tribal cultural resource specialist as required. The archaeologist shall report any finds in accordance with current professional protocols. The archaeologist shall meet the Professional Qualifications Standards mandated by the Secretary of the Interior and the California Office of Historic Preservation. In the event that any human remains are uncovered at the Project site during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area until after the Alameda County Coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and (if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin) the descendants from the deceased Native American(s) have made a recommendation to the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.
Hydrology & Water Quality: Construction activities. Construction activities such as grading, excavation, and vegetation removal could degrade water quality in the receiving waters where the existing on-site storm drainage systems discharge. Construction activities would generate dust, sediment, litter, oil, paint, and other pollutants that could temporarily contaminate runoff from the site.	
	Mitigation Measure Hydro-1: NPDES C.3 Requirements, Stormwater Control Plan. Pursuant to the San Francisco Bay RWQCB's Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (Permit Number CAS612008) (MRP), the Project applicant shall be required to design, construct and operate stormwater treatment controls to treat post-construction

Potential Impact	Mitigation Measures
	stormwater runoff. These controls shall be sized, designed, implemented and operated in accordance with the Provision C.3 requirements of the regional permit, and the technical requirements of the Contra Costa Clean Water Program C.3 Stormwater Handbook, 6th Edition Update, dated March 2016.
Noise: Construction Vibration Impact: Although paving activities that use vibratory rollers are not expected to occur for more than a few days in total, close to the end of the construction period, these vibration levels would be bothersome to adjacent residences. Without mitigation, this could produce a significant impact.	
	Mitigation Measure Noise-1: Vibration Impacts to Adjacent Offices and Nearby Residences. Paving activities that use vibratory rollers should minimize impacts by implementing the following: 1. The Construction Management Plan should limit use of the equipment that could produce perceptible levels of vibration at adjacent locations to as few total hours as possible (i.e., equipment delivering vibration levels > 94 VdB (to the residences on A Street and at 205 Smalley Ave.) 2. Usage of this equipment should be limited to weekday daytime hours (9am-6pm). 3. Provide prior notification to adjacent residents that perceptible vibrations could occur during this limited period of time

CEQA Findings

The County of Alameda has determined that with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in this Mitigated Negative Declaration, the proposed Project will not have any significant effects on the environment. If this Mitigated Negative Declaration is adopted by the County of Alameda, the requirements of CEQA will be met by the preparation of this Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Project will not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. This decision is supported by the following findings:

a. The Project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. It does not reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history, since there is no identified area at the Project site which is habitat for rare or endangered species, or which represents unique examples of California history or prehistory. The Project does not have any significant, unavoidable adverse impacts. Implementation of specified mitigation measures will avoid or reduce the effects of the Project on the environment and thereby avoid any significant impacts.

b. The Project does not involve impacts which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable, because the Project will incorporate mitigation measures to avoid significant impacts of the Project in the context of continued growth and development in the County of Alameda.

c. The Project does not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, because all adverse effects of the Project will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels.

Initial Study Checklist

Environmental factors that may be affected by the Project are listed alphabetically below. Factors marked with an "X" (☒) were determined to be potentially affected by the Project, involving at least one impact that required mitigation to reduce the impact to less than significant levels, as indicated in the Environmental Evaluation Form Checklist and related discussion that follows. Unmarked factors (☐) were determined to not be significantly affected by the Project, based on discussion provided in the Checklist, including the application of mitigation measures which the applicant has agreed to implement.

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☒	Air Quality
☐	Biological Resources	☒	Cultural Resources	☐	Geology /Soils
☐	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☒	Hydrology / Water Quality
☐	Land Use / Planning	☐	Mineral Resources	☒	Noise
☐	Population / Housing	☐	Public Services	☐	Recreation
☐	Transportation/Traffic	☐	Utilities / Service Systems	☐	Mandatory Findings of Significance

There are no impacts that would remain significant with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

Lead Agency Determination

On the basis of this evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures to reduce these impacts will be required of the Project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

For

Signature

September 19, 2017

Date

Albert Lopez, Planning Director

Evaluation of Environmental Effects

The Checklist portion of the Initial Study is below, with discussion of each CEQA issue topic. Four outcomes are possible, as explained below.

1. A "no impact" response indicates that no action that would have an adverse effect on the environment would occur due to the Project.
2. A "less than significant" response indicates that while there may be potential for an environmental impact, there are standard procedures or regulations in place, or other features of the Project as proposed, which would limit the extent of this impact to a level of "less than significant."
3. Responses that indicate that the impact of the Project would be "less than significant with mitigation" indicate that mitigation measures identified in the subsequent discussion will be required as a condition of Project approval in order to effectively reduce potential Project-related environmental effects to a level of "less than significant."
4. A "potentially significant impact" response indicates that further analysis is required to determine the extent of the potential impact and identify any appropriate mitigation. If any topics are indicated with a "potentially significant impact," these topics would need to be analyzed in an Environmental Impact Report.

Note that this document does not indicate that any environmental topics would be considered "potentially significant" after application of mitigation measures identified in this document.

1. Aesthetics

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			☒	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			☒	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			☒	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			☒	

a-d) Scenic Vistas, Resources and Visual Quality and Character

There is no designated or eligible State Scenic Highway in the vicinity of the Project, nor is there any nearby scenic roadway or corridor identified in the Eden Area General Plan.[3,4] The visual character of the Project site and area is urban, consisting of a mix of commercial and residential development, streets, and a major freeway within ½-mile. With the exception of some mature trees, the Project site does not provide any scenic vistas or contain other aesthetic resources.

[3] California Department of Transportation, State Scenic Highway Mapping System, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm

[4] Eden Area General Plan, Land Use Element. 2010. Available at: http://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/03_LandUse.pdf. Accessed March 23, 2017.

The Project involves construction of a worship sanctuary on property already developed for Church use, of modest building height (2-story) and size. While the visual landscape of the site would change with the addition of the sanctuary, development of the site as proposed would replace a portable building and two older (but not historically significant) structures with a worship facility that is visually compatible with existing Church buildings onsite. In addition, the Project would create additional landscaped areas across the entire site, enhancing its visual appeal.

Standard external commercial lighting will be provided for the new structure in compliance with applicable County design standards. Exterior lighting, except for signage, will be directed downward and shielded to minimize spillover light into adjacent residential areas. The Project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Therefore, the impacts related to scenic vistas, resources, visual quality, and light would be **less than significant**.

2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Would the Project:	**Potentially Significant**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation**	**Less Than Significant**	**No Impact**
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production(as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				☒

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				☒

According to Public Resources Code §21060.1, "agricultural land" is identified as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or unique farmland, as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture land inventory and monitoring criteria, as modified for California. CEQA also requires consideration of impacts on lands that are under Williamson Act contracts. The site is currently not zoned for or currently being used for agricultural or forestry purposes, nor is it subject to the Williamson Act. There would be **no impact** to agricultural and forestry resources as a result of this Project.

3. Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. **Would the Project:**	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			☒	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation?		☒		
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which			☒	

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. **Would the Project:**	**Potentially Significant**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			☒	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			☒	

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan

The Project site is subject to several plans developed to meet applicable laws, regulations, and programs that protect and enhance air quality, foremost among them being the Bay Area Clean Air Plan (CAP), first adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) in association with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments in 1991 to meet state requirements and those of the Federal Clean Air Act. As required by state law, updates to the CAP are developed approximately every three years. The plan is meant to demonstrate progress toward meeting the ozone standards, but also includes other elements related to particulate matter, toxic air contaminants, and greenhouse gases. The State is currently operating under the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan. However, a Draft of the Clean Air Plan 2017 was released for public review in January 2017.

A project would be judged to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality plan if it would be inconsistent with regional growth assumptions or implementation of control strategies. The proposed Project does not include large residential or commercial development or large local or regional employment centers and therefore would not result in significant population or employment growth. The proposed Project is a small development that does not exceed BAAQMD operational and construction threshold levels for criteria pollutants (see analysis for criteria (b) and (c)). The Project would be required to comply with all applicable rules and regulations that are implemented by the EPA, ARB, and BAAQMD. The Project would not significantly conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable CAP. As such, there are no significant adverse regional air quality impacts from the Project since it is in compliance with area population growth. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation

Past, present and future development projects contribute to the region's adverse air quality impacts on a cumulative basis. By its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. No single project is sufficient in size to result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards by itself. Instead, a project's individual emissions can contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. If a

project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable, then the Project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.[5]

Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as "criteria air pollutants" because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation, and include ozone precursors (NOx and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), and suspended particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB) is considered "attainment" for all of the national standards, with the exception of ozone. It is considered "nonattainment" for State standards for ozone and particulate matter. SFBAAB's nonattainment status is attributed to the region's development history.

Alameda County applies screening level thresholds that use the size of the project (in number of dwelling units) as a proxy measure of whether a given project could potentially produce significant levels of criteria pollutant emissions. These screening levels were originally developed as part of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)'s CEQA Guidelines, based on the BAAQMD's treatment of a project-level source. Although BAAQMD is no longer recommending that these thresholds be used as a measure of a project's potential to produce significant air quality impacts, many cities and localities in the State (including Alameda County) continue to apply them on a project-specific basis, based on the validity of the substantial body of scientific evidence that was developed in creating them.

If a project does not exceed the screening level, it is assumed that the project would not generate construction or operational-related criteria air pollutants and/or precursors that exceed the Thresholds of Significance. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

Operational Criteria Pollutants

For operational emissions of criteria pollutants, the screening level for a house of worship is 439,000 square feet (sf). The proposed worship facility has a footprint of 10,868 sf, with a second floor of approximately 5,000 sf, bringing total building square footage to under 16,000. This is well under the screening size, below which impacts would not be significant. Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would result in a **less-than-significant cumulative impact to** air quality from criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions.

Construction-Period Criteria Pollutants

Construction of the Project would involve demolition, excavation and site preparation, and building erection. Although these construction activities would be temporary, they would have the potential to cause both nuisance and health-related air quality impacts. PM_{10} is the pollutant of greatest concern associated with dust. If uncontrolled, PM_{10} levels downwind of actively disturbed areas could possibly exceed State standards. In addition, dust fall on adjacent properties could be a nuisance. If uncontrolled, dust generated by grading and construction activities represents a significant impact associated with Project development. In addition construction impacts would be a source of exhaust emissions from construction vehicles, which contribute to regional emission levels.

[5] BAAQMD, May 2011, California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, p. 2-1.

For a place of worship such as the proposed new CFCC sanctuary, the screening level for construction emissions of criteria pollutants is 277,000 sf. As before, the Project size of 16,000 gross sf would be well bellowing screening size that could trigger significant impacts. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would result in a **less-than-significant cumulative impact to** air quality from criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions.

Demolition and earth-moving activities can also result in fugitive dust, which contributes to particulate matter levels. While the Project would not exceed the significance thresholds for criteria pollutant emissions, the Air District recommends implementation of construction mitigation measures to reduce construction-related criteria pollutant and fugitive dust emissions for all projects. These basic measures are included in Mitigation Measure Air-1 below, and would further reduce construction-period criteria pollutant impacts to ensure they are less than significant. BAAQMD does not have a threshold of significance for fugitive dust impacts, but instead regards fugitive dust impacts as mitigated if appropriate management practices are implemented, as outlined in Mitigation Measure Air-1.

Mitigation Measure

Air-1: Basic Construction Management Practices. The Project shall demonstrate proposed compliance with all applicable regulations and operating procedures prior to issuance of demolition, building or grading permits, including implementation of the following BAAQMD "Basic Construction Mitigation Measures":

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Mitigation Measure Air-1 would further reduce **less-than-significant** construction-period criteria pollutant impacts consistent with BAAQMD recommendations.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant

As a nonattainment area, the Bay Area currently exceeds ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ standards; therefore, the existing cumulative impact is significant. A project would have a cumulatively considerable impact from criteria pollutants if the project exceeded BAAQMD screening levels or if modeled emissions exceed BAAQMD construction or operational thresholds. When the cumulative impact is significant without the project, a project's cumulative contribution is assessed to determine if it is cumulatively considerable. Since the CFCC worship facility Project does not exceed BAAQMD criteria pollutant thresholds (because it is below applicable screening level size and because its projected emissions are below the thresholds, as discussed above), the Project's impacts are less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

Carbon Monoxide Emissions

Pursuant to BAAQMD Guidelines, localized CO concentrations should be estimated for projects in which (1) project-generated traffic would conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP) established by the county congestion management agency, or (2) project-generated traffic would increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour (or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited, such as tunnels, parking garages, bridge underpasses, natural or urban street canyons, and below grade roadways).

The Project does not conflict with a congestion management program. The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is designated as the Congestion Management Agency to oversee the Alameda County Congestion Management Program (CMP). The closest arterial to the Project is A Street, which is managed as part of the CMP. A Street had an average daily traffic volume of 31,000 vehicles in 2003.[6] The limited increases in Project-generated traffic would not push traffic volumes past threshold levels (see the Transportation/Traffic section for additional traffic information). The impact related to carbon monoxide concentrations would be **less than significant**.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations

Construction Health Risk

Construction activity that uses traditional diesel-powered equipment results in the emission of diesel particulate matter, including fine particulate matter, which is considered a toxic air contaminant and a potential health risk. The generation of these emissions would be temporary, occurring only in the construction period.

The Project site is located within approximately 40 feet of the nearest residences at 140 & 150 A St, with backyards adjacent to the Project site. In addition, the nearest residences across Smalley Avenue are within 75 of the Project site. While BAAQMD does not provide a screening level to determine projects that are small enough to be assumed below significance thresholds, the modeling to quantify health risks was not originally intended for emissions periods spanning less than 7 years and is not recommended by any agency for use for less than a 2-year period, which is longer than the proposed construction period.

[6] Eden Area General Plan, Circulation Element. 2010. P. 4-19.

For these reasons, similar to the approach for construction-period criteria pollutants, potential health risks due to construction-period emissions impacts should be minimized through implementation of construction management practices.

Mitigation Measure

Air-2: Construction Emissions Minimization Practices. The Project shall demonstrate compliance with the following Construction Emissions Minimization Practices prior to issuance of demolition, building or grading permits:

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements:

    a) Where access to alternative sources of power is available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited;

    b) All off-road equipment shall have:

        i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and

        ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).

    c) Exceptions:

        i. Exceptions to 1(a) may be granted if the Project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the County that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the Project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply.

        ii. Exceptions to 1(b)(ii) may be granted if the Project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the County that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the County that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to 1(b)(ii), the Project sponsor must comply with the requirements of 1(c)(iii).

        iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to 1(c)(ii), the Project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, including a Tier 2 engine standard and the following emissions control/alternative fuel in order of preference if available: 1) ARB Level 2 VDECS, 2) ARB Level 2 VDECS, or 3) Alternative Fuel.

Mitigation Measure Air-2 would further reduce **less-than-significant** construction-period health risk impacts.

Operational Health Risk

As a place of worship, the Project would not be a source of substantial toxic air contaminants (TACs) during the operational period. The Project would not result in higher-than-anticipated emissions during the construction period, and potential temporary construction-related TAC emissions from fuel-combusting construction equipment (primarily diesel particulate matter) would be reduced through implementation of BAAQMD's Construction Measures, identified above.

There are two stationary sources of TAC emissions within 1000 ft. of the Project site, according to BAAQMD data (Arco Gas Station at 207 A St, and Tommy's Auto Body at 22383 Meekland Ave.). Taken together, these facilities produce health risks well below the County's cumulative health risk thresholds.[7] Moreover, as a worship facility, usage of the site would be on an infrequent basis, making the health risk even lower. Therefore, the Project's impact related to TACs would therefore be **less than significant**.

e) Create objectionable odors

Land uses that have the potential to create objectionable odors (such as landfills, waste recycling facilities, agriculture, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, dairies, etc.) are not part of the Project. Short-term construction-related impacts could result from the use of construction equipment such as graders, dump trucks, and worker vehicles and the resulting diesel exhaust, as well as from fugitive dust during excavation and site preparation activities. Long-term, operational air quality impacts could occur from vehicle emissions related to automobile trips to and from the Project site. Emissions from volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and paving activities may generate objectionable odors as well; however, these odors would be temporary and would not be expected to affect a substantial number of people, as the proposed Project will take approximately 12-18 months to complete. The only operational odor sources associated with the Project would be a minor increment in typical waste management activities associated with the Church; however, proper maintenance and implementation of established waste management practices would be expected to reduce the potential for objectionable odors during proposed project operations to a less than significant level. Thus, potential impacts associated with objectionable odors would be **less than significant**.

[7] Health Risk Screening analysis conducted using BAAQMD Stationary Source Screening Analysis Tool and BAAQMD's Roadway Screening Analysis Calculator shows a cumulative risk of 71.2 for cancer (below the County threshold of 100) and 0.19 for PM2.5 (below threshold of 0.8).

4. Biological Resources

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			☒	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			☒	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				☒
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory		☒		

wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			☒	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				☒

a) Special Status Species and Habitat

Eight special status plant species are known to occur in the wider vicinity (2 miles) of the Project site and may have historically occurred on or near the property. However, these species are unlikely to be present on the Project site due to the high level of disturbance, lack of habitat, and the low probability of dispersal to the site from source populations.[8]

Ten special status wildlife species are known to occur in the vicinity of the site and may have historically occurred on or near the property. However, all are unlikely to occur on the site due to the fully developed status and resulting unsuitability of habitat for these species. These species consist of the Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), yellow warbler (*Dedroica petechial brewsteri*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*), silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagens*), hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*), pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), Alameda whipsnake (*Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*), and Alameda song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia pusillula*). These species were not observed during the November 2013 site visit. The avian species may fly above or forage on the site during migration; however, potentially suitable nesting habitat is not present for these species. In addition, there is no suitable habitat onsite for the Alameda whipsnake. Therefore, impacts to special status species would be **less than significant**.

There are several trees on and adjacent to the Project site. Common birds such as house finch, American robin, northern mockingbird, European starling, and/or Brewer's blackbird could utilize nearby trees. These species are locally and regionally abundant, and Project's effects on these species would be minimal. However, native birds are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Wildlife Code, so the following mitigation would be applicable to prevent a "take" of these species under these regulations related to disturbance during nesting.

[8] Special status species information draws on a biological resources evaluation conducted for the nearby St. Alphonsus Property Initial Study, conducted for County of Alameda in 2014. Available at http://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/landuseprojects/currentprojects.htm. Accessed March 16, 2017.

Mitigation Measures

Bio-1: **Nesting Birds.** If construction occurs during the breeding season (February through August), the site and a surrounding radius of not less than 0.5 mile shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist to verify the presence or absence of nesting birds protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Wildlife Code. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted within 15 days prior to start of work and shall be submitted to the Building Division. If the survey indicates the potential presence of nesting birds, the applicant shall comply with recommendations of the biologist regarding an appropriately sized buffer around the nest in which no work will be allowed until the young have successfully fledged. The size of the nest buffer will be based to a large extent on the nesting species and its sensitivity to disturbance. Based on the absence of special status species for the reasons noted above, the Project will have less than significant impacts, directly or indirectly, on special status species or their actual or potential habitat. With this mitigation, impacts to protect migratory birds would be **less than significant**.

b) Riparian or other sensitive natural communities

The National Wetlands Inventory mapping system[9] displays no riparian communities that include, adjoin, or surround the site. The Project site is located in an urbanized area, and has been previously developed with a commercial building and surface parking. On-site vegetation consists of previously established ornamental vegetation, and non-native grasses as well as ruderal vegetation consisting mostly of weeds. Therefore, there would be **no impact** related to riparian or other sensitive natural communities.

c) Wetlands

There are no wetlands on or adjacent to the Project site, as noted in the National Wetlands Inventory. The nearest body of surface water is Sulphur Creek, located approximately ¼-mile southwest of the Project site. Therefore, there would be **no impact** related to wetlands.

d) Wildlife Corridors

Based on the developed nature of the site and the surrounding area, the site is not likely to provide any wildlife corridors for migratory species. Therefore, there would be **no impact** related to wildlife corridors.

e) Local Policies and Ordinances

There is one tree proposed for removal as part of the Project; it is the pine tree standing next to 140 Smalley Avenue (Joy House). However, the tree is completely on Church-owned property, not within the County right-of-way, and thus not subject to Chapter 12.11 of the County General Ordinance Code (permit requirements for removal). Therefore the Project does not violate any local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. The Project proposes to plant 19 trees and over 350 shrubs over a total landscaped area of 3,606 sf. Tree plantings would include Saratoga Bay Laurel, Maidenhair Tree, Coast Live Oak, and Crape Myrtle. The shrubs would consist mostly of low water-use shrubs. To

[9] Wetlands Mapper V2, available at https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html. Accessed March 24, 2017.

the extent any plantings occur on the County right-of-way along Smalley Ave, the Project would be required to obtain an encroachment permit for such plantings, pursuant to Section 12.11.110 of the County Code. The Project Landscape Plan is included as Figure 7. Therefore, there would be no impacts resulting from a conflict with local policies and ordinances.

f) Conflicts with Habitat Conservation Plans

There are no habitat conservation plans related to biological resources that cover the Project site. Therefore, the Project would have **no impact** regarding conflicts with local policies and ordinances.

5. Cultural Resources

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Section 15064.5?				☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Public Resources Section 15064.5?		☒		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			☒	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicate cemeteries?			☒	
e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either: 1) a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, that is listed or eligible for listing on the				☒

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
California Register of Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or 2) a resource determined by a lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in Public Resources Code section 5024.1 (c), and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

a) Historic Resources

The Project site includes two former residential homes, both built more than 50 years ago and been re-purposed for continuing use by CFCC. For this reason, a Historic Architectural Assessment Report (HAAR) was prepared by William Self Associates (WSA). The HAAR consisted of the following research methodology:

- A site visit by an architectural historian;
- A records search for the project at the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University (NWIC) (File No. 16-1365). The records search included a review of recorded cultural resources recorded within the Project area as well as surveys and study reports for architectural and built environment resources within ¼ mile of the Project area. The records search also included a review of the Office of Historic Preservation's Directory of Historic Property Data File for Alameda County and the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR).
- A search of archival records including historical maps, aerial photos, city directories, 1930 and 1940 census schedules, records of the Alameda County Assessor and Clerk Recorder, and newspaper articles from the Hayward Daily Review, Oakland Tribune, and other newspapers; and
- Contacts to the Hayward Area Historical Society HAHS and the Alameda County Parks, Recreation, and Historical Commission

The following summarizes the relevant conclusions of the report for these two properties[10]. The full HAAR is included with this CEQA document as Attachment B.

149 Smalley Avenue, "House of Joy"

[10] Historic Architectural Assessment Report, 149 and 159 Smalley Avenue, Hayward, prepared by WSA. March 2017.

This house was built around 1925. It is a rectangular, single-story building in a simple bungalow style. It is currently used for administration and meeting space, and is proposed for demolition and redevelopment as an asphalt parking lot. Pictures of 149 Smalley Avenue are included in the full HAAR, Attachment B.

WSA concluded that the house at 149 Smalley Avenue is recommended as eligible for the CRHR only under Criterion 1 of four[11], based on its historical associations with Eden Township's subdivision as a residential community intermediate between the region's large-scale agricultural history from approximately the 1860s to the early 1920s and the modern, post-Second World War development of Alameda County's unincorporated neighborhoods' suburban residential, commercial, and light industrial character. The building's integrity of location and design are good, as the house is in its original location and the building effectively communicates its original 1920s residential architectural style. 149 Smalley Avenue's integrity of materials and workmanship have been compromised by installation of modern doors and hardware, modern aluminum and/or vinyl framed windows, and the corrugated metal roof segment connecting the rear of this building to the adjacent church building to the south. The house's integrity of setting, association, and feeling are the most severely compromised aspects of integrity for CRHR eligibility consideration. At the time of original neighborhood subdivision in the early 1920s, the project vicinity consisted of parcels containing single-family homes with garages, chicken coops and/or rabbit hutches and large yards with mature fruit trees remaining from the previous owners' orchards. Today, the building's parcel and adjoining lots are almost entirely paved, and include a large parking lot as well as modern administrative and church buildings. A few other 1920's-era houses along this block of Smalley Avenue are interspersed with later, mid-20th-century ranch-style inspired houses and late-20th-century apartment buildings. Overall, the building in its current setting does not effectively communicate the significance of its period of construction. Consequently, although recommended as eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 1, WSA finds that the building's integrity is insufficient to fully justify recommendation for listing in the CRHR.

159 Smalley Avenue, "House of Peace"

This home was built around 1950. It is a rectangular, single-story building with painted horizontal wood siding. It is currently used for office and classroom space, and is proposed for demolition and redevelopment as the new worship facility. Pictures of 159 Smalley Avenue are included in the full HAAR, Attachment Y.

The HAAR concluded that this property did not meet any of the four criteria for eligibility for listing in the CRHR.

In addition, as noted, an archival records search was conducted to identify previous cultural resource studies done on or adjacent to the Project site. There have been six previous cultural resources studies conducted within ¼-mile of the Project area; the study areas of two of these overlap with the southern portion of the Project area. These studies were conducted in 1977 as part of development of A Street. No previously recorded cultural resources were identified within the Project area by either study.

[11] Criterion 1: "Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage." Title 14 CCR, Section 4852.

The State Office of Historic Preservation Historic Property Directory (OHP HPD) (which includes listings of the CRHR, California State Historical Landmarks, California State Points of Historical Interest, and the National Register of Historic Places) lists no recorded buildings or structures adjacent to the proposed Project area. In addition to these inventories, the NWIC base maps show no recorded buildings or structures within the proposed Project area.

Because there are no historic structures within the proposed Project area, the Project would have **no impact** related to historic resources.

b, c) Archaeological/Paleontological Resources/Human Remains

The Project site has been previously developed and is fully covered by paving and structures. Ground disturbance is proposed for the entire site. The site has been characterized in *Archaeology in Alameda County: A Handbook for Planners* (Handbook) as of moderate archeological sensitivity (see Figure 9.) Pursuant to guidance in the Handbook, "in moderately sensitive zones, only projects which require major environmental evaluation studies would call for field inspection by a trained professional."[12] Although not very likely, disturbance of previously unrecorded archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, paleontological resources and/or human remains represents a **potentially significant** environmental impact associated with the Project, and Mitigation Measure Cultural-1 is identified.

Mitigation Measures

Cultural -1: Halt Construction/Assess Significance of Find/Follow Treatment Plan. Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities (including clearing vegetation and demolition procedures), the developer or contractor shall inform all supervisory personnel and all contractors whose activities may have subsurface soil impacts of the potential for discovering archaeological resources, paleontological resources, tribal cultural resources and/or human remains, and of the procedures to be followed if these previously unrecorded cultural resources are discovered. These procedures shall include:

- Halting all ground-disturbing activities within 100 feet of the area where a potential cultural resource has been found;
- Notifying a qualified archaeologist of the discovery; and
- Following a treatment plan prescribed by the appropriate professional if the cultural resource is deemed significant, in accordance with federal or state law.

In the event cultural resources as defined above are encountered during ground disturbing activities, the developer shall, subject to approval by the County of Alameda, retain an on-call archaeologist to review the excavation work, assess the significance of the potential cultural resource and prescribe a treatment plan. The archaeologist will consult with a paleontologist or tribal cultural resource specialist as required. The archaeologist shall report any finds in accordance with current professional protocols. The archaeologist shall meet the Professional Qualifications Standards mandated by the Secretary of the Interior and the California Office of Historic Preservation.

[12] *Archaeology in Alameda County: A Handbook for Planners,* prepared by Quaternary Research Group, 1976. P. 17.

In the event that any human remains are uncovered at the Project site during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area until after the Alameda County Coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and (if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin) the descendants from the deceased Native American(s) have made a recommendation to the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

With implementation of this mitigation measure and compliance with applicable statutory requirements, impacts to archaeological or paleontological remains would be **less than significant**.

d) Human Remains

The records search conducted for the site found that the ethnographic literature references no Native American resources in or adjacent to the proposed Project area. As noted previously, the Project site is a previously developed site in an urbanized area and, as such, it is anticipated that no known human remains would be disturbed by the proposed Project. However, Mitigation Measure Cultural-1, described above, would also apply to the discovery of human remains.

Because of the low likelihood of encountering such resources, and the protections required by the mitigation measure above and applicable laws addressing findings of unknown resources, the impact is considered **less than significant**.

e) Tribal Cultural Resources

Based on the records search conducted by WSA at NWIC, the site does not meet the criteria for definition as a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) 21074 or section 5024.1(c). PRC Section 21074 states:

(a) "Tribal cultural resources" are either of the following:

> (1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
>
> > (A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
> >
> > (B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
>
> (2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

(b) A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape.

(c) A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a "non-unique archaeological resource" as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

PRC section 5024.1(c) states:

(c) A resource may be listed as an historical resource in the California Register if it meets any of the following National Register of Historic Places criteria:

> (1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
>
> (2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

(3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.

(4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The Native American Historic Resource Protection Act (Public Resources Code section 21083.09, added by Assembly Bill 52 or AB 52 [2014]) is intended to minimize conflict between Native American and development interests. AB 52 adds "tribal cultural resources" to the specific cultural resources protected under CEQA, and requires lead agencies to notify relevant tribes about development projects. It also mandates lead agencies to consult with tribes if requested, and sets the principles for conducting and concluding the required consultation process.

The County sent notifications to potentially affected tribes on April 26, 2017, alerting them to the nature of the proposed Project. No requests for consultation have been received as of this writing.[13]

Because the site does not meet the definition of a tribal cultural resource, there would be **no impacts** to tribal resources.

[13] Personal email communication from Damien Curry, Alameda County Community Development Department, July 7, 2017.

6. Geology and Soils

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42)			☒	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			☒	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			☒	
iv) Landslides?				☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			☒	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			☒	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			☒	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately				☒

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				

a-d) Geologic Hazards

Fault Rupture & Ground Shaking

The San Francisco Bay Area is considered one of the most seismically active regions in the United States. Significant earthquakes have occurred in the San Francisco Bay Area and are believed to be associated with crustal movements along a system of sub-parallel fault zones that generally trend in a northwesterly direction. According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones Map of the Hayward Quadrangle, the site is almost ¾-mile away and outside of the Hayward Fault earthquake fault zone as designated by the State of California[14], therefore the risk of surface fault rupture is considered low.

The U.S. Geological Survey (2016) has stated that there is a 72 percent chance of at least one earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater striking the San Francisco Bay region between 2014 and 2043. Therefore, the site will probably be subjected to at least one moderate to severe earthquake that will cause strong ground shaking. The shaking predicted for an earthquake of this magnitude on the Hayward Fault is considered very strong (level MMI Level 8).[15] The proposed building will be required to meet California Building Standards Code standards for design and construction. In the context of earthquake hazards, these standards have a primary objective to assure public safety and a secondary goal of minimizing property damage and maintaining function during and following seismic events. In particular, the following policies apply:

- Policy P10 of the Safety Element of the Alameda County General Plan[16] states that "Buildings shall be designed and constructed to withstand ground shaking forces of a minor earthquake (1-4 magnitude) without damage, of a moderate (5 magnitude) earthquake without structural damage, and of a major earthquake (6-8 magnitude) without collapse of the structure."
- In addition, Action A6 of the Safety Element states, "Require sites to be developed in accordance with recommendations contained in the soil and geologic investigations reports."

[14] California Geological Survey Map, Available at http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/quad/HAYWARD/maps/Hayward_EZRIM.pdf. Accessed March 24, 2017.

[15] Association of Bay Area Governments Resilience Program, Earthquake Map. Available at http://gis.abag.ca.gov/website/Hazards/?hlyr=calaverasSCN&co=6001. Accessed March 24, 2017

[16] Safety Element of Alameda County General Plan, adopted January 13, 2014, amended February 4, 2014., p. 17.

With implementation of detailed design-level specifications California Building Code, and with County of Alameda and State of California Standards for seismic construction, adverse effects related to ground shaking will be **less than significant**.

Liquefaction

As described in the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the Project (see Attachment C), the potential for liquefaction occurring in the sand layer below the groundwater table is relatively high.[17] However, the Cone Penetration Test conducted on the proposed worship facility parcel found no potential liquefiable soils there; soil boring found groundwater at 34.0 feet. Sandy silt subject to potential liquefaction may be encountered at 47 feet deep below ground surface. The actual ground surface damage will vary depending on the thickness of the overlying non-liquefiable soils and the underlying liquefiable soils. The report concluded that potential settlement from "liquefaction-caused structures distress" underlying this site is low.[18] No recommendations were proposed in the Geotechnical Report to specifically address this risk. Therefore, impacts related to liquefaction would be **less than significant**.

Landslides

The Project is located in a flat area with no slopes that could be considered a landslide risk. There would be **no impact** related to landslides.

Soil erosion or loss of topsoil

The Project would not involve changes in topography that could lead to soil erosion. There are no recognized unique geologic features or physical features that would be affected by the construction of the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion and topsoils would be **less than significant**.

Expansive soil

The soil boring on the proposed building site found subsurface soil consisting of approximately 1.5 feet of asphaltic concreate and baserock, followed by dark brown and brown silty clay, stiff to very stiff, silty clayey, to 10 feet; followed by brown sandy silt, moist and firm to 12 feet; followed by brown silty clay, moist and stiff, to 15 feet; followed by brown clayey silt, moist, firm to 18 feet;, followed by brown silty clay, very moist, firm to stiff to 35 feet. Below the clay, brown silty fine sand, very moist and medium dense was encountered to 41 feet, followed by brown clayey silt, very moist and stiff, to the maximum depth explored of 50 feet.

Expansive soils typically arise as a result of an increase in water content in the upper few meters from ground surface. More clayey, highly expansive surface soil materials will be subjected to volume changes during seasonal fluctuations in moisture content. Atterberg tests for the boring conducted at the

[17] Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Church and Classroom, Chinese for Christ Church. Prepared by Wayne Ting and Associates, 2007. The earlier findings were reviewed and confirmed in an updated report, also by Wayne Ting and Associates, in July 2016. Specifically, the updated report confirmed that the proposed structure can be supported on a mat slab or post-tensioned slab foundation, and provided recommendations for allowable bearing capacity for either foundation type.

[18] Ibid., p. 8.

proposed building site displayed a plasticity index of 15, indicating slightly plastic soils[19], which correlates to slight potential for expansion.[20] To reduce the potential for post-construction distress to the proposed structure resulting from swelling and shrinkage of these materials, the report recommends that the proposed structure be supported on a pier and grade beam foundation or post-tensioned slabs designed to reduce the impact of the expansive soils. The Project would implement this and other recommendations from the Geotechnical report (Attachment C). Therefore, with implementation of the engineering design recommendations incorporated by reference Attachment C, the impacts from expansive soil would be **less than significant**.

e) Septic Tanks

The Project would not include the use of septic tanks and associated disposal facilities. Therefore, the Project would have **no impact** in this regard.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			☒	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				☒

a) Greenhouse Gas Emissions

BAAQMD has determined that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and global climate change represent cumulative impacts. Alameda County applies screening level thresholds that use the size of the project as a proxy measure of whether a given project could potentially produce significant levels of GHG emissions. These screening levels were originally developed as part of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)'s CEQA Guidelines, based on the BAAQMD's treatment of a project-

[19] Sowers, 1979. Introductory Soil Mechanics and Foundations: Geotechnical Engineering, 4th Ed., Macmillan, New York. (as referenced in Coduto, 1999. Geotechnical Engineering: Principles and Practices. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.

[20] Correlations Between Soil Plasticity and Strength Parameters, in *Advanced Engineering Geology & Geotechnics* , Available at: http://web.mst.edu/~rogersda/umrcourses/ge441/Soil%20Plasticity%20vs%20Strength%20Parameters.pdf. Accessed March 27, 2017

level source. Although BAAQMD is no longer recommending that these thresholds be used as a measure of a project's potential to produce significant air quality impacts, many cities and localities in the State (including Alameda County) continue to apply them on a project-specific basis, based on the validity of the substantial body of scientific evidence that was developed in creating them.

If a project does not exceed the screening level, it is assumed that the project would not generate operational-related GHG that exceed the Thresholds of Significance. For a place of worship such as the Project, the screening level project size for greenhouse gas emissions is 61,000 sf. At approximately 16,000 sf, the Project is well below the size that would require greenhouse gas modeling to assess impact significance. Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would therefore result in a **less-than-significant cumulative impact to** greenhouse gas emissions.

BAAQMD does not suggest a threshold for assessment of construction-period GHG emissions impacts or provide a screening level at which to compare projects. However, with a project on an already developed site requiring relatively little site preparation, such as the proposed Project, construction-period GHG emissions would add a small amount to the lifetime operational GHG emissions and would not change conclusions discussed below.

b) Conflict with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plans

The Community Climate Action Plan (Plan) for the unincorporated areas of Alameda County fulfills the requirements of a BAAQMD-qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, as demonstrated in Appendix E of that Plan[21]. The Plan contains measures that the Applicant could implement to be consistent with County-wide recommended actions in the Plan, including:

- **Energy Performance**: Use building materials containing recycled content
- **Water Use**: Reduce potable water use for landscape irrigation by 60 percent of the baseline initial requirements for plant installation and establishment (Section 5.304) as identified in Section A5.304.4 Tier 1 of the 2010 CALGreen.

Project compliance with applicable policies and measures included in the Plan would ensure there would be **no impact** in relation to consistency with GHG reduction plans.

[21] Alameda County (Unincorporated Areas) Community Climate Action Plan. Approved by AC Board of Supervisors February 4, 2014. Available at http://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/110603_Alameda_CCAP_Final.pdf. Accessed March 27, 2017.

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			☒	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			☒	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			☒	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				☒
e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?				☒
f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?				☒

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				☒
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				☒

a, b) Hazardous Materials

The proposed building parcel site at 159 Smalley Avenue appears to have been exclusively developed as a residential site. However, the site does appear on EDR's list of Historical Automobile sites from the 1940s. Further research into local records and advertisements of the time suggests that the owners of the business lived at 159 Smalley and sometimes used their home phone numbers as their business number, while the auto body work itself was conducted at another location on Castro St.[22] Other than its status on a list of previous auto-service related sites, the site does not appear in any government databases for hazardous waste storage, disposal, or cleanup.

There are a number of sites within ¼-mile of the Project that are listed on government websites for leaking underground storage tanks (gasoline stations), or as small-quantity generators of hazardous waste (all are dry cleaners). The only one of these sites under active cleanup within ¼-mile is the Sequoia Grove site at 130 A Street. The site is approximately 0.73 acres and is a vacant, undeveloped parcel on the southwest corner of A Street and Walnut Street in a mixed residential and commercial area. The site was first developed in the early 1900s for residential use. The homes were demolished in the 1980s as part of the re-construction of A Street and associated overpass. The Sequoia Grove site is largely covered with vegetation with some trees. A layer of fill material up to two feet thick reportedly overlies native soil at the site. Previous investigations at the site were conducted in preparation for planned site redevelopment into residential housing by Habitat for Humanity. Previous investigations include soil and soil vapor sampling. Analytical results for the Sequoia Grove site indicated the presence

[22] Personal email communication with Stacy Kasokovich, William Self Associates. April 8, 2017.

of several organochlorine pesticides, lead, and petroleum hydrocarbons in shallow soil. Field work on the site cleanup was completed in early February, 2017.[23]

Because the CFCC Project site's appearance on a database as an automobile-service related facility is likely inaccurate, it is unlikely that activities that disturb the soil (excavation, grading) could expose any hazardous wastes remaining in the ground. However, if soil, groundwater, or another environmental medium with suspected contamination is encountered unexpectedly during construction activities (e.g., identified by odor or visual staining, or if any underground storage tanks, abandoned drums or other hazardous materials or wastes are encountered), the Applicant shall cease work in the vicinity of the suspect material, the area shall be secured as necessary, and the Applicant shall take all appropriate measures to protect human health and the environment. Appropriate measures shall include notifying the Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (ACDEH), and complying with the ACDEH regulatory process to identify and remedy the nature and extent of contamination, as directed. Work shall not resume in the affected area until the required measures have been implemented under the oversight of the County.

Hazardous waste generated by Project visitors could reach local waterways through dumping, runoff, sewer spills, storm drains, and disposal in landfills. Operation of the Project, however, would not involve generation, storage, or handling of substantial amounts of materials considered to be hazardous. Therefore, impacts from hazardous materials generated by Project operations would be **less than significant**.

c) Hazardous Materials Near Schools

The closest existing school site is Burbank Elementary School which is located approximately 0.2 miles southeast of the Project site. However, normal operation of a worship facility of the size proposed would not involve handling substantial quantities of materials considered to be hazardous. The Project therefore represents a **less-than-significant impact** relative to the potential exposure of the public including students at nearby schools to hazardous materials.

d) Government Code Section 65962.5

The Project site is not included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code, including a list of hazardous sites as compiled by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)[24]. Therefore, there would be **no impact** related to hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

e, f) Airport Hazards

The closest airport is Hayward Executive Airport, a general aviation airport servicing local private pilots, and located approximately 1 mile from the Project site. The Project site does not violate any height and

[23] Envirostor database, Department of Toxic Substances Control. Available at http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/profile_report.asp?global_id=60002341. Accessed March 27, 2017. According to the page for this case, fieldwork has been completed and no letter from DTSC is required.

[24] EnviroStor. Website: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/ Accessed: March 27, 2017. GeoTracker. Website: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=159+Smalley+Ave%2C+Hayward%2C+CAAccessed: March 27, 2017.

use restrictions in any airport land use plan. The proposed Project does not include elements dangerous to aircraft such as blinking lights, smoke columns, or attraction of birds. There are no other airports or airstrips, either public or private within the vicinity of the Project. There would be **no impact** related to airport hazards.

g) Emergency Response Plan

The Project would not substantially alter traffic patterns and would not impair implementation of any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Access to the Project site would continue to be from a driveway on Smalley Avenue along the site's northern boundary. No other exterior vehicle ingress or egress is provided to the site.

The Project would be required to adhere to all requirements of the California Fire Code as well as provisions in the Alameda County Fire Code (Chapter 6.04 of the Municipal Code) requiring development projects to ensure adequate provision for emergency access. Therefore, the Project would have **no impact** in this regard.

h) Wildland Fire

The Project site is located in an urbanized area removed from areas typically subject to wildland fire. Therefore, the Project would have **no impact** related to wildland fire.

9. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in a significant increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters (marine, fresh, and/or wetlands) during or following construction (considering water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and typical stormwater pollutants, e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash?		☒		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				☒
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			☒	
d) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff (e.g., due to increased impervious surfaces) in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site (i.e. within a watershed)?				☒
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or			☒	

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
planned stormwater drainage systems due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		☒		
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			☒	
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?			☒	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			☒	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			☒	

a,f) Violate Water Quality or Waste Discharge Standards, Degrade Water Quality

Regulations promulgated under the federal Clean Water Act require municipalities to obtain permits under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to regulate the discharge of pollutants from stormwater. Unincorporated areas within Alameda County such as Cherryland must eliminate or reduce "non-point" pollution, consisting of all types of substances generated as a result of urbanization (e.g. pesticides, fertilizers, automobile fluids, sewage, litter), to the "maximum extent practicable" (as required by Clean Water Act Section 402(p)(3)(iii)).

In California, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is authorized by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to implement the NPDES program created by the Clean Water Act. The RWQCB does this through a Municipal Regional Permit (MRP), NPDES Permit No. CAS612008 adopted November 19, 2015, as the NPDES permit for all Bay Area municipalities, including the unincorporated areas of Alameda County. The MRP includes a Provision C.3 intended to address

stormwater runoff pollutant discharges and prevent increases in runoff flows from new development and redevelopment projects. This goal is to be accomplished primarily through the implementation of low impact development (LID) techniques (such as runoff reduction features).

Clean Water Act Section 402(p) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regulations (40 CFR 122.26) specify a municipal program of "best management practices" to control stormwater pollutants. Best Management Practices (BMPs) refers to procedures or devices designed to minimize the quantity of pollutants that enter the storm drain system. To comply with these practices, Alameda County, 14 of its incorporated cities, and the Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District have joined together to form the Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program (ACCWP).

The Project site is located on a gently sloping site that ranges from 72 to 75 feet. Construction will involve demolition, excavation and grading activities. These activities generate dust, sediment, litter, oil, paint, and other pollutants that could temporarily contaminate runoff from the site and degrade water quality in Sulphur Creek (which drains directly to San Francisco Bay) due to potential sheet flow runoff into the surrounding storm drain system which eventually discharges into these waterways. The Project could therefore result in a violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality, but this impact would be reduced through required implementation of construction-period and post-construction water quality mitigation measures (**less than significant with mitigation**).

After development, the Project will contribute stormwater runoff pollutants from building roof tops and paved areas. Runoff from streets and parking areas often carries grease, oil, and trace amounts of heavy metals into natural drainages. Although the amounts of these pollutants ultimately discharged into the waterways are unknown, over time they could accumulate and be substantial.

Project construction would disturb approximately 35,000 square feet. The satellite parking lot fronting A Street would not be disturbed as part of the Project. Because the total disturbance is less than one (1) acre, the Project does not require coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit. However, because the Project creates or replaces more than 10,000 square feet of impervious surfaces, and the total replaced impervious area is more than 50% of the existing impervious area, the NPDES C.3 provisions for source control site design and water treatment requirements apply to the Project. To further ensure these provisions are effectively implemented, the following mitigation measure has been identified:

Mitigation Measure

Hydro-1: NPDES C.3 Requirements – Stormwater Control Plan. Pursuant to the San Francisco Bay RWQCB's Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (Permit Number CAS612008) (MRP), the Project applicant shall be required to design, construct and operate stormwater treatment controls to treat post-construction stormwater runoff. These controls shall be sized, designed, implemented and operated in accordance with the Provision C.3 requirements of the regional permit, and the technical requirements of the Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program (ACCWP) Stormwater C.3 Stormwater Technical Guidance, Version 5.1 dated May 2, 2016. The ACCWP is administered by the Alameda County Public Works Agency.

The Applicant will prepare a preliminary Stormwater Control Plan showing the location of the bio-retention area. The preliminary Stormwater Control Plan is depicted in Figure 10.

A typical Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) includes recommendations on the use of permanent Best Management Practices (BMP) for the Project. Probable design storm flows and permanent BMP selections are usually also presented in the SWCP, which is developed to meet the technical requirements of the Alameda County Clean Water Program Stormwater C.3 Technical Guidance.

Key elements of a typical project SWCP are shown below.

1. *Bio-treatment Pond.* The stormwater collected within the proposed Project will be treated by a bio-treatment pond to be built during the construction phase of the Project. The storm runoff from the site will be directed to the on-site storm drainage system before runoff is discharged to the pond. The treatment pond is a depressed landscaping area that allows the collection of stormwater runoff to percolate through a sandy soil into a sub-drain which facilitates pollutant removal.
2. *Labeling Of Stormwater Inlets*. Storm water inlets shall have metal badges installed with the logo "No Dumping--Flows to Bay". This measure is intended to prevent unlawful dumping of waste materials such as motor oil or trash into the inlets by educating citizens of potential contamination.
3. *Integrated Pest Management.* Alternative methods for pest reduction methods will be employed to limit the usage of pesticides. Methods may include the incorporation of planting materials. Owner and maintenance staff shall review and adhere to the Landscape Maintenance Techniques for Pest Reduction as specified in the plan.
4. *Preventive Maintenance of Structural BMPs.* The property owner will enter into a perpetual maintenance contract for the maintenance of the bio-treatment area and flow-through planters during post-construction operations. Regular maintenance, sweeping, and trash pick-up from the parking and landscaping areas will be created to decrease the possibly of solids and pollutants entering into the on-site storm drainage system.
5. *Materials Handling and Storage.* No outside storage of materials is anticipated or allowed post-construction. No car washing will be allowed within the Project site. No vehicle storage will be anticipated on-site.

Once construction of the Project has been completed, ongoing operations and maintenance of all water quality elements of the Project will be required. With implementation of the mitigation measure requiring a Stormwater Control Plan and compliance with County Best Management Practices during Project operations, the Project would not violate any adopted water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. On-going operations and maintenance of the proposed stormwater treatment systems will result in a **less-than-significant impact** (with mitigation) on water quality.

b) Groundwater Supplies and Recharge

Potable water will be provided to the Project by East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). The Project does not propose to use or pump groundwater. In terms of groundwater recharge, the Project site is currently approximately 100 percent impervious surface and stormwater on the Project site does not contribute to recharging of the groundwater aquifers; it drains into the site's stormwater system and is ultimately discharged into San Leandro Creek. Implementation of the Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or impede groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. The Project would produce a **less-than- significant impact** on ground water supply and recharge.

c,d) Alteration of Existing Drainage Patterns Resulting in Erosion

Existing drainage facilities consist of a system of underground storm drain pipes used to collect stormwater runoff directed from impervious surfaces into inlets located throughout the site. Stormwater flows are then carried into the public system connected via catch basins fronting Smalley Ave into the sewer network along Meekland Avenue. The amount of existing impervious area is approximately 49,520 square feet. The Project proposes to install 12,944 of pervious pavement. Onsite stormwater runoff will surface-flow or be collected and directed to a bio-retention area located between the new building and the Smalley Avenue frontage via a private storm drain system. The bio-retention area will include a storm drain inlet at 6" minimum elevation, which will connect to the Smalley Ave storm drain network. The design features of the drainage network will minimize potential impacts to erosion or siltation from the increase in impervious surface. In addition, no stream or river is present on-site, nor would the Project alter the course of any stream or river. Therefore, impacts will be **less than significant**.

e) Exceed stormwater capacity or provide additional sources of polluted runoff

The Project site is currently covered by approximately 49,520 square feet of impervious surfaces and all stormwater runoff from the site is directed to the municipal stormwater system located via inlets and pipes along Smalley Avenue. The Project proposes to use pervious paving for a portion of the Project, totaling 12,944 sf. An additional 19,876 sf impervious surface would be created or replaced. This would result in approximately 31,382 square feet of impervious surface on-site, a decrease of approximately 18,000 square feet from current. Only a portion of the pervious unpaved surface would be landscaped. The Project would include a bio-retention area of 861 sf, equivalent to 4% of the created or replaced impervious surface area.[25] Stormwater from the site would continue to be directed to the municipal stormwater network along Smalley Avenue.

Because the Project will increase the relative amount of pervious surface by additional landscaping and add a properly sized and engineered bio-retention area, the Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes. Thus, the Project would result in a **less than significant impact** relative to drainage patterns or stormwater runoff.

g-j) Flooding and Inundation

The Project site is outside of the 0.2% annual chance floodplain area (the 500-year flood).[26] The Project is not located within a mapped dam failure inundation area. In addition, there are no levees in the area with the potential to cause flooding if a failure would occur. Therefore, the Project site would not be subject to flooding in the event of a catastrophic failure of the dam.

A seiche is a tidal change in an enclosed or semi-enclosed water body caused by sustained high winds or an earthquake. The Project site is not located near any water body with the potential to generate a

[25] When the total amount of replaced impervious surface is less than 50% of the existing impervious surface, treatment requirements apply onto the impervious surface created and/or replaced, per Alameda County Clean Water Program, Provision C.3 Guidelines. For the Project, created/replace impervious surface =19,876/49,520=40%.

[26] Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), Map Number 06001C0286G, effective on 08/03/2009.

seiche. Tsunamis are seismically induced sea waves that, upon entering shallow near-shore waters, may reach heights capable of causing widespread damage to coastal areas. The Project site is situated in an urbanized area with no potential for exposure to mudflows. The Project site is not subject to tsunami inundation, based on maps prepared by the California Geological Survey.[27]

Therefore, the Project represents no **impact** relative to flooding and inundation.

[27] Association of Bay Area Governments, Earthquake and Hazards Information, Tsunami Inundation Map for Coastal Evacuation website, viewed on March 29, 2017, http://gis.abag.ca.gov/website/Hazards/?hlyr=tsunami/

10. Land Use and Planning

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			☒	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				☒

a) Physical Division of a Community

The Project involves redevelopment of an existing use at the site and does not involve any physical changes that would have the potential to divide the established community. The Project would, therefore, have **no impact** under this item.

b) Conflict with Land Use Plan

The General Plan land use designations for the Project site are Medium Density Residential (MDR) and General Commercial (GC) (see Figure 3). The sanctuary site is classified into the RS-DV (Suburban Residential, Density Variable) District, the satellite parking lot into a PD (Planned Development) District allowing commercial uses with an approved Site Development Review. The Church has been operating under a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at this location since the 1980s. The CUP was granted by the Board of Zoning Adjustments for operation of a community facility, pursuant to Alameda County Municipal Code (ACMC) Ordinance 17.12.040 (Zoning). This CUP would be re-issued as part of the entitlements for the proposed Project. The CUP will also allow deviation from the 25-foot building height

development standard applicable to R-S districts, allowing a maximum height of 75 feet (proposed building height is 30'-6").[28]

Parking requirements for churches are found in ACMC Table 17.52.920, excerpted below. The proposed new worship facility will seat 325 worshipers, thereby requiring 81 parking spaces. The Church proposes to utilize the 36 existing spaces on the combined parcel at 159-161 Smalley proximate to the new facility on the south and east. On an adjacent parcel, the Joy House at 149 Smalley (also owned by the Church) would be demolished and replaced with 15 vehicle spaces. The remaining 32 spaces would be located on the Church-owned parcel located at 100 A Street. The Project will require a Variance from the ACMC because the requisite number of parking spaces will not be located on the same parcel on which the building would be located. The Project proposes to provide the required number of vehicle spaces on three other parcels owned by the Church. Congregants who park in the lot at 100 A Street will use the public sidewalk and the new pedestrian walkway proposed from Meekland Ave. to access the worship facility (about 1/10th of a mile from the entrance to the proposed sanctuary building).

Table 2. Parking Spaces Required for Places of Assembly

Use	Number of Spaces Required
Auditorium, church, mortuary, chapel, sports stadium or arena, race track, theater	1 for each 4 seats, counting 18 inches of seating space on a bench as 1 seat, and counting only the largest assembly room in the case of a church

Source: excerpted from Alameda County Municipal Code, Section 17.52.920.

With the renewal of the CUP and the granting of the required parking variance to allow the remote site to be used to fulfill the County's parking requirements, the Project would have a **less-than-significant impact** with regard to land use plan conflicts.

c) Conflict with Conservation Plan

The Project site is not subject to an existing conservation plan. It is surrounded by urban development and has been designated for developed land uses for a considerable period of time. The Project would, therefore, have **no impact** under this item.

[28] Height limit of 25' for R-S districts is given in Alameda County Code Section 17.12.100, which references Section 17.52.090, which specifies allowable height of 75' for churches.

11. Mineral Resources

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				☒

a, b) Mineral Resources

The site contains no known mineral resources.[29] The Project would have **no impact** on mineral resources.

12. Noise

Would the Project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			☒	

[29] U.S. Geological Survey, 2005, Mineral Resources Data System: U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia. Available through: http://tin.er.usgs.gov/mrds/. Accessed March 29, 2017.

Would the Project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		☒		
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?			☒	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?		☒		
e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure of people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?				☒
f) For a Project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure of people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?				☒

Noise is defined as unwanted sound. Sound levels are usually measured and expressed in decibels (dB) with 0 dB corresponding roughly to the threshold of hearing. Most of the sounds that are heard in the environment do not consist of a single frequency, but rather a broad band of frequencies, with each frequency differing in sound level. The intensities of each frequency add together to generate a sound. Noise is typically generated by transportation, specific land uses, and ongoing human activity.

The standard unit of measurement of the loudness of sound is the decibel (dB). The 0 point on the dB scale is based on the lowest sound level that the healthy unimpaired human ear can detect. Changes of 3 dB or less are only perceptible in laboratory environments; a change of 3 dB is the lowest change that can be perceptible to the human ear in indoor environments, while a change of 5 dBA is considered to be the minimum readily perceptible change to the human ear in outdoor environments.

Since the human ear is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies, the A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) was derived to relate noise to the sensitivity of humans. It gives greater weight to the frequencies of sound to which the human ear is most sensitive. The A-weighted sound level is the basis for a number of various sound level metrics, including the day/night sound level (L_{dn}) and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), both of which account for the increased human sensitivity to sound at night. In addition, the equivalent continuous sound level (L_{eq}) is the average sound energy of time-varying noise over a sample period and the L_{max} is the maximum instantaneous noise level occurring over a sample period.

The Noise Element of the County's Eden Area General Plan (2010) contains noise and land use compatibility standards. For church uses, exposure to an exterior CNEL of 60 dBA or less is considered "normally acceptable;" ambient noise levels from 60-75 dBA CNEL are considered "conditionally acceptable", such that specified land uses may be permitted only after detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements and needed noise insulation features included in the design.

Community noise within the Eden Area of Alameda County is also governed by the standards established in the Alameda County Noise Regulations. Other noise policies that affect development in the area are those established by the California Noise Insulation Standards, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) regulates highway noise and the State of California and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) control airport noise.

Section 6.60.040 of the Alameda County Noise Ordinance establishes regulations and standards for the generation of noise in a church. Table 6.60.040A of the Ordinance establishes an exterior noise standard of 60 dBA for the nearby residences. The Ordinance also states, however, that "In the event the measured ambient noise level exceeds the applicable noise level standard in any category above, the applicable standard shall be adjusted so as to equal said ambient noise level."[30] In the Project case, the exterior noise is projected at 64-69 dBA CNEL, so the standard against which to measure the Project's potential noise impacts should be adjusted to that level. Section 6.60.070 exempts construction noise from this ordinance, provided construction activities do not take place before 7am or after 7pm any day except Saturday or Sunday, or before 8am or after 5pm on Saturday or Sunday.

a) Excessive Noise

Existing ambient noise levels at the Project site were projected from the Noise Level Contours presented in the Eden Area General Plan[31]. Among the noise monitoring locations used for the General Plan measurement was Meekland and Poplar Avenues, less than 1/4-mile from the Project site and subject to the same traffic patterns. The methodology used was consistent with best practice methods outlined in Caltrans, FHWA, and similar guidance. The results of noise monitoring show that the Project site is located in a range with a CNEL of 64-69 dBA.

Implementation of the Project would result in increased traffic noise (discussed in section (c) below) as well as new stationary noise sources, such as mechanical equipment and parking lot activities.

[30] Alameda County Noise Ordinance, Chapter 6.60, Table 6.60.040A.

[31] County of Alameda, Eden Area General Plan, Noise Element, Figure 7-2. 2010.

A significant impact would occur if the Project would result in an exceedance of the operational noise performance standard at nearby land uses given in the County's Noise Ordinance. This performance standard is 64-69 dBA CNEL as measured at the backyards of residences that front on A Street, south of the Project site, and at 250 Smalley Avenue, adjacent east of the Project site.

The Project would generate higher levels of stationary noise sources such as parking lot activities, HVAC systems, and landscape maintenance. Such activities include people conversing, doors slamming, or vehicles entering, exiting, parking, and idling. The proposed parking areas on the Smalley Ave parcels are extend to less than 50 feet from the nearest off-site receptors (the two dwelling units to the south at 130 and 140 A Street, and the units at 205 Smalley Ave directly east). These parking lot activities would be expected to be concentrated heavily in the 9:00am-12n Sunday time period, as congregants or students arrive and leave the parking lot areas, and the resulting maximum noise levels would therefore occur for approximately 30 cumulative minutes within the hour before worship services begin at 9:45am every Sunday, and the hour after they end at 11am (the Church has a weekly luncheon after the service end; this would likely have the effect of spreading parking lot noise over a longer period, as the majority of congregants would leave after service at 11am, but some would remain). Even if these three hours per week were to occasionally produce maximum noise levels above the 64-69 dBA standard, the average contribution to CNEL over 7 days would be small. As a result, noise from these activities, when averaged over a 24-hour period, would not result in an exceedance of the County's noise performance threshold of 64-69 dBA CNEL. Therefore, Project-related parking lot activities would not result in exposure of off-site persons to noise levels in excess of established standards, and thus such impacts would be **less than significant**.

At the time this analysis was prepared, details were not available pertaining to proposed mechanical ventilation systems for the Project. Noise impacts resulting from HVAC systems can vary considerably depending on the equipment selected, the system design, and the location of the equipment relative to the noise sensitive use. Noise levels from commercial HVAC systems are typically in the range of 60 to 70 dBA L_{eq} at a distance of 15 feet. Conservatively using the higher noise level of 70 dBA for the HVAC system and based on the attenuation of sound with distance, at a distance of 45' to the nearest residences the proposed mechanical ventilation systems would attenuate to 61 dBA L_{eq}[32]. Conservatively applying the standard formula for adding separate noise sources yields a resulting noise level of 65.7 dBA. [33] This is 1.7 dBA higher than the lower end of ambient noise level range, but within the 64-69 dB range; thus the HVAC only contributes an imperceptible increment (less than 3 dBA) to noise at the nearest locations. As a result, noise from operation of mechanical ventilation systems, when averaged over a 24-hour period, would not result in an exceedance of the County's noise performance

[32] Based on the Inverse Square Law, which applies the following equation to describe sound attenuation with distance. $L_{p2} - L_{p1} = 10 \log (R_2 / R_1)^2$. In this case, $L_{p2} - L_{p1}$ = 10 log $(45ft/15ft)^2$ =9.5 dB.

Accessed at http://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/inverse-square-law-d_890.html.

[33] In this case, the most conservative result comes from maximizing the difference between ambient noise level and HVAC noise level, because the widest difference translates to the greatest incremental noise contribution of the HVAC system; thus, the ambient noise level is the lower end of the projected range (64 dBA), and the HVAC noise is the attenuated level of the noisiest HVAC level (70dBA-9dBA attenuation= 61dBA). The formula for adding sounds is $SPL_{(total)} = 10\log_{10} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 10^{(SPL_i)/10}$

threshold of 64-69 dBA CNEL as measured at the nearest off-site receptor. Therefore, stationary operational noise levels would result in a **less than significant impact**.

b) Groundborne Vibration

Groundborne vibrations consist of rapidly fluctuating motions within the ground that have an average motion of zero. Vibrating objects in contact with the ground radiate vibration waves through various soil and rock strata to the foundations of nearby buildings. The County's performance standards in Zoning Ordinance Section 18.50.060(B) state, "no use, activity, or process shall produce groundborne vibrations that are perceptible without instruments by a reasonable person at the property lines of a site."

In extreme cases, excessive groundborne vibration has the potential to cause structural damage to buildings. Common sources of groundborne vibration include construction activities such as blasting, pile driving and operating heavy earthmoving equipment. Construction vibration impacts on building structures are generally assessed in terms of peak particle velocity (PPV) or Vibration decibels (VdB) of the root mean square (RMS) amplitude of the vibration wave. Typical vibration source levels from construction equipment are presented using both measures in Table 3.

Table 3: Vibration Levels of Construction Equipment

Construction Equipment	PPV at 25 Feet (inches/second)	RMS Velocity in Vibration Decibels (VdB) at 25 Feet
Water Trucks	0.001	57
Scraper	0.002	58
Bulldozer—small	0.003	58
Jackhammer	0.035	79
Concrete Mixer	0.046	81
Concrete Pump	0.046	81
Paver	0.046	81
Pickup Truck	0.046	81
Auger Drill Rig	0.051	82
Backhoe	0.051	82
Crane (Mobile)	0.051	82
Excavator	0.051	82
Grader	0.051	82
Loader	0.051	82
Loaded Trucks	0.076	86
Bulldozer—Large	0.089	87
Caisson drilling	0.089	87
Vibratory Roller (small)	0.101	88
Compactor	0.138	90
Clam shovel drop	0.202	94
Vibratory Roller (large)	0.210	94
Pile Driver (impact-typical)	0.644	104
Pile Driver (impact-upper range)	1.518	112
Source: Compilation of scientific and academic literature, generated by FTA and FHWA.		

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has established industry accepted standards for vibration impact criteria and impact assessment. These guidelines are published in its Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment document[34]. The FTA guidelines include threshold criteria for construction vibration impacts for various structural categories as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Federal Transit Administration Construction Vibration Damage Criteria

Building Category	PPV (in/sec)	Approximate VdB
I. Reinforced-Concrete, Steel or Timber (no plaster)	0.5	102
II.Engineered Concrete and Masonry (no plaster)	0.3	98
III.Non-Engineered Timber and Masonry Buildings	0.2	94
IV.Buildings Extremely Susceptible to Vibration Damage	0.12	90
Source: FTA, 2006[35].		

Table 5. Ground-Borne Vibration (GBV) Impact Levels

Land Use Category	GBV Impact Levels (VdB re 1 micro-inch /sec)		
	Frequent Events[1]	Occasional Events[2]	Infrequent Events[3]
Category 1: Buildings where vibration would interfere with interior operations.	65	65	65
Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep.	72	75	80

[34] Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Federal Transit Administration, May 2006. Accessed at https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf

[35] Ibid.

Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime use.	75	78	83
Notes: 1. "Frequent Events" is defined as more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day. Most rapid transit projects fall into this category. 2. “Occasional Events” is defined as between 30 and 70 vibration events of the same source per day. Most commuter trunk lines have this many operations. 3. "Infrequent Events" is defined as fewer than 30 vibration events of the same kind per day. This category includes most commuter rail branch lines.			
Source: FTA, 2006			

To analyze potential impacts from the Project, it is necessary to estimate the vibration levels of construction equipment associated with the Project, factoring in attenuation from the absorption of vibration by the soil as the vibration waves travel toward nearby buildings and receptors.

Propagation of vibration through soil can be calculated using the following vibration reference equation:

$PPV_{equip} = PPV_{ref} \times (25/D)^n$, where:

PPV_{ref} = reference measurement at 25 feet from vibration source (Table 3)

D = distance from equipment to property line

n = vibration attenuation rate through ground (according to Chapter 12 of the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment manual (2006), an “n” value of 1.5 is recommended to calculate vibration propagation through typical soil conditions)

Among the variety of equipment used during construction, the vibratory rollers that are anticipated to be used during the paving phase of construction would produce the greatest groundborne vibration levels (higher impact equipment such as pile drivers is not expected to be used during construction of this Project). Large vibratory rollers produce groundborne vibration levels ranging up to 0.21 inches per second (in/sec) PPV at 25 feet from the operating equipment. The nearest off-site structures are the residences located immediately south (130 and 140 A Street) and east (205 Smalley Avenue) of the Project site, approximately 25 feet from the nearest construction area where this equipment would operate. Since the structures are at the same distance as the reference level of vibration, no attenuation factor is applied.

Using the formula above, groundborne vibration levels would be .21 PPV from operation of a large vibratory roller. These vibration levels are in excess of the industry standard vibration damage criteria of 0.2 PPV for this type of structure (see Table 4). Therefore, construction-related groundborne vibration damage impacts could be considered **potentially significant** without mitigation.

Impacts from groundborne vibration are also considered from the annoyance felt by nearby receptors, in addition to the potential for structural damage. This is the impact referenced in the “perceptibility”

standard given in the Zoning Code performance standards. Although groundborne vibration can be felt outdoors, it is typically only an annoyance to people indoors where the associated effects of the shaking of a building can be notable. When assessing annoyance from groundborne vibration, vibration is typically expressed as root mean square (RMS) velocity in units of decibels (VdB) of 1 micro-inch per second. The vibration levels expressed as VdB can be calculated at a given distance from the source using the following equation:

L_v (D)=L_v (25ft) – 30 x Log (D/25) where:

L_v=vibration level

D=distance from source

Using this formula, the vibration from the large vibratory roller is 94 since there is no attenuation at 25' from the Project site. This is above the impact threshold of 83 VdB for an institutional (Category 3) land use, even for infrequent events (Table 5). The small vibratory roller has a reference vibration level of 88 VdB, also greater than the FTA threshold. Although paving activities that use vibratory rollers are not expected to occur for more than a few days in total, close to the end of the construction period, these vibration levels would be perceptible by adjacent residents. Without mitigation, this could produce a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure

Noise-1: Construction Vibration Impacts to Adjacent Residences. The Project should minimize impacts by implementing the following:

- The Construction Management Plan should limit use of the equipment that could produce perceptible levels of vibration at adjacent locations to as few total hours as possible (i.e., equipment delivering vibration levels $\geq$ 94 VdB (to the residences on A Street and at 205 Smalley Ave.)
- Usage of this equipment should be limited to weekday daytime hours (9am-6pm).
- Provide prior notification to adjacent residents that perceptible vibrations could occur during this limited period of time

Upon completion of construction, the Project would not include any permanent sources of groundborne vibrations. As such, implementation of the Project would not expose persons within the Project vicinity to excessive groundborne vibration levels. Therefore, with the implementation of measures in Mitigation Measure Noise-1, Project-related groundborne vibration impacts would be **less than significant**.

c) Substantial permanent increases in ambient noise levels

"Audible increases in noise levels" generally refer to a change of 3 dBA or more, as changes of less than 3 dBA have been found to be barely perceptible to the human ear in outdoor environments. A change of 5 dBA is considered to be the minimum change considered readily perceptible to the human ear in outdoor environments. Therefore, for purposes of conservative analysis, an audible increase in noise levels (that is, an increase of 3 dBA or greater) would be considered a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Another characteristic of noise is that a doubling of sound sources with equal strength is required to result in a perceptible increase (3 dBA or greater) in noise level.

The Transportation Impact Analysis conducted for the Project estimated that, based on the Applicant's estimated increase in worship service attendees, the Project would generate an additional 80 vehicle trips on Sundays.[36] The second largest increase would be on Wednesdays, when an additional 68 daily trips would result (see Tables 7 & 8 in Section 15, Transportation). These Project trips do not represent a doubling of traffic volumes along any roadway segment in the Project vicinity, so the Project is not expected to result in a perceptible increase (3 dBA or greater) in traffic noise levels on any of the local roadways in the Project vicinity. Therefore, Project-related traffic noise impacts on off-site receptors would be **less than significant.**

As shown in the impact discussion under section (a) above, increased noise levels from parking lot activities could occur within 25 feet of nearest off-site receptors. However, these noise levels would be concentrated in a very few hours of the week—namely, Sunday morning beginning no earlier than 8:30 am, and ending no later than 2pm. In addition, noise levels from the operation of proposed mechanical ventilation systems would not exceed 61 dBA CNEL as measured at the nearest off-site receptor. The existing 24-hour weighted average community noise equivalent level in the Project vicinity, as documented through the long-term ambient noise measurements taken for the Eden Area General Plan, are in the range of 64-69 dBA CNEL. As such, stationary operational noise sources would not result in a substantial permanent perceptible increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project, and would therefore result in a **less than significant impact**.

d) Temporary or Periodic Increases in Ambient Noise

Section 6.60.070 exempts noise associated with construction from the standards in the ordinance, provided construction activities do not take place before 7am or after 7pm any day except Saturday or Sunday, or before 8am or after 5pm on Saturday or Sunday. This means that construction noise, by definition, will not create a significant impact for CEQA purposes. However, because construction noise could impact nearby residents, it is analyzed here, along with potential noise reduction measures.

Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during the construction of the proposed Project. First, construction crew vehicle trips to and from the site and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the Project site would incrementally increase noise levels on access roads leading to the site. Although there would be relatively high potential for short-term noise exposure causing intermittent noise nuisance, the effect on longer-term (hourly or daily) ambient noise levels would be negligible. Therefore, short-term construction-related impacts associated with worker commute and equipment transport to the Project site would be **less than significant**.

The second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during construction on the Project site. Construction is completed in discrete steps, each of which has its own mix of equipment and, consequently, its own noise characteristics. The various sequential phases change the character of the noise generated on the site and the noise levels surrounding the site as construction progresses. Despite the variety in the type and size of construction equipment, similarities in the dominant noise sources and patterns of operation allow construction related noise ranges to be categorized by work phase. Table lists typical construction equipment noise levels, based on a distance of 50 feet between

[36] Transportation Impact Analysis for the Chinese for Christ Church Project, conducted by W-Trans, April 11, 2017.

the equipment and a noise receptor.[37] Typical operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve 1 or 2 minutes of full-power operation followed by 3 or 4 minutes at lower power settings. Impact equipment such as pile drivers is not expected to be used during construction of the Project.

Table 6 Typical Construction Equipment Maximum Noise Levels, L_{max}

Type of Equipment	Impact Device? (Yes/No)	Specification Maximum Sound Levels for Analysis (dBA at 50 feet)
Pickup Truck	No	55
Pumps	No	77
Air Compressors	No	80
Backhoe	No	80
Front-End Loaders	No	80
Portable Generators	No	82
Dump Truck	No	84
Tractors	No	84
Auger Drill Rig	No	85
Concrete Mixer Truck	No	85
Cranes	No	85
Dozers	No	85
Excavators	No	85
Graders	No	85
Jackhammers	Yes	85
Man Lift	No	85
Paver	No	85
Pneumatic Tools	No	85
Rollers	No	85
Scrapers	No	85

[37] Typical equipment types are appropriate to use in the Project analysis, as neither the site nor proposed construction would require any specialized or unordinary equipment.

Concrete/Industrial Saws	No	90
Impact Pile Driver	Yes	95
Vibratory Pile Driver	No	95
Source: FHWA, 2006.		

Some of the loudest equipment expected to be used on the Project includes graders, bulldozers, jackhammers, pavers, concrete mixer trucks, vibratory roller compactors, backhoes, and front loaders. A characteristic of noise is that each doubling of the sound sources with equal strength increases the noise level by 3 dBA. Assuming that each piece of construction equipment operates at some distance from the other equipment, the worst-case combined noise level during this phase of construction would be 90 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 feet from an active construction area.

The nearest off-site land uses are the residences approximately 25 feet east and 35 feet south of the Project construction footprint. Residences across Smalley Avenue are less than 75 feet away. For purposes of a conservative analysis, assuming that multiple pieces of construction equipment operate simultaneously at some distance from each other, construction noise levels during the loudest phase of construction could range up to 91 dBA L_{max} at the closest of the nearest receptor land uses[38].

These construction noise levels would be clearly audible at all adjacent residential land uses. Increases in noise from Project construction activities would be periodic and temporary, occurring only through the duration of construction. These types of heavy equipment would only operate during the site preparation phase, which would continue for a maximum of one to two months. In addition, these noise levels are the worst-case (loudest) noise levels that would temporarily occur when construction equipment operate simultaneously at full power at the Project boundaries.

As mentioned above, although Project activities would likely generate a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project, construction noise has been excepted from the noise standards in County Ordinance Section 6.60.070. Therefore, the Project's temporary increase in noise levels would result in a **less-than-significant impact**.

Nonetheless, because of the proximity of the Project site to adjacent and nearby residences, the Applicant should consider implementing the recommended construction noise reduction measures below.

Best Management Practices to Reduce Construction Noise Levels. The following activities shall be implemented to reduce construction noise emanating from the Project site to the surrounding sensitive land uses:

- Comply with construction hours established within the Noise Ordinance to limit hours of exposure. The County's General Code limits construction activities to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends.

[38] Based on the Inverse Square Law, which applies the following equation to describe sound attenuation with distance. $L_{p2} - L_{p1} = 10 \log (R_2 / R_1)^2$. In this case, $L_{p2} - L_{p1}$ = 10 log $(25ft/50ft)^2$ =-6.02 dB. This is interpreted that the noise will be 6.02 dbB louder than the reference noise.

- Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines should be strictly prohibited.
- Locate stationary noise-generating equipment, such as air compressors or portable power generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Construct temporary noise barriers or partial enclosures to acoustically shield such equipment where feasible.
- Construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to operational business, residences or other noise-sensitive land uses where a noise control plan analysis determines that a barrier would be effective at reducing noise.
- Erect temporary noise control blanket barriers, if necessary, along building façades facing construction sites. Noise control blanket barriers can be rented and quickly erected.
- Utilize "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- Control noise from construction workers' radios to a point where they are not audible at existing residences bordering the Project site.
- Route construction-related traffic along major roadways and away from sensitive receptors where feasible.
- The contractor shall prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. The construction plan shall identify a procedure for coordination with adjacent residential land uses so that construction activities can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance.
- Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., bad muffler) and will require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include in it the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.

e, f) Airport Noise

The Project is unrelated to airport operation and would not result in changes or increases in airport noise that could expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. The Project would have **no impact** related to airport noise.

13. Population and Housing

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				☒

a-c) Substantial Population Growth

The proposed Project would displace neither existing housing nor people. As a non-residential project, it would not increase local employment (other than temporary construction employment) or induce population growth. Therefore, there would be **no impact** on population and housing.

14. Public Services

Would the Project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services?				
a) Fire protection.			☒	
b) Police protection.			☒	
c) Schools.				☒
d) Parks.				☒
e) Other public facilities.				☒

The Project would not lead to any increases in the County population. While the new worship facility will likely attract more worshipers, it will be replacing the previous facility located at virtually the identical site. Therefore, there would be **no significant impacts** associated with providing new or physically altered governmental facilities that support the provision of public services.

a) Fire Protection

The Project site is served by Alameda County Fire Department (ACFD) Station 23, located about 0.6 miles northwest of the Project. This fire station houses one engine company and is staffed by three firefighters.

The Project would increase the on-site user population over that of past use by 100-125 people, at most, primarily on Sunday from 9am-2pm. This increase could result in an increase in calls for fire and

emergency services. The Project be required to meet all requirements of the Alameda County Fire Code (ACMC Section 6.04.010). The Project would be adequately served by existing fire protection services and impacts would be **less than significant**.

b) Police Services

The Project would nominally increase the on-site user population over past use of the site. Such an increase could result in an increase in reported crimes. The Project applicant will consult with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department during final project design to assure appropriate security measures are incorporated. The Project would not significantly impact police protection services or require the construction of new or remodeled facilities. Therefore, Project impacts on police services would be **less than significant**.

c,d,e) Schools, Parks, Other facilities

As a non-residential project, the new CFCC worship facility would not lead to increased demand for schools, parks, or other facilities. Therefore, the Project would have **no impacts** on the provision of these public services.

15. Transportation

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			☒	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			☒	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?				☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			☒	

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			☒	
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			☒	

a) Conflict with applicable plan, ordinance, or policy

A transportation impact analysis was conducted for the Project by W-Trans. It is included here as Attachment D[39].

Trip Generation

Trip generation estimates are typically developed using standard rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in *Trip Generation Manual*, 9th Edition, 2012. The standard "Church" (ITE LU 560) rates are based on either building square footage or the number of seats in the main worship room. Because the proposed new construction on the existing church site is not anticipated to result in attendance growth comparable to the increase in building size, trip generation rates were developed based on the current programming schedule and number of attendees, and the anticipated future programming schedule and incremental church growth.

The existing conditions at the Chinese for Christ Church were derived using the current programming schedule, see attached schedule, and the average number of attendees for a Sunday service. An average vehicle occupancy of 1.2 persons per vehicle was used to determine the number of trips for the programming schedule on weekdays and Saturdays, while the average occupancy for a Sunday service was determined based on the number of families who attend the church, the average number of persons per family from the 2011-2015 American Community Survey (3.24), and 1.2 persons per vehicle for other attendees. The church currently accommodates 450 attendees on Sunday, which is comprised of approximately 100 families and 125 additional attendees. The 100 families account for 100 round trips and equate to 325 total attendees. The existing trip generation estimates are summarized in **Error! Reference source not found.**.

[39] Transportation Impact Analysis for the Chinese for Christ Church Project, conducted by W-Trans, April 11, 2017.

Table 7 – Trip Generation--Existing Conditions

	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Total Daily Attendees (persons)	450	0	45	55	40	45	75
Attendee Trips (each way)	205	0	38	46	34	38	63
Employee Trips (each way)	7	6	6	6	6	6	7
Daily Trips	**424**	**12**	**88**	**104**	**80**	**88**	**138**

Note: Attendee Round Trips (Sunday) are based on 100 families and 125 attendees with an average occupancy of 1.2 persons per vehicle
Attendee Trips are based on an average occupancy of 1.2 person per vehicle
Employee Trips are based on one person per vehicle
Daily Trips assume one inbound and one outbound trip per Attendee/Employee

The majority of Church activity occurs on the weekend and outside of commute hours. Based on the current programming schedule, the Church currently generates an average of 75 weekday trips, including 6 weekday a.m. peak hour trips and 20 weekday p.m. peak hour trips.

The proposed growth at the Chinese for Christ Church was provided by Church staff and would include approximately 100 additional Sunday attendees and increased attendance of small group activities during the week. These 100 additional attendees are assumed to be split between family trips (25 family trips, totaling 81 new attendees) and non-family trips (15 trips, totaling 19 new attendees, using the same occupancy assumptions to determine the proposed trip generation. The proposed trip generation estimates are summarized in **Error! Reference source not found.** 8.

Table 8 –Trip Generation—With Project

	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Total Daily Attendees (persons)	550	0	60	95	60	60	100
Attendee Trips (each way)	245	0	50	80	50	50	84
Employee Trips (each way)	7	6	6	6	6	6	7
Daily Trips	**504**	**12**	**112**	**172**	**112**	**112**	**182**

	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Note: Attendee Round Trips (Sunday) are based on 125 families and 150 attendees with an average occupancy of 1.2 persons per vehicle Employee Trip Ends are based on one person per vehicle Daily Trips assume one inbound and one outbound trip per Attendee/Employee							

Based on the proposed programming schedule, the Church would generate an average of 104 weekday trips, including 6 during the a.m. peak hour and 27 during the p.m. peak hour. The proposed programing schedule would be expected to generate 29 net new weekday trips, no new a.m. peak hour trips and 7 new p.m. peak hour trips. During the a.m. peak hour the only trips expected to be generated by the church are employee trips and the church does not anticipate hiring additional employees.

For comparison, if ITE *Trip Generation* standard trip generation rates were used, the project would be expected to generate an average of 144 weekday trips, including nine during the a.m. peak hour and nine during the p.m. peak hour, based on the proposed building square footage.

As detailed below, the Transportation Impact Study concluded that the Project would not cause significant impacts to Transportation or Circulation. In addition, based on its field study of site conditions, the report included the following recommendations to ensure or improve non-vehicular access, circulation, safety, and accessibility:

- The Project sponsor should replace the sidewalk on the east-side of Meekland Avenue between the A Street Ramp and Smalley Avenue to provide connectivity between the project site and the off-site parking lot.
- Short-term bicycle storage should be installed on-site storage that can accommodate at least two bicycles.
- Parking should be prohibited within 50 feet of the Project driveways and any new plantings or signs should be located to maintain adequate sight lines.
- The Project sponsor should provide one additional handicap accessible parking space, per ADA regulations.[40] The final site plan should confirm that the parking lots are designed in compliance with Chapter 17.52.780 and include parking space dimensions, parking space angles, driveway widths, and backup area dimensions.

In conclusion, the proposed Project is not expected to result in a significant impact to the performance of the circulation system. New Project-generated trips are expected to occur on the weekend and outside of commute hours. Therefore, based on the results of the traffic study, the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures for the effectiveness or performance of the circulation system.

[40] Per Table 208.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design, the minimum number of handicapped accessible parking spaces is 4 where the total number of parking spaces provided is from 76 to 100. Available at: https://www.ada.gov/regs2010/2010ADAStandards/2010ADAstandards.htm#pgfId-1010282. Accessed April 12, 2017.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) serves as the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Alameda County. ACTC's most recent Congestion Management Plan, referred to as the 2015 CMP Monitoring Report, establishes the designated CMP Roadway network, which includes A Street, Hesperian Boulevard, I-880, and Mission Boulevard (SR 238) near the Project site and the LOS standard for each roadway in the network. The Project is expected to generate few peak hour trips, and the majority of trips would be from local residents. Traffic on the designated CMP roadway network is not expected to be impacted. Therefore, the Project is not expected to conflict with ACTC's Congestion Management Program. **No impact** would occur.

c) Change in air traffic patterns

The Project is not located within an airport land use compatibility plan area. Therefore, the Project would have **no impact** on air safety or operations of airport facilities.

d) Substantially increase hazards

Recommended modifications to the existing transportation facilities, including the sidewalk improvements, are expected to accommodate any increase in pedestrians and bicyclists traveling along Meekland Avenue. Therefore, there would be no increases in safety hazards associated with the Project. **No impact** would occur.

e) Inadequate emergency access

The Project does not include any modifications to the existing transportation and street network, beyond the recommended sidewalk replacement. Therefore, the Project would result in no impacts to emergency access.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities

The proposed Project and recommended improvements are consistent with adopted County policies and plans regarding public transportation, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The Project is not expected to hinder efforts to encourage walking, bicycling, or public transit use, but rather improve pedestrian and public transit connectivity for project generated trips and local residents through the recommended sidewalk replacement on the east-side of Meekland Avenue between the A Street Ramp and Smalley Avenue, to provide continuous and uniform connectivity between the Project site and the off-site parking lot. As described, these recommendations are expected to improve access to the Project site and would adequately accommodate any increase in pedestrian activity accessing the Church. There would be **no impact**.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			☒	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			☒	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			☒	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			☒	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's Projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			☒	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?			☒	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid			☒	

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
waste?				

The Project is situated in an urban location already served by all supporting municipal utilities (wastewater, stormwater, water, and solid waste). As described below, the Project will not cause significant impacts to provision of utility services.

a,b,e) Wastewater

The Oro Loma Sanitary District (OLSD) provides wastewater collection and treatment services. East Bay Dischargers Authority (EBDA) provides wastewater disposal.

The Project will generate minimal additional wastewater compared to the current usage, and thus will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Impacts to wastewater treatment requirements would be **less than significant**.

c) Stormwater

Existing drainage facilities are composed of multiple surface inlets located throughout the site, which carry stormwater flows into the public system connected via catch basins along Smalley Avenue. The amount of existing impervious area is approximately 49,520 square feet (sf), including roofed, paved, and parking areas.

Under the Project, the amount of impervious surface will decrease from approximately 49,520 sf to 31,382 sf, a decrease of approximately 18,000 sf in impervious surface. Onsite stormwater runoff would continue to be directed to the municipal stormwater network along Smalley Avenue.

The site will comply with the current C.3 treatment requirements set forth by Alameda County Clean Water Program through the use of a bio-retention area onsite. The proposed bio-retention treatment area totals approximately 861 sf, which exceeds the treatment size of 795 based on the requirements of Provision C.3 of the County's Regional Stormwater Permit, and therefore the Project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Therefore, a minimal increase in contributions to the municipal stormwater system would result. The existing stormwater conveyance system is adequate to accommodate the Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Water Supply

The Project site is served by existing water supplies, treatment facilities and distribution systems operated and managed by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). Additional worshipers and

new landscaping will create very minor increases in water demand, but sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources. The Project may need to obtain a "will serve" letter from EBMUD. The Project will have a **less-than-significant impact** on EBMUD's water supply.

f, g) Solid Waste

Solid waste service in Cherryland is provided by OLSD. In addition, OLSD provides refuse collection at district-owned facilities and in public spaces. Through Waste Management, Inc. of Alameda County, OLSD offers weekly solid waste collection and biweekly recyclable collection services to residents. The District requires businesses to use the private hauler for solid waste collection; businesses choose their own recycling collection service.

Project demolition and construction activities would generate solid waste, including debris from demolition of existing site improvements and construction material waste. The Project would comply with the disposal requirements of the Alameda County Waste Reduction and Recycling Act of 1990 (Measure D), including that at least 50 percent of the construction and demolition debris generated by the Project would be diverted from landfill disposal by reuse or recycling. The Project will comply other applicable requirements of Oro Loma Sanitary District Ordinance No. 34-41.

Each permit applicant for building, demolition, or encroachment must submit a Waste Management Plan that identifies the materials that will be recycled, salvaged or landfilled. Upon the completion of the Project, a report is required to verify, with official weight receipts as proof, the material types and quantities recycled, salvaged, or disposed.

Three landfills serve Alameda County including the Altamont Landfill in Livermore, Tri-Cities Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility in Fremont and Vasco Road Landfill in Livermore. Solid waste generated at the Project site would most likely be disposed of at the Altamont Landfill, which receives over 40% of disposed solid waste originating in Alameda County, and had 65.4million cubic yards of remaining disposal capacity as of December 31, 2014.[41]

For the reasons stated above, there is sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs. The impact would be **less than significan**t. The permit under which Altamont Landfill operates requires compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

[41] CalRecycle web page for Altamont Landfill & Resource Recovery. Available at http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/01-AA-0009/Detail/. Accessed March 30, 2017.

17. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			☒	
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects.)			☒	
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			☒	

a) Environmental Quality

With implementation of mitigation measures as identified in this checklist, the Project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. The Project would not impact rare or endangered wildlife species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b, c) Cumulative Impacts and Adverse Effects on Human Beings

The Project would not result in adverse impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable and would not involve substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, including effects for which Project-level mitigation were identified to reduce impacts to less-

than-significant levels. All of these potential effects would be **less than significant** with implementation of mitigation measures identified in this document and would not contribute in considerable levels to cumulative impacts.

Document Preparers

Lamphier – Gregory, Inc. (Primary Report Preparers)
Bruce Kaplan, Senior Environmental Planner
1944 Embarcadero
Oakland, Ca. 94606
(510) 535-6741

County of Alameda

This document was prepared in consultation with Damien Curry, Planner, Alameda County Community Development Agency.

References

Alameda Local Agency Formation Commission Report, Final Municipal Services Review, Vol II—Utilities. 2005. https://www.acgov.org/lafco/msrcycle1.htm#oro

Alameda County Community Climate Action Plan, 2014. Available at http://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/110603_Alameda_CCAP_Final.pdf.

Archaeology in Alameda County: A Handbook for Planners, prepared by Quaternary Research Group, 1976.

Association of Bay Area Governments Resilience Program, http://resilience.abag.ca.gov/.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, May 2010, California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines. http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/draft_baaqmd_ceqa_guidelines_may_2010_final.pdf?la=en

C.3 Stormwater Technical Guidance, version 5.1, dated May 2, 2016, Alameda Clean Water Program. http://www.cleanwaterprogram.org/uploads/C.3_Tech_Guidance_v5.1_FINAL_May_2016%20(low%20res).pdf

California Department of Transportation, State Scenic Highway Mapping System, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm

Cortese List Data Resources, Cal EPA, http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/. 2017

County of Alameda, Eden Area General Plan. 2010. All General Plan Elements available at http://acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/index.htm.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), Map Number 06001C0286G, effective on 08/03/2009. https://msc.fema.gov/portal

Federal Highway Administration, Highway Traffic Noise: Analysis and Abatement Guidance. 2011. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/regulations_and_guidance/analysis_and_abatement_guidance/revguidance.pdf

Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Church and Mobile Classroom Structures, 100 A Street, Hayward. Prepared by Wayne Ting & Associates. April 2007.

Geotechnical Investigation (updated), prepared by Wayne Ting & Associates. July 2016.

Transportation Impact Analysis, prepared by W-Trans, April 11, 2017.

U.S. Geological Survey, 2005, Mineral Resources Data System: U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia. Available through: http://tin.er.usgs.gov/mrds/

This page intentionally left blank

Attachment A: Air Quality Screening Analysis

Attachment B: Historic Architectural Assessment Report

Attachment C: Geotechnical Investigation (Original and Update)

Attachment D: Transportation Impact Analysis