

4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section describes regulations and policies affecting land use development contained in the Alameda County East County Area Plan (ECAP) and the Alameda County General Code. In accordance with *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* Section 15125(d), an analysis of the project's consistency with applicable plans, policies, and regulations is also provided. Existing land use information was obtained from an on-site reconnaissance and review of applicable plans and policies. This section also assesses land use compatibility.

4.9.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located within an unincorporated area of Alameda County, approximately 10 miles east of the city of Livermore and approximately 7 miles west of the city of Tracy, in the eastern portion of the county. (See **Figure 3.0-1, Altamont Motorsports Park Location Map**). Altamont Motorsports Park (AMP) is located immediately south of the Interstate 580/Interstate 205 interchange.

The topography of the irregularly shaped site (see **Figure 3.0-2, Altamont Motorsports Park Site Plan**) is characterized by gently rolling hills with elevations varying by approximately 100 feet from the highest and lowest locations on the site. Approximately 35 acres of the site are developed with the racetrack and associated facilities. Approximately 12 of those 35 acres are developed with the oval race track, which is situated on two plateau areas within a natural bowl.

The remainder of the project site is characterized by non-native, annual grasses and sparsely vegetated areas, approximately 40 acres of which are used for parking during race events. A detention pond is located in the northern portion of the project site. The site contains easements for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) adjoining the Interstate 580 and 205 freeways, as well as a 40-foot Public Utilities Easement (PUE) along the southern boundary of the property which also serves as an access way for a private 20-acre site to the east of the AMP site.

Access to the AMP site is off of Midway Road, a paved 2-lane road, via a paved driveway at the southwest side of the site. Midway Road connects to Interstate 580 via West Grant Line Road on the north and via Patterson Pass Road on the south.

Similar to the project site, the surrounding area is characterized by sparse rural residential development and rolling hills that are vegetated with annual grasses and used for cattle grazing and wind farming. The area is dominated by nearby wind farms and high voltage power lines.

To the south of the project site is a single rural residence on a hilltop. To the west, along Midway Road and south of Interstates 205 and 580 there are approximately 11 rural residences; there are approximately 14 rural residences north of Interstates 205 and 580.

4.9.2 REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

4.9.2.1 Alameda County East County Area Plan

California planning law requires each city and county to adopt a comprehensive, long-term General Plan for the physical development of the area within its jurisdiction and any land outside its boundaries that bears relations to its land use planning activities. The primary General Plan document providing land use policy for the project area is the Alameda County East County Area Plan (ECAP). The purpose of ECAP is to present a clear statement of the County's intent concerning future development and resource conservation within the East County. The ECAP identifies the need for public facilities and services, and provides the basis for County zoning and subdivision approvals, as well as regulatory actions. The ECAP also serves as an important source of detailed information regarding existing conditions and trends in the County. According to ECAP, the Project Site is located outside of the Urban Growth Boundary, within the Wind Resource Area and is designated Large Parcel Agriculture land use (ECAP 2002).

4.9.2.2 General Plan Designation

The underlying General Plan land use designations within the Project Area, as established by ECAP, consist of Large Parcel Agriculture (A). The Large Parcel Agriculture designation requires a minimum parcel size of 100 acres, and sets a maximum building intensity or floor area ratio (FAR) for non-residential buildings of 0.01 square foot per square foot of net parcel size, but not less than 20,000 square feet. The Large Parcel Agriculture designation permits recreational uses, in addition to agricultural uses, limited residential uses, public and quasi-public uses, quarries and habitat protection. ECAP states that:

subject to the provisions of the Initiative [Measure D], this designation permits agricultural uses, agricultural processing facilities (for example wineries, olive presses), limited agricultural support service uses (for example animal feed facilities, silos, stables, and feed stores), secondary residential units, visitor-serving commercial facilities (by way of illustration, tasting rooms, fruit stands, bed and breakfast inns), recreational uses, public and quasi-public uses, solid waste landfills and related waste management facilities, quarries, windfarms and related facilities, utility corridors, and similar uses compatible with agriculture.

When Alameda County voters approved Measure D in November 2000, the provisions of Measure D became the applicable land use policy for the unincorporated areas of Alameda County, including the project site. ECAP has been subsequently amended to ensure consistency with the provisions of Measure D.

4.9.2.3 Alameda County General Code

Zoning Designation

The County zoning code provides further detail about the allowed and prohibited uses in each zone. As the project site and surrounding areas is zoned A (Agricultural) District, the intent of the zoning designation is as follows:

"A" districts are established to promote implementation of general plan land use proposals for agricultural and other nonurban uses, to conserve and protect existing agricultural uses, and to provide space for and encourage such uses in places where more intensive development is not desirable or necessary for the general welfare (Alameda County Code Section 17.06.010).

In 1997, in an effort to preserve open space lands and support agriculture in the County, the Alameda County Board of Supervisors amended the Zoning Ordinance to increase the minimum parcel size from 100 (A-100) to 160 (A-160) acres (Alameda County 2000). Allowed uses include single-family residences, general agriculture, grazing, riding, or hiking trails.

4.9.2.4 Consistency with Applicable Regulations

The potential for a project to 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 or zoning ordinance is considered as part of the CEQA process (see *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15125(d)). The General Plan Guidelines published by the State Office of Planning and Research defines consistency as follows: "An action, program, or project is consistent with the General Plan if, considering all its aspects; it will further the objectives and policies of the General Plan and not obstruct their attainment." Therefore, the standard for analysis used in the EIR is based on general agreement with the policy language and furtherance of the policy intent (as determined by a review of the policy context). In other words, the project does not have to be in exact agreement with a policy for the project to be consistent with it. However, if conflicts or inconsistencies with a policy result in environmental affects, then this would be considered a significant impact.

The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Alameda County General Plan and the Alameda County General Code. A consistency analysis is provided below for applicable goals and polices in these regulating documents.

4.9.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

4.9.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The proposed project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Physically divide an established community;

- 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; or
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

4.9.3.2 Methodology

Land use information drawn from an on-site reconnaissance and review of applicable plans and policies was used in determining whether impacts to land use and planning would be significant environmental effects.

4.9.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential Impact 4.9-1: Would the project physically divide an established community?

Rezoning the proposed project site from A (Agricultural) District to the PD (Planned Development) District will provide for the continued operation of the facility, with further definition of currently permitted uses and operations, and to provide for the addition of drifting as a specific form of motorsport as well accommodation for future, unanticipated changes to motorsport industry, such as racing types, etc; and, the installation of two freeway signs, and two caretaker residences.

As stated above, the site is generally bounded by Interstates 205 and 580 to the north and Interstate 580 to the east (see **Figure 3.0-1, Altamont Motorsports Park Location Map**). To the south of the project site is a single rural residence atop a hilltop. To the west, along Midway Road and south of Interstates 205 and 580 there are approximately 11 rural residences; there are approximately 14 rural residences north of Interstates 205 and 580. No new roadway connections or improvements are proposed with the project. Access to the site will remain from Midway Road.

The project site is in a rural area, surrounded by rural residential development and undeveloped land. According to the ECAP, the site is designated as Large Parcel Agriculture which permits recreational uses, in addition to agricultural uses, limited residential uses, public and quasi-public uses, quarries and habitat protection.

Implementing the project would not result in the physical expansion of existing parcels in such a way that would divide established communities. The existing roadway infrastructure in the project area would provide access to the project site; thus, new roadway connections would not divide the existing community outside the project site. Therefore, implementation of the project would have no impact to established communities.

Conclusion: No impact

Mitigation Measure: None required

Potential Impact 4.9-2: Would the project 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?

Project consistency with applicable individual ECAP policies is presented in **Table 4.9-1, Project Consistency with Relevant ECAP Policies**. The policies presented in **Table 4.9-1** were selected because they address the avoidance or mitigation of an environmental effect and are, therefore, relevant to determine whether the project results in a significant land use impact. Analysis of those applicable policies reveals that the proposed project would be consistent with the relevant policies, with the exception of Policy 215 regarding scenic values.

4.9.3.2.1 County of Alameda Zoning Ordinance

As noted above, the applicant is requesting a rezoning from A (Agricultural) District to the PD (Planned Development) District as described in **Section 3.0, Project Description**.

The intent of the PD district is established to encourage the arrangement of a compatible variety of uses on suitable lands in such a manner that the resulting development will:

- Be in accord with the policies of the general plan of the County;
- Provide efficient use of the land that includes preservation of significant open areas and natural and topographic landscape features with minimum alteration of natural land forms;
- Provide an environment that will encourage the use of common open areas for neighborhood or community activities and other amenities;
- Be compatible with and enhance the development of the general area; and
- Create an attractive, efficient, and safe environment (Prior gen. code § 8-31.0).

The proposed project, as noted above, is inconsistent with one applicable policy (Policy 215) of the ECAP, and therefore the intent of the Alameda County General Code that requires a PD district to “Be in accord with the policies of the general plan of the County” cannot be satisfied.

**Table 4.9-1
Project Consistency with Relevant ECAP Policies**

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 26	<p><u>County Housing Obligations</u></p> <p>Nothing in the Initiative shall be applied to preclude County compliance with housing obligations under State law. To the maximum extent feasible, the County shall meet State housing obligations for the East County Area within the County Urban Growth Boundary. In providing required housing, the County shall protect environmental values, enhance the quality of life of affected persons, and comply with policies and programs of the Initiative to the maximum extent feasible. If the State-imposed housing obligations make it necessary to go beyond the Urban Growth Boundary, the voters of the County may approve an extension of the Boundary.</p>	<p>Consistent: The project site is not within the Urban Growth Boundary. The project would not conflict with the County’s obligations under State law. Therefore, the project is consistent with the policy.</p>	None required	Not applicable

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 96	In areas outside the County Urban Growth Boundary designated Large Parcel Agriculture, Resource Management or Water Management Lands, the number of parcels that may be created, the residential units permitted on each parcel, the size of development envelope, the maximum floor areas and floor area ratios, and the uses permitted by the Plan on February 1, 2000, or by Initiative, whichever is less, may not be increased.	Consistent: Implementing the project would provide for the continued operation of the facility, with: (1) further definition of permitted uses and operations; (2) the addition of drifting and (3) the installation of freeway signs and caretakers residence. The 1996 Conditional Use Permit allowed AMP to continue operating as a motorsports park. The project does not increase the number of parcels. The caretaker residences would develop 5,600 square feet, which is well within the 0.01 square foot per square foot of net parcel size allowed for this land use in the ECAP. Therefore, the project is consistent with this goal and policy.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 106	Structures may not be located on ridgelines or hilltops or where they will project above a ridgeline or hilltop as viewed from public roads, trails, parks and other public viewpoints unless there is no other site on the parcel for the structure or on a contiguous parcel in common ownership on or subsequent to the date this ordinance becomes effective. New parcels may not be created that have no building site other than a ridgeline or hilltop, or that would cause a structure to protrude above a ridgeline or hilltop, unless there is no other possible configuration.	Consistent: Implementation of the project would develop two caretaker residences and the installation of freeway signs. While the project site is located in an area of varying topography with rolling hills, the additional structures would not be on a hilltop or ridgeline, nor would they protrude above the ridgeline or hilltop. The project does not increase the number of parcels. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 107	The County shall permit no structure (e.g., housing unit, barn, or other building with four walls) that projects above a visually-sensitive major ridgeline.	Consistent: Please refer to the discussion under Policy 106 above. The project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 108	To the extent possible, including by clustering if necessary, structures shall be located on that part of a parcel or on contiguous parcels in common ownership on or subsequent to the date this ordinance becomes effective, where the development is least visible to persons on public roads, trails, parks and other public viewpoints. This policy does not apply to agricultural structures to the extent it is necessary for agricultural purposes that they be located in more visible areas.	Potentially Inconsistent: Implementation of the project would include development of two caretaker residences and freeway signs. The two caretaker residences are not located in an area that is visible to the public and would not substantially affect available public views of the project site. As discussed in Section 4.1 , construction of two 48-foot wide by 14-foot long, 75-foot-tall LED signs would be highly visible from the site's Interstate 580 frontages. Although aesthetic and scenic values are highly subjective and vary depending on the affected population, as outlined in Section 4.1 , the signs are conservatively assumed to represent a significant and unavoidable impact due to their visual prominence, particularly from Interstate 580. Therefore, the project is potentially inconsistent with this policy.	No feasible mitigation	Inconsistent
Policy 114	The County shall require the use of landscaping in both rural and urban areas to enhance the scenic quality of the area and to screen undesirable views. Choice of plants should be based on compatibility with surrounding vegetation, drought-tolerance, and suitability to site conditions; and in rural areas, habitat value and fire retardance.	Consistent: Implementing the project would not involve landscaping. Implementing the project would provide for the continued operation of the facility, with: (1) further definition of permitted uses and operations; (2) the addition of drifting and (3) the installation of freeway signs and caretakers residence. While the project site would be subject to this policy, the project would not implement a landscaping plan for which this policy would apply. Future landscaping on the project site would be subject to this policy. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 115	In all cases appropriate building materials, landscaping and screening shall be required to minimize the visual impact of development. Development shall blend with and be subordinate to the environment and character of the area where located, so as to be as unobtrusive as possible and not detract from the natural, open space or visual qualities of the area. To the maximum extent practicable, all exterior lighting must be located, designed, and shielded so as to confine direct rays to the parcel where the lighting is located.	Potentially Inconsistent: Implementation of the two caretaker residences would not substantially change the visual character of the project site, as outlined in Section 4.1 . As discussed in Section 4.1 , the design and siting of the proposed LED signs would substantially alter the existing visual character of the site and the view shed. Although aesthetic and scenic values are highly subjective and vary depending on the affected population, the signs are conservatively assumed to represent a significant and unavoidable impact due to their visual prominence. Therefore, the project is potentially inconsistent with this policy.	No feasible mitigation	Inconsistent
Policy 116	To the maximum extent possible, development shall be located and designed to conform with rather than change natural landforms. The alteration of natural topography, vegetation, and other characteristics by grading, excavating, filling, or other development activity shall be minimized. To the extent feasible, access roads shall be consolidated and located where they are least visible from public view points.	Consistent: As of July 3, 2008, no grading plans for the caretaker residences have been submitted to the County. The caretaker residences would be minimally visible from public viewpoints from I-205 and I-580, and would not substantially alter the existing visual character of the site. The grading plans would be subject to County approval. Additional signage along the frontage of Interstate 580 would not alter the topography of the site. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 117	The County shall require that where grading is necessary, the off-site visibility of cut and fill slopes and drainage improvements is minimized. Graded slopes shall be designed to simulate natural contours and support vegetation to blend with surrounding undisturbed slopes.	Consistent: As of July 3, 2008, no grading plans for the caretaker residences have been submitted to the County. These plans would be subject to County approval at the time they are submitted, and would be subject to this policy. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 118	The County shall require that grading avoid areas containing large stands of mature, healthy vegetation, scenic natural formations, or natural watercourses.	Consistent: As of July 3, 2008, no grading plans for the caretaker residences have been submitted to the County. These plans would be subject to County approval at the time they are submitted, and would be subject to this policy. The caretaker residences would not be located on a site containing large stands of mature, healthy vegetation, scenic natural formations, or natural watercourses. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 119	The County shall require that access roads be sited and designed to minimize grading.	Consistent: The proposed project would not construct access roads. The project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 120	The County shall require that utility lines be placed underground whenever feasible. When located above ground, utility lines and supporting structures shall be sited to minimize their visual impact.	Consistent: The project applicant has not submitted plans for the caretaker residences' utility requirements. Such plans would be submitted to the County at a future date if the proposed rezoning is approved. Therefore, the proposed project would not include aboveground utility lines. The project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 122	The County shall encourage that wetland mitigation be consolidated in areas that are relatively large and adjacent to or otherwise connected to open space. To the extent possible, these areas should be included in, adjacent to, or linked through open space corridors with lands designated as "Resource Management" that are managed specifically for the preservation and enhancement of biological resources.	Consistent: As discussed in Section 4.3 , potential wetlands and waters of the U.S. occur on the project site where the seasonal detention pond and associated swale occur. Implementation of the proposed project could directly or indirectly impact this wetland. The proposed Mitigation Measure BIO-16 includes provisions to construct a fence around the swale. No off-site mitigation would be required that would result in wetlands mitigation in a non-consolidated area. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 123	Where site-specific impacts on a biological resource resulting from a proposed land use outside the Urban Growth Boundary are identified, the County shall encourage that mitigation is complementary to the goals and objectives of the ECAP. To that end, the County shall recommend that mitigation efforts occur in areas designated as "Resource Management" or on lands adjacent to or otherwise contiguous with these lands in order to establish a continuous open space system in East County and to provide for long term protection of biological resources.	Potentially Inconsistent: Implementation of the proposed project could result in site specific impacts on biological resources due to intensified use of the site.	See mitigation measures in Section 4.4, Biological Resources	Consistent

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 125	The County shall encourage preservation of areas known to support special status species	Potentially Inconsistent: Implementation of the proposed project could result in the further limitation of range and habitat for protected species including the California red-legged frog, the San Joaquin kit fox, and the California Tiger Salamander.	See mitigation measures in Section 4.4, Biological Resources . Measures include conducting surveys to determine presence/absence of the species and measures to preserve species if found on the site. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.	Consistent
Policy 126	The County shall encourage no net loss of riparian and seasonal wetlands	Potentially Inconsistent: Implementation of the project does not result in the loss of riparian or seasonal wetlands. However, implementation of the project would result in indirect impacts of increased lighting, noise, and human presence on the willow-cattail stand and detention pond.	See mitigation measures in Section 4.4, Biological Resources . Measures include implementation of a habitat management plan to preserve this type of habitat. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.	Consistent

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 134	The County shall not approve new development in areas with potential natural hazards (flooding, geologic, wildland fire, or other environmental hazards) unless the County can determine that feasible measures will be implemented to reduce the potential risk to acceptable levels, based on site-specific analysis.	Consistent: The proposed project would generate a temporary and recurring increase in demand for fire services during events held on site from an incremental increase in temporary site population as well as from the installation of two caretaker residences.	See mitigation measures in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.	Consistent
Policy 136	The County shall identify and preserve significant archeological and historical resources, including structures and sites which contribute to the heritage of East County.	Consistent: The project site and its surrounding are not located within a high archaeological sensitivity zone as determined by the County. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 137	The County shall require development to be designed to avoid cultural resources or if avoidance is determined by the County to be infeasible, to include implement appropriate mitigation measures that offset the impacts.	Potentially Inconsistent: Construction on the project site would occur for the grandstand roof, additional freeway signage, and the two caretaker residences. That in turn would result in the potential for the discovery of resources below levels of prior disturbance. Therefore, there is a low probability of encountering archaeological resources, paleontological, or Native American artifacts on the project site.	See Mitigation Measures CULT-2a through 2f and CULT-3a through 3e in Section 4.5, Cultural Resources	Consistent
Policy 215	The County shall manage development and conservation of land within East County scenic highway corridors to maintain and enhance scenic values	Potentially Inconsistent: The proposed project includes the construction of two 48-foot wide by 14-foot long, 75-foot-tall LED signs along the site's Interstate 580 frontages. Although aesthetic and scenic values are highly subjective and vary depending on the affected population, as outlined in Section 4.1 , the signs are conservatively assumed to represent a significant and unavoidable impact due to their visual prominence, particularly from the portion of Interstate 580 that is designated as a State Scenic Highway.	No feasible mitigation	Inconsistent

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 248	The County shall promote use of solid waste source reduction, recycling, composting and environmentally-safe transformation of wastes.	Consistent: As indicated in Section 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems , implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to solid waste. The project would not conflict with this policy because it would not conflict with the County's promotion of solid waste source reduction, composting and environmentally-safe transformation of wastes.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 247	The County shall conform its solid waste policies and programs to the Recycling Plan prepared by the Recycling Board, and generally coordinate its hazardous and solid waste management with the Alameda County Waste Management Authority's goals, policies, and plans, except to the extent that they are inconsistent with the Initiative or the Recycling Plan.	Consistent. The proposed project includes the continued use and transport of fuels and other automotive-related hazardous materials associated with the use of the site as a motorsports park; however, there would be no net increase in the use and transport of those materials with regard to vehicles used for competition. The project would be encouraged to comply with the County's solid waste policies and programs. The project would be consistent with this policy and goal.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 249	The County shall support efforts to provide solid waste recovery facilities and household hazardous wastes collection facilities convenient to residences, businesses, and industries.	Consistent. The proposed project includes the continued use and transport of fuels and other automotive-related hazardous materials associated with the use of the site as a motorsports park; however, there would be no net increase in the use and transport of those materials with regard to vehicles used for competition. The project would be encouraged to comply with the County's solid waste policies and programs. The project would be consistent with this policy and goal.	None required	Not applicable

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 250	The County shall encourage development of innovative technologies to reclaim contaminated soils and sewage sludge.	Potentially Inconsistent. As discussed in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality , the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with groundwater quality and polluted stormwater level. Therefore, the project is potentially inconsistent with this policy.	Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HYDRO-1, HYDRO-3 and HYDRO-4 include innovative technologies to reduce contamination of soils and water on the project site. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant	Consistent
Policy 288	The County shall endeavor to maintain acceptable noise levels throughout East County.	Potentially Inconsistent. The Office of the County Counsel has opined that certain noise standards, provided in Chapter 6.60 of the Alameda County General Ordinance Code, have never been applied to the race track and that, as a result, the standards in Chapter 6.60 do not provide an appropriate threshold of significance for the purposes of analyzing impacts under CEQA. As such, the 1996 CUP maximum permitted noise level described above is the threshold for determination if noise generated at the raceway is an impact.	Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would ensure continued compliance with Condition 12 of the 1996 Conditional Use Permit, and thereby avoid a potentially significant impact by exposing people to noise levels in excess of an applicable standard.	Consistent

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 306	<p>The County shall protect surface and groundwater resources by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserving areas with prime percolation capabilities and minimizing placement of potential sources of pollution in such areas; • Minimizing sedimentation and erosion through control of grading, quarrying, cutting of trees, removal of vegetation, placement of roads and bridges, use of off-road vehicles, and animal related disturbance of the soil; • Not allowing the development of septic systems, automobile dismantlers, waste disposal facilities, industries utilizing toxic chemicals, and other potentially polluting substances in creekside, reservoir, or high groundwater table areas when polluting substances could come in contact with flood waters, permanently or seasonally high groundwaters, flowing stream or creek waters, or reservoir; and • Avoiding establishment concentrations of septic systems over large land areas. 	<p>Potentially Inconsistent: The project site is approximately 83 acres in size, and has been previously developed with a motorsports facility, which includes paving and other impervious materials over a portion of the site. The proposed project would add some impermeable surface at the locations of the two caretaker residences. The net increase in impervious surfaces within the context of the 83-acre site is considered negligible.</p> <p>The septic systems that would serve the proposed caretakers residences would be designed in accordance with applicable County policies and standards, and as such would have less than significant impacts to surface waters or groundwaters.</p>	<p>See mitigation measures in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials and Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality. The mitigation measures include preparation of a stormwater collection and filtration system, and measures to reduce contamination of surface and groundwater. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce in less than significant impacts.</p>	Consistent
Policy 308	<p>The County shall not permit development within any area outside the Urban Growth Boundary exceeding 25 percent slopes to minimize hazards associated with slope instability.</p>	<p>Consistent: Implementation of the project does not provide for development on a slope exceeding 25 percent.</p>	None required	Not applicable

Goal	Policy/Objective	Project Consistency	Mitigation Measures	Consistency After Mitigation
Policy 315	The County shall require that buildings be designed and constructed to withstand groundshaking forces of a minor earthquake without damage, of a moderate earthquake without structural damage, and a major earthquake without collapse of the structure. The County shall require critical facilities and structures (e.g., hospitals, emergency operation centers) be designed and constructed to remain standing and functional following an earthquake.	Consistent: New construction associated with the proposed project, including the grandstand roof, the two caretaker residences, and the two freeway signs would be required to comply with all provisions of the Uniform Building Code as well as local regulations of Alameda County as they relate to the use of designs, construction techniques, and construction materials designed to resistant damage from seismic events.	None required	Not applicable
Policy 320	The County shall consider, in reviewing development projects and subdivision of agricultural lands, the severity of natural fire hazards, potential damage from wildland and structural fires, the adequacy of fire protection services, road access, and the availability of an adequate water supply and pressure.	Consistent: The proposed project would generate a temporary and recurring increase in demand for fire services during events held on site from an incremental increase in temporary site population as well as from the installation of two caretaker residences.	See mitigation measures in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials . Specifically, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 would reduce impacts associated with wildfires to a less than significant level.	Consistent
Policy 324	The County shall require the use of fire resistance building materials, fire-resistant landscaping, and adequate clearance around structures in “high” and “very high” fire hazard areas.	Consistent: New construction associated with the proposed project, including the grandstand roof, the two caretaker residences, and the two freeway signs would be required to comply with all provisions of the Uniform Building Code as well as local regulations of Alameda County as they relate to the use of fire resistive design and materials in construction.	None required	Not applicable

The project is inconsistent with one ECAP policy (Policy 215) for which no feasible mitigation has been defined. Therefore, the project would conflict with applicable land use policy and ordinance adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, specifically, the maintenance of scenic values in East County scenic highway corridors.

Conclusion: Significant and unavoidable

Mitigation Measure: No feasible mitigation

Potential Impact 4.9-3: Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

According to the ECAP, there are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that pertain to the project site. Therefore, implementation of the project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Conclusion: No impact

Mitigation Measure: None required