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**ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>°C</td>
<td>degrees Celsius (Centigrade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°F</td>
<td>degrees Fahrenheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>µg/m$^3$</td>
<td>micrograms per cubic meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEL</td>
<td>Community Noise Equivalent Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Dublin-San Ramon Services District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACCS</td>
<td>East Alameda County Conservation Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Interstate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mph</td>
<td>miles per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIR</td>
<td>Supplemental Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>underground storage tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>volatile organic compound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Purpose

The purpose of this Initial Study (IS) is to identify any potential environmental impacts from implementation of the IKEA Retail Center Project in the City of Dublin, California. Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15367, the City of Dublin (City) is the Lead Agency in the preparation of this IS and any additional environmental documentation required for the project. The City has discretionary authority over the proposed project. The intended use of this document is to determine the level of environmental analysis required to adequately prepare the project’s Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) and to provide the basis for input from public agencies, organizations, and interested members of the public.

1.2 - Project Location

The project site is located at 5344 and 5411 Martinelli Way in the City of Dublin, Alameda County, California (Exhibit 1). The 27.446 gross-acre project site is bounded by Arnold Road (west), Martinelli Way (north), Hacienda Drive (east), and Interstate 580 (I-580) (south); refer to Exhibit 2. The project site is located on the Dublin, California, United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map, Township 3 South, Range 1 East, Section 5 (Latitude 37°42’10” North; Longitude 121°53’27” West).

1.3 - Environmental Setting

1.3.1 - Existing Site Characteristics

The project site contains mostly unimproved, undeveloped land. The project site was previously cleared and graded, and is regularly disked for weed abatement purposes. A fence surrounds the project site. The elevation ranges from approximately 350 feet in the north to approximately 340 feet in the south.

An unoccupied, single-story building is located in the northern portion of the project site on an asphalt pad. An asphalt driveway connects the building pad to Martinelli Way. Ornamental landscaping is located around the building.

A single-story masonry block utility building is located in the southeast corner of the site along Arnold Road. This building is owned and operated by Dublin-San Ramon Services District (DSRSD).

The site contains areas where soil has been stockpiled. One of the stockpiles (Stockpile No. 2) contains approximately 500 cubic yards of soil that contains polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, diesel and oil range petroleum hydrocarbons, and polychlorinated biphenyls that must be removed prior to development activities. The other stockpiles have been tested for hazardous materials and determined to be within acceptable levels for commercial development.
The project site contains 1.92 acres of seasonal wetland depressions regulated by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) as Waters of the State. These wetlands were determined to be isolated and are therefore non-jurisdictional under Federal Clean Water Act Section 404.

Vehicular access to the project site is currently available through three driveway stub-outs on Martinelli Way and three driveway stub-outs on Arnold Road. The middle driveway on Martinelli Way (which connects to the unoccupied building) is signalized and aligned with the main entrance to Persimmon Place retail center on the opposite side of the roadway. The project site is precluded from taking vehicular access on Hacienda Drive pursuant to a “No Access” easement.

An asphalt pedestrian path is located along the project frontages with Arnold Road and Martinelli Way. A concrete sidewalk is located along the Hacienda Drive frontage.

A storm drainage easement is located along the project frontage with Arnold Road and I-580. A water line easement is located along the project frontage with Arnold Road. A Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) easement is located along the project frontage with I-580. Several utility boxes and vaults are located within the easements along the I-580 frontage. In addition, a portion of the site has been designated for designation (to the City) for the future extension to the Bay Area Rapid Transit line along the project’s I-580 frontage.

Exhibit 3 provides a site photograph of the project site.

1.3.2 - General Plan and Zoning Designations

The project site is designated “General Commercial” by the City of Dublin General Plan and is zoned “General Commercial” by the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. The project site is located within the Hacienda Gateway planning subarea of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan.

1.4 - Project Background

1.4.1 - Project Site

The project site was originally part of the Parks Reserve Forces Training Area (known locally as “Camp Parks”), a United States Army Reserve installation that opened in 1943. The project site was located in a portion of the base that—at various times—contained a gatehouse, guest reception lounge, an athletic field and athletic field house, fuel depot, railroad spurs, and a warehouse receiving area. In the late 1960s, a portion of Camp Parks that included the project site was transferred to the County of Alameda for civilian use.

In the mid-1990s, the military buildings were demolished and the site was cleared. An underground storage tank (UST) associated with the past military uses was removed in 2008. The project site was graded several times between 2007 and 2009. The property owner has been pursuing soil, soil gas, and groundwater remediation efforts under the auspices of the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency, which has included removal of contaminated soil and pumping of contaminated groundwater. On October 30, 2014, Alameda County Health Care Services Agency issued a notice of “Potential Case Closure” that noted that the agency would consider closure of the case once the last
soil stockpile is removed from the project site. No updated documentation of site remediation has been presented.
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Exhibit 2
Local Vicinity
Aerial Base

Source: Bing Imagery, 2015
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1.4.2 - Eastern Dublin Specific Plan

The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan serves as the zoning ordinance for approximately 4,200 acres in the eastern portion of the City of Dublin. Much of this acreage included former portions of Camp Parks that have been transferred to civilian use, including the project site. The Specific Plan (and associated General Plan Amendment) was adopted in 1993 and has been amended several times, most recently in 2014. The Specific Plan is organized into 10 chapters that set forth policy recommendations, design concepts, and implementation measures. The first three chapters are primarily descriptive, summarizing the Plan, the planning context, and the existing setting. The policies, standards, guidelines, and implementation measures that regulate future development are presented in subsequent chapters.

The SEIR will include mitigation measures from the Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan EIR “Eastern Dublin EIR”, if applicable, to reduce or avoid impacts.

1.5 - Project Description

The project is proposing the development of approximately 432,099 square feet of commercial uses on 27.45 acres. The project would be anchored by an IKEA store of approximately 339,099 square feet and feature up to 93,000 square feet of lifestyle retail-restaurant uses. Table 1 summarizes the project and Exhibit 4 depicts the conceptual site plan.

Table 1: IKEA Retail Center Project Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major 1 (IKEA)</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>339,099</td>
<td>2 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle retail-restaurant</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Freestanding restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>Multiple buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>93,000</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication for Rail Line (BART)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>432,099</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GreenbergFarrow, 2017.

Major 1 - IKEA

The IKEA store would consist of a two-story building located over a two-level parking structure. The building would be set against the Arnold Road frontage and face Hacienda Drive. The building would stand 61 feet above finished grade. The principal loading docks would be located in the rear of the building facing Arnold Road. A recycling and refuse collection area, trash compactor, and emergency diesel generator would also be located in the rear of the store. A two-bay loading dock for home deliveries would be located on the south side of the building facing I-580.

---

1 This store prototype has been used in Colorado and South Florida.
The building design reflects a contemporary theme incorporating blue and yellow\(^2\). The building facades would be broken up by geometry, and building materials such as composite metal panels, steel elements and clear anodized glass, aluminum, and storefront glazing at the entrance. Covered walkways would be incorporated along the front of the building.

**Operational Characteristics**

The IKEA store is expected to be open for business 7 days a week from 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Longer operational hours may be applicable during holidays or to accommodate future operational needs/market conditions.

The project is anticipated to employ 150 employees per shift for a total of approximately 350 employees.

Approximately five to seven trucks (including 53-foot tractor-trailer combination units) daily.

**Lifestyle Retail-Restaurant Center**

The eastern portion of the site (would support a retail center consisting of up to 93,000 square feet of lifestyle retail-restaurant center uses. An 8,000 square-foot restaurant pad would be located at the intersection of Martinelli Way / Hacienda Drive. Multiple buildings totaling 85,000 square feet that would be organized around a pedestrian plaza would be located directly opposite the IKEA store entrance.

**Site Access and Parking**

**Vehicular Access**

The proposed project would result in modifications to access of the site as follows:

- **Martinelli Way**: The signalized full entry along Martinelli Way would remain in-place and the main entry is proposed to be designated as “IKEA Place.” The existing west driveway stub-out would be eliminated. The existing east driveway stub-out would serve as a right-in, right-out access point.
- **IKEA Place**: IKEA Place would serve as a north-south internal street within the project and provide access to the IKEA parking structure and the lifestyle retail-restaurant center surface parking.
- **Arnold Road**: The median in Arnold Road that restricts movements at the driveway located in the approximate center of the site would be modified to provide full access to the IKEA parking structure. Additionally, a right-out ramp from the IKEA parking structure would connect to northbound Arnold Road. The existing Arnold Road “T”-intersection near I-580 would be converted to a cul-de-sac.
- **East-West Internal Road**: would extend from Arnold Road east into the project site along the southern perimeter and connect to both the IKEA parking structure and IKEA Place.

\(^2\) Blue and yellow are the national colors of Sweden and the corporate colors of IKEA.
Parking

The IKEA store would provide 1,026 parking spaces a two-level below-store structure. Access to the parking structure would be taken from either entrances/exits at the north and south ends. The lifestyle retail-restaurant uses would provide 568 surface parking spaces.
1.6 - Required Discretionary Approvals

The following discretionary approvals are required by the City of Dublin for approval of the proposed project:

- **EIR Certification.**
- **Lot Line Adjustment or Lot Merger.** A Lot Line Adjustment or Lot Merger would shift and eliminate lots lines so that the only two parcels remain, one for the IKEA site and second parcel for the Retail Center. This may also be done as part of the Vesting Tentative and Final Map.
- **Vesting Tentative and Final Map.** A Vesting Tentative Parcel Map with multiple Final Maps would subdivide the IKEA parcel into four smaller parcels. The future owner of the Retail Center may also seek a Vesting Tentative Parcel Map in the future.
- **Site Development Review.** A Site Development Review would describe the specific design color, materials, parking and access, and landscaping for the project.
- **Master Sign Program/Site Development Review.** A Master Sign Program/Site Development Review for the entire project is required to ensure effective and attractive signage through the project.
- **Development Agreements.** The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan requires that developers enter into development agreements prior to development of a property. It is anticipated that two separate development agreements may be required, one for the IKEA store and one for the Retail Center. The development agreements would serve to “lock in” approved development on the project site for a number of years.

In addition, the proposed project would require ministerial approvals, including but not limited to grading, building, and encroachment permits.

1.7 - Intended Uses of this Document

This IS has been prepared to determine the appropriate scope and level of detail required in completing the environmental analysis for the proposed project’s SEIR. This document will also serve as a basis for soliciting comments and input from members of the public and public agencies regarding the proposed project. The Draft IS will be circulated for a minimum of 30 days, during which period comments concerning the analysis contained in the IS should be sent to:

Amy Million, Principal Planner  
City of Dublin  
Community Development Department  
100 Civic Plaza  
Dublin, CA 94568  
Phone: 925.833.6610  
Fax: 925.833.6628  
Email: amy.million@dublin.ca.gov
SECTION 2: ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Factors Potentially Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Biological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Geology/Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Hazards/Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Land Use/Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Mineral Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Population/Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Transportation/Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Utilities/Services Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. 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 measure 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.

Date: ___________________________ Signed: ___________________________
1. **Aesthetics, Light, and Glare**

   **Would the project:**

   a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

a) **Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Approval and construction of the proposed project would alter the character of existing scenic vistas and could obscure important sightlines by adding new buildings and signs adjacent to the I-580 freeway.

This impact was addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR (Impacts 3.8/B, 3.8/C, 3.8/F, 3.8/H, 3.8/l, and 3.8/J). Related Mitigation Measures applicable to the proposed project and/or site include 3.8/2.0, 3.8/3.0, 3.8/3.0, 3.8/7.0, 3.8/7.1, 3.8/8.0, and 3.8/8.1 (pp3.8-4 through 3.8-9 of the Eastern Dublin EIR). Mitigation measures encourage preservation of the natural landscape, preservation of the natural beauty of the hills, and preservation of views to the northerly hills.

The proposed project is located in Scenic Corridor Zone 1 as identified in the Eastern Dublin Scenic Corridor Policies and Standards document. Eastern Dublin Scenic Corridor policies state that properties within Scenic Corridor Zone 1 are subject to three specific standards: Standard 1.1, 1.2, and 2.1.

**Standard 1.1** states that the three designated Viewpoints in Zone 1 (shown in Figure 12 of the Scenic Corridor Policies and Standards document) maintain a generally uninterrupted view to significant natural resources. Within the project area, the significant natural resource identified in Figure 12 is Tassajara Creek. Tassajara Creek, and the view cone identified in Figure 12, are approximately 2,400 feet to the east. Therefore, the project complies with Standard 1.1 because it would not have a
visual impact to Tassajara Creek or the view cone identified to protect the visual resource associated with the Creek.

**Standard 1.2** states that structures generally within 700 feet of the Scenic Corridor (identified as I-580) should be allowed to obstruct the views of the Visually Sensitive Ridgelands from I-580 for not more than approximately 50 percent of the developed frontage.

The Visually Sensitive Ridgelands as identified in the Scenic Corridor Policies are the Ridgelands located to the east of Fallon Road, within the area known as Fallon Gateway, which was annexed to the City in 2002. The Visually Sensitive Ridgelands are approximately 3 miles to the east. The acute view angle (approximately 12 degrees) restricts the ability for the driver on westbound I-580 to view the Visually Sensitive Ridgelands, 3 miles to the east. Additionally, the view of the Visually Sensitive Ridgelands for eastbound I-580 drivers is obscured by the existing BART station and tracks located in the freeway median. Moreover, the total frontage of the project site is approximately 1,320 feet; the project proposes to construct 650 feet of building facing the frontage of I-580. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 1.2 because it will not have a visual impact on Visually Sensitive Ridgelands or obstruct the view of the developed frontage by more than 50 percent.

**Standard 2.1** states that architecture visible from the Scenic Corridors should complement the local environment. The local environment includes the Hacienda Crossings shopping center to the east, the proposed Transit Center high-density project to the west, and Persimmon Place, a commercial retail center located to the north. The existing local environment is characterized as a “built environment.” Landscaping has been incorporated into the project to enhance and soften the IKEA building; various corridors have been incorporated into the design of the Retail Center. The proposed project has been found to be consistent with the local environment. Additionally, landscaping and view corridors have been incorporated to ensure compliance with this standard; therefore the project is consistent with Standard 2.1.

The adopted Mitigation Measures and Specific Plan policies will continue to apply to the project. There are no impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR, and, therefore, no additional review or analysis is necessary.

b) **Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Development of the project site will alter the visual experience of travelers on scenic routes in Eastern Dublin. I-580 has been designated as a scenic corridor by Alameda County and the City of Dublin.

This potential impact (Impact 3.8/J) was identified and addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR, and Mitigation Measures 3.8/8.0 and 3.8/8.1 (page 3.8-9) encourage the City to adopt certain roads as scenic corridors, and encourage the City to require detailed visual analyses with development project applications (i.e., Stage 2 PD-Planned Development applications). Additionally, Policies 6-30 and 6-31 of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan provide guidance for areas of the project visible from a scenic corridor. As identified in subsection “a,” above, the project is consistent with the applicable
Scenic Corridor policies and standards and would therefore be Less-than-significant. Impacts on scenic highways were adequately addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and no further analysis is required.

**Standard 2.1.** Standard 2.1 states that architecture visible from the Scenic Corridors should complement the local environment. The local environment includes the Hacienda Crossings shopping center to the east, the proposed Transit Center high-density project to the west, and the Persimmon Place commercial retail center to the north. The existing local environment is characterized as a “built environment.” Landscaping has been incorporated into the project to enhance and soften the IKEA building; various corridors have been incorporated into the design of the Retail Center. The proposed project has been found to be consistent with the local environment. Additionally, landscaping and view corridors have been incorporated to ensure compliance with this standard; therefore the project is consistent with Standard 2.1.

c) **Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

**No Impact.** This impact was addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR (Impact 3.8/B-Alteration of Rural/Open Space Visual Character and Impact 3.8/F-Alteration of Visual Character of Flatlands). Development of the project area would alter the existing rural and open space qualities and alter the existing visual character of valley grasses and agricultural fields. The Eastern Dublin EIR concluded that no mitigation measures could be identified to fully or partially reduce this impact on flatlands to a less than significant level. Furthermore, the EIR concluded this impact would be a potentially significant unavoidable impact and an irreversible change; therefore, pursuant to CEQA, the City of Dublin adopted a Statement of Overriding Consideration for this impact.

The proposed project would reduce the scale of development anticipated in the Eastern Dublin EIR for the project area but would not change the level or intensity of impact since the flatlands along I-580 would still be developed for urban uses. Impacts on the existing visual character of the project site were adequately addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and no further analysis is required.

d) **Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would increase the amount of light and glare due to new street lighting and building security lighting. In some instances, the additional lighting could result in perceived negative aesthetic impacts through the “spill-over” of unwanted lighting onto adjacent properties that are not intended to be lighted. The anticipated light and glare generated by the proposed project would not be unique or different from other development projects within the City or the Eastern Dublin planning area. Furthermore, similar lighting exists or would be installed in the future on neighboring properties with approved or potential development projects. The City of Dublin has adopted regulations that limit the amount of “spill-overlighting” and standard conditions of approval limit potential light and glare impacts. The City’s zoning ordinance site development review guidelines, as well as conditions of approval, become part of the project. If approved, the project would have impacts that are less than significant, because light and glare created by the proposed project would be typical of development...
elsewhere in the City, and because of standard City regulations, light and glare impacts would be less than significant. Impacts related to light and glare were adequately addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and no further analysis is required.
### Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **Agriculture and Forestry Resources**

*In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.*

Would the project:

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

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?

---

**Environmental Evaluation**

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project;
and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

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

**No Impact.** The project site is mapped as “Other Land” by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, which is a non-agricultural land use designation. Thus, the development of the proposed project would not convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

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

**No Impact.** The project site is zoned “General Commercial,” which is a non-agricultural zoning designation. Additionally, the project site is not in agricultural use, which precludes the possibility of a Williamson Act contract. These conditions preclude the possibility of conflicts with agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

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))?

**No Impact.** The project is zoned “General Commercial,” which is a non-forest zoning designation. Additionally, the project site does not contain forest or timberland. These conditions preclude the possibility of conflicts with forest or timberland zoning. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** The project site does not contain any forest land. This precludes the possibility of the loss of forest land. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

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?

**No Impact.** The project site and surroundings are mapped as “Other Land” or “Urban and Built-Up Land” by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Thus, the development of the proposed project would not convert Important Farmland or forestland to non-agricultural or non-forest use. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.
### Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 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:

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 exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

---

### Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

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

*Potentially Significant Impact.* Impact 3.11/E of the Eastern Dublin EIR identified increased stationary source air emissions from the project area that would remain significant on a cumulative level even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.11/12.0 and 13.0. The prior EIR also assumed increased development in other areas, such as the San Joaquin Valley, and related commutes to the Bay Area, and it identified cumulative air quality impacts as Significant and Unavoidable. Upon approval of the Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan, the City adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for these two impacts. Since certification of the Eastern Dublin EIR, development and commutes from the east have increased as expected, but commute patterns along I-580 may be different from what is expected as commuters cut through nearby Dublin streets to avoid the freeway. In addition, based on the project’s size and related traffic generation, the project may contribute to further degradation of anticipated LOS F conditions on I-580. Since automobile traffic is the primary source of pollutants for which the Basin is in non-compliance, the potential for supplemental traffic impacts could also contribute to emissions.
exceeding Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) significance thresholds. This may be a potentially significant impact and will be assessed in the SEIR.

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** For the reasons noted above, the project could contribute to emissions exceeding BAAQMD significance thresholds. This may be a potentially significant impact and will be assessed in the SEIR.

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 exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** For the reasons noted in impact a), the project could contribute to emissions exceeding BAAQMD significance thresholds. This may be a potentially significant impact and will be assessed in the SEIR.

\[d\] Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**No Impact.** Development of the project area with urban uses will create emissions from a variety of stationary (non-vehicular) sources such as evaporative emissions from paints and cleaning products, etc. There are no sensitive receptors that could be exposed to stationary or vehicular source pollutants from the project. No impact would occur.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**No Impact.** Development of the project area with urban uses will create emissions from a variety of stationary (non-vehicular) sources such as evaporative emissions from paints and cleaning products, etc. The project does not propose residential development and no residential development exists or is planned adjacent to the project. No impact would occur.
Environmental Checklist and City of Dublin—IKEA Retail Center Project
Environmental Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Biological Resources
Would the project: |                                |                                                      |                            |           |
| 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 Game 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, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. 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 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? | ☐                              | ☐                                                     | ☐            | ☒         |

Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
Potentially Significant Impact. The Eastern Dublin EIR identified 12 special-status plant species; 17 special-status amphibian, reptile, bird, and mammal species; and 10 special-status invertebrate species that could potentially occur within the entire Eastern Dublin planning area (Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-2, pp. 3-7.19 through 3.7.21). Since certification of the Eastern Dublin EIR, new special-status species not addressed in the prior EIR have been identified and may occur on the project site, which could be potentially significant. The SEIR will analyze whether the project could result in new significant impacts related to these species.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project site contains 1.92 acres of seasonal wetland depressions that are classified as Waters of the State, which could be considered sensitive natural communities. The SEIR will analyze whether the project could result in new significant impacts on these resources.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. As indicated in the Delineation of Waters of the U.S., dated November 5, 2013 prepared by WRA, Inc., the project site contains 1.92 acres of seasonal wetland depressions that are likely to be classified as Waters of the State. These wetlands were determined to be isolated and therefore non-jurisdictional under Federal Clean Water Act Section 404. However, the non-jurisdictional status has not been confirmed by the United Stated Army Corps of Engineers. The SEIR will analyze whether the project could result in new significant impacts on these resources.

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 wildlife nursery sites?

No Impact. The project site does not contain any waterways, which precludes the possibility of migratory fish movement occurring on-site. The project site is surrounded by urban development or infrastructure on four sides and is enclosed with a fence. These conditions preclude the possibility of wildlife movement occurring on-site. No impact would occur.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. There are no trees within the project site, which precludes the possibility of conflicts with a tree protection ordinance or similar regulations. No impact would occur.

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?

No Impact. The project site is within the boundaries of the East Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS). The City of Dublin uses the EACCS as guidance for mitigating impacts associated
with public projects, but compliance is not mandated for private projects. Thus, the EACCS is not considered an “adopted” or “approved” plan that requires a consistency determination under CEQA. No impact would occur.
Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site previously supported military uses associated with Camp Parks; however, all buildings were removed in the mid-1990s. The project site has been graded several times since 2007 in preparation for reuse. As such, the likelihood of encountered undiscovered historic resources is considered low. Nonetheless, implementation of standard inadvertent discovery procedures set forth in the Eastern Dublin EIR in the event cultural resources are encountered during earthwork activities (Mitigation Measures 3.8/B and 3.9/D) would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

No Impact. The project site previously supported military uses associated with Camp Parks; however, all buildings were removed in the mid-1990s. The project site has been graded several times since 2007 in preparation for reuse. Thus, the likelihood of undiscovered archaeological resources being present within the project site is very low. Nonetheless, implementation of standard inadvertent discovery procedures set forth in the Eastern Dublin EIR in the event cultural resources are encountered during earthwork activities (Mitigation Measures 3.8/B and 3.9/D) would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.
c)  **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

No Impact. The project site previously supported military uses associated with Camp Parks; however, all buildings were removed in the mid-1990s. The project site has been graded several times since 2007 in preparation for reuse. Thus, the likelihood of undiscovered paleontological resources being present within the project site is very low. Nonetheless, implementation of standard inadvertent discovery procedures set forth in the Eastern Dublin EIR in the event cultural resources are encountered during earthwork activities (Mitigation Measures 3.8/B and 3.9/D) would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

d)  **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

No Impact. The project site previously supported military uses associated with Camp Parks; however, all buildings were removed in the mid-1990s. The project site has been graded several times since 2007 in preparation for reuse. Thus, the likelihood of undiscovered burial sites being present within the project site is very low. Nonetheless, implementation of standard inadvertent discovery procedures set forth in the Eastern Dublin EIR in the event cultural resources are encountered during earthwork activities (Mitigation Measures 3.8/B and 3.9/D) would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.
### Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6. Geology and Soils

**Would the project:**

- **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 supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

### Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

- **a)** Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Similar to many areas of California, the site could be subject to ground shaking caused by the regional faults identified above. Under moderate to severe seismic events, which are probable in the Bay Area over the next 30 years, buildings, utilities, and other
improvements constructed in the project area would be subject to damage caused by ground shaking. However, since the project area is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone (formerly Alquist-Priolo Zone), the potential for ground rupture is anticipated to be minimal.

The Eastern Dublin EIR identified the primary and secondary effects of ground-shaking (Impacts 3.6/B and 3.6/C) and Mitigation Measure 3.6/1.0 requiring modern seismic design for resistance to lateral forces in construction, which would reduce the potential for structure failure, major structural damage and loss of life. These design standards are reflected in current building standards and would be required for issuance of building permits by the City of Dublin for the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures 3.6/2.0, 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, 7.0, and 8.0 will be implemented, as appropriate to the project site, to reduce the secondary effects of ground-shaking and require stabilization of unstable landforms where possible or restriction of improvements from unstable utilization of properly engineered retention structures and fill; design of roads and infrastructure to accommodate potential settlement; and completion of design-level geotechnical investigations (pp. 3.6-8 through 3.6-9).

Adherence to Mitigation Measures MM 3.6/1.0 through 8.0 will ensure that new structures and infrastructure built within the project area will comply with generally recognized seismic safety standards.

The applicant for development of the property has commissioned a soils and geotechnical report to conform to adopted mitigation measures contained in the Eastern Dublin EIR and policies set forth in the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. Development plans submitted for the project reflect the report’s recommendations. There are no impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR. Adopted Mitigation Measures will continue to apply to this project. Therefore no additional review or analysis is necessary.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Eastern Dublin EIR notes that development would modify the existing ground surface and alter patterns of surface runoff and infiltration and could result in a short-term increase in erosion and sedimentation caused by grading activities (Impact 3.6/K.). Long-term impacts could result from modification of the ground-surface and removal of existing vegetation (Impact 3.6/L). Related Mitigation Measures 3.6/27.0 and 28.0 (pp. 3.6-14 and -15) require the preparation and implementation of erosion control measures to be utilized on short-term and long-term bases. In addition to these measures, the project would be subject to erosion control and water quality control measures required by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and implemented by the City of Dublin. The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan also contains Policy 6-43, which requires that new development be designed to provide effective control of soil erosion as a result of construction activities. Since erosion impacts are adequately addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR, no further analysis is required.
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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Portions of the project area are underlain by soil types with high shrink-swell potential that has the potential to cause damage to foundations, slabs, and pavement (Impact 3.6/H). The proposed project will be required to comply with Mitigation Measures 3.6/14.0 through 16.0 (pp. 3.6-11 and -12) requiring appropriate structural foundations and other techniques to overcome shrink-swell effects. As such, impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Portions of the project area are underlain by soil types with high shrink-swell potential that has the potential to cause damage to foundations, slabs, and pavement (Impact 3.6/H). The proposed project will be required to comply with Mitigation Measures 3.6/14.0 through 16.0 (pp. 3.6-11 and -12) requiring appropriate structural foundations and other techniques to overcome shrink-swell effects. As such, impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

**No Impact.** All new development within the project area would be connected to a public sanitary sewer system and maintained by DSRSD, which serves all of the City of Dublin. No septic systems are proposed within the project area. No impact would occur.
Environmental Checklist and City of Dublin—IKEA Retail Center Project Environmental Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Eastern Dublin EIR was prepared prior to enactment of the California Global Warming Solutions Act in 2006 and, therefore, did not evaluate greenhouse gas emissions. The SEIR will evaluate project-related emissions of greenhouse gases and determine if they are within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s adopted thresholds.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Eastern Dublin EIR was prepared prior to enactment of the California Global Warming Solutions Act in 2006 and, therefore, did not evaluate greenhouse gas emissions. The SEIR will evaluate whether the proposed project is consistent with the greenhouse gas emissions reduction objectives of the City of Dublin Climate Action Plan.
### Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

a) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. These uses would involve the routine uses of common low-level hazardous materials such as cleaning solvents, diesel, gasoline, grease/degreasers, mechanical fluids, and oil. Given the small quantities involved and the characteristics of use, the use thereof would not be considered a potential risk to human health or the environment. The use of acutely hazardous materials of any quantity that have the potential to result in releases that could potentially expose substantial numbers of people or the environment to harm is not anticipated by the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. These uses would involve the routine uses of common low-level hazardous materials such as cleaning solvents, diesel, gasoline, grease/degreasers, mechanical fluids, and oil. Given the small quantities involved and the characteristics of use, the use thereof would not be considered a potential risk to human health or the environment. The use of acutely hazardous materials of any quantity that have the potential for reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

c) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**No Impact.** The project site is 0.33 of a mile southwest of James Dougherty Elementary School, the closest school to the project site. Additionally, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle large quantities of hazardous materials. These characteristics preclude the possibility of the project exposing schools located within 0.25 of a mile of the project site to hazardous emissions or hazardous materials. No impact would occur.

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?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is listed on a hazardous materials site database as a result of clean-up efforts that have been pursued under the auspices of the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency. As of 2014, the only task left to complete was the removal of 500 cubic yards of a soil stockpile. Removal would need to occur prior to grading activities. Once that occurs, the
agency has indicated that it will consider issuing a closure letter that confirms that the site is suitable for reuse for commercial purposes. As such, mitigation should be required in the SEIR to ensure proper soil removal.

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?

**No Impact.** The project site is located outside of the Airport Influence Area of the Livermore Municipal Airport, as shown in Figure 3-1 of the Livermore Executive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. This condition precludes the possibility of exposing persons residing or working in the project vicinity to aviation hazards. No impact would occur.

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?

**No Impact.** There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity. This condition precludes the possibility of exposing persons residing or working in the project vicinity to aviation hazards. No impact would occur.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would be accessible from five vehicular access points on Martinelli Way and Arnold Road. This would comply with California Fire Code requirements that mandate a minimum of two vehicular access points for a project with these characteristics. In addition, Arnold Road would be converted to a cul-de-sac and the connection to Campus Drive would be eliminated; however, this roadway is not essential for circulation in the project vicinity and would not impair emergency access or evacuation. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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?

**No Impact.** The project site is surrounded by urban development or infrastructure on all four sides. This condition precludes the possibility of exposing persons or structures to wildland fire hazards. No impact would occur.
### 9. Hydrology and Water Quality

#### Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Site grading (cut and fill) would occur to construct driveways, parking lots, building pads, utilities connections, and similar improvements. Proposed grading could increase the potential of erosion and increase the amount of sediments carried by stormwater runoff into bodies of water, on and off the project site. These impacts were identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR (Impacts 3.5/Y and 3.5/AA) along with Mitigation Measures 3.5/44.0–47.0, 49.0, 51.0, and 52.0, which require drainage facilities to minimize any increased potential for erosion; preparation of a Master Drainage Plan prior to development (Stage 2 PD-Planned Development) approval; facilities and management practices which protect and enhance water quality; specific water quality investigations that address water quantity and quality of runoff; and community-based programs to educate local residents and business on methods to reduce non-point sources of pollutants. The mitigation measures will be applied to the proposed project as appropriate.

Additionally, development of individual parcels within the project area will be required by City ordinance to prepare Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP), implementing Best Management Practices that reduce the potential for water quality degradation during construction and post-construction activities. These measures can include revegetation of graded areas, silt fencing, and use of biofilters within parks and other landscaped areas. These individual SWPPPs must conform to standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and City of Dublin and shall be approved by the City of Dublin prior to issuance of grading permits. Both agencies monitor construction and post-construction activities according to the SWPPP and adjustments are made during project construction as necessary to erosion control methods and water quality protection as field conditions warrant. Specific development projects containing 5 acres of more are also required to submit a Notice of Intent from the State Water Resources Control Board prior to commencement of grading.

The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan also contains policies that reflect the mitigation measures of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan EIR listed above. Policies 9-7 through 9-9 and Programs 9T through 9X (pp. 133–134) address the potential for erosion and changes in water quality, stormwater runoff, and storm drainage due to development of the project area. The Eastern Dublin EIR and applicable requirements for project-specific SWPPPs adequately address potential water quality impacts of the project. As such, impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Eastern Dublin EIR noted that the project area is located in an area of minimal groundwater recharge stating that groundwater reserves and the majority of the Tri-Valley's groundwater resources are in the Central Basin, south of the project area. Mitigation
Measure 3.5/50.0 notes that Zone 7 supports ongoing groundwater recharge programs for the Central Basin. Water for the proposed project would be supplied by DSRSD, so that there would be no depletion of groundwater resources. The Eastern Dublin EIR noted that development of the area could have an impact on local groundwater resources and groundwater recharge due to an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces within the project site, (Impact 3.5/Z). With implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.5/49.0 and 3.5/50.0 (p. 3.5-26), this impact would be less than significant and no further analysis is needed.

c)  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Development of the project site would change existing natural drainage patterns in the area. Approval and implementation of the proposed project would increase stormwater runoff from the site due to construction and post-construction activities and thereby increase the potential for erosion. These impacts and related mitigations have been identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR (Impacts 3.5/Y and 3.5/AA) in relation to impact a), above. The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan also contains policies and programs (Policies 9-7 through 9-9 and Programs 9S through 9X, pp. 133–134) addressing potential erosion.

The Eastern Dublin EIR adequately analyzes potential erosion impacts. The adopted Mitigation Measures and Specific Plan policies would continue to apply to the project. There are no impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and therefore no additional review or analysis is necessary.

d)  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would install an on-site storm drainage system consisting of a network of street gutters, inlets, basins, and underground piping that would ultimately convey runoff to the municipal storm drainage system. In accordance with current storm water management requirements, peak runoff flows would be detained during peak storm events and released at a rate no greater than the pre-development peak runoff flows. This would ensure that downstream waterways are not inundated by project-related runoff such that flooding would occur. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

e)  Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would install an on-site storm drainage system consisting of a network of street gutters, inlets, basins, and underground piping that would ultimately convey runoff to the municipal storm drainage system. In accordance with C.3 requirements, peak runoff flows would be detained during peak storm events and released at a rate no greater than the pre-development peak runoff flows. This would ensure that downstream
drainage facilities are not inundated by project-related runoff, which precludes the need for new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction activities related to development of the project site and post-construction activities could degrade water quality resulting in additional sedimentation and potential pollutants in on-site or downstream waters. These impacts were identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR (Impacts 3.5/Y and 3.5/AA) and related Mitigation Measures 3.5/44.0—49.0, 51.0, and 52.0, as described in impact a) above. Policies of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan (Policies 9-7 through 9-9 and Programs 9T through 9X, pp. 133–134) also would be implemented such that the City will require preparation of a SWPPP prior to the issuance of project grading plans.

The Eastern Dublin EIR adequately addressed potential water quality impacts for the project. The adopted mitigation measures and Specific Plan policies would continue to apply to the project. There are no impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR, and, therefore, no additional review or analysis is necessary.

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?

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not involve the development of residential land uses, a condition that precludes placing housing within a 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain, so there would be no impacts with impedance or redirection of flood waters. No impact would occur.

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?

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located in an area protected by any levees. The project site as well as the majority of Dublin is not within a dam failure inundation zone. This condition precludes the possibility of flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. No impact would occur.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**No Impact.** The site is not located near a major inland body of water that could be susceptible to a seiche. The project site is more than 20 miles from the Pacific Ocean and, thus, would not be susceptible to tsunamis. Finally, the project site is not located in an area of volcanic activity or steep slopes, a condition that precludes susceptibility to mudflows. No impact would occur.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Land Use and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Evaluation**

Would the project:

a) **Physically divide an established community?**

No Impact. The project site contains undeveloped land, an unoccupied building, and a utility building. The site is enclosed with a fence and public access is not permitted. As such, the project site does not support any established communities. This condition precludes the possibility of the division of an established community. No impact would occur.

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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project consists of the development of commercial-retail center. The City of Dublin General Plan designates the project site as “General Commercial,” while the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan zones the site as “General Commercial,” which permits the construction of retail-commercial uses. Development on-site would be required to comply with all applicable General Plan policies and Specific Plan regulations, and would be reviewed by the City prior to approval of the necessary permits. As such, impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

c) **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?**

No Impact. The project site is within the boundaries of the EACCS. The City of Dublin uses the EACCS as guidance for mitigating impacts associated with public projects, but compliance is not mandated for private projects. Thus, the EACCS is not considered an “adopted” or “approved” plan that requires a consistency determination under CEQA. No impact would occur.
11. Mineral Resources

Would the project:

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?

No impact. The project site has not historically supported mineral extraction activities and is not a known location of significant mineral deposits. This condition precludes the possibility of the loss of mineral resources. No impact would occur.

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?

No Impact. The project site has not historically supported mineral extraction activities and is not designated by the City of Dublin General Plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. This condition precludes the possibility of the loss of mineral resources. No impact would occur.
Environmental Evaluation

Would the project result in:

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. As indicated in City of Dublin General Plan Figure 9-1, the project site is currently exposed to noise levels in excess of 75 dBA CNE L associated with traffic noise on I-580. General Plan Figure 9-2 anticipates noise exposure levels increasing by Year 2035 as a result of additional freeway traffic and the planned BART extension to Livermore. The General Plan identifies the noise exposure range of 71 to 75 dBA CNE L to be “conditionally acceptable” for new commercial development, and notes that new construction that incorporates noise insulation, closed windows, and air conditioning would suffice. Accordingly, noise exposure will be further evaluated in the SEIR to determine if the project meets these standards.
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Groundborne vibration can be caused by temporary activities such as construction and regular, reoccurring activities such as truck and train movements. The only buildings within 200 feet of the project site are associated with Persimmon Place and were constructed relatively recently in accordance with current California Building Code standards; thus, they would not be susceptible to damage from vibration from construction or operational activities that occur within the project site. Additionally, the project site is more than 50 feet from the closest lane on I-580 and more than 150 feet from the BART tracks; these distances would be sufficient to attenuate any vibration from these transportation facilities to levels that would not be perceptible within the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. These uses would add new daily trips to local roadways, including those that experience existing noise levels of 75 dBA CNEL as shown on City of Dublin General Plan Figure 9-1. This has the potential to cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Additionally, the proposed project would generate on-site, non-transportation noise from operational activities (loading/unloading activities, stationary equipment, etc.) that also has the potential to increase ambient noise levels. Accordingly, the proposed project’s operational noise will be further evaluated in the SEIR to determine if it contributes to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. Construction activities would involve the use of heavy equipment that has the potential to expose surrounding receptors to a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Accordingly, the proposed project’s construction noise will be further evaluated in the SEIR to determine if it contributes to a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**No Impact.** The project site is located outside of the Airport Influence Area of the Livermore Municipal Airport, as shown in Figure 3-1 of the Livermore Executive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. This condition precludes the possibility of exposing persons residing or working in the project vicinity to excessive aviation noise. No impact would occur.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity. This condition precludes the possibility of exposing persons residing or working in the project vicinity to excessive aviation noise. No impact would occur.
13. **Population and Housing**

*Would the project:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Evaluation**

Would the project:

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)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. The IKEA store would employ up to 350 workers. Using a standard employment estimate of 1 job/500 square feet, the 93,000 square feet of lifestyle retail and restaurant uses would employ an estimated 186 workers. In total, the proposed project would employ as many as 536 workers. The California Employment Development Department indicates that the Alameda County labor force totaled 836,900 persons as of June 2017. Of this figure, 33,300 persons were unemployed. This serves to signify the there is a large enough pool of labor in Alameda County to fill the proposed project’s employment opportunities such that it would be unlikely that substantial numbers of people would relocate to the Dublin area. Additionally, the proposed project would not develop residential uses and, therefore, would not directly facilitate population growth. Lastly, the project site is located within an area served with urban infrastructure and services. Thus, no infrastructure or services would need to be extended to the site in a manner that would remove a physical barrier to growth. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The project site does not contain any dwelling units. This condition precludes the possibility of displacement of existing housing. No impact would occur.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The project site does not contain any dwelling units. This condition precludes the possibility of displacement of persons. No impact would occur.
14. Public Services

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>☏</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Evaluation

Would the project impact:

a) Fire protection?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. No residential uses are proposed. The project site is located approximately 1.0 mile from Alameda County Fire Station No. 17. Using an average travel speed of 25 miles per hour, a fire engine responding to the project site from Station No. 17 would take 2 minutes, 30 seconds. This response time would be within acceptable standards, and, therefore, no new or expanded fire protection facilities would be required. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

b) Police protection?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. No residential uses are proposed. The proposed project would incorporate safety and security measures including parking lot lighting, video surveillance, and loss prevention measures to deter and prevent criminal activity. These measures would minimize demand for police protection services such that new or expanded police facilities would not be required. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

c) Schools?

**No Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. No residential uses are proposed. As such, the proposed project would not directly generate any new K-12 enrollment in the Dublin Unified School District. This precludes the need for new or expanded school facilities. No impacts would occur.
d) Parks?

**No Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. No residential uses are proposed. As such, the proposed project would not create new demand for park facilities. This precludes the need for new or expanded park facilities. No impacts would occur.

e) Other public facilities?

**No Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. No residential uses are proposed. As such, the proposed project would not create new demand for other public facilities such as libraries. This precludes the need for new or expanded library or other public facilities. No impacts would occur.
Environmental Issues | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---|---
15. Recreation

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [x]

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [x]

Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

**No Impact.** The proposed project would develop up to 432,099 square feet of new commercial uses on the project site. No residential uses are proposed. As such, the proposed project would not increase use of park or recreational facilities such that physical deterioration would occur. No impact would occur.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not include new park or recreation facilities. This precludes the possibility of physical impacts on the environment from the construction of such facilities. No impact would occur.
### Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

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?**
Potentially Significant Impact. The Eastern Dublin EIR considered the development of the project area with Campus Office land uses, and adopted mitigation measures to address the impacts thereof. However, retail uses could result in different peak-hour impacts, and changes in Tri-Valley commute patterns in addition to the anticipated project traffic, may cause potentially significant impacts not anticipated by the Eastern Dublin EIR. These impacts could include traffic impacts within the project area, at nearby intersections, or on freeways and roads that project traffic may use. This topic will be addressed in the SEIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. As noted above, the construction of retail floor space on the project site was not anticipated in the Eastern Dublin EIR and could result in peak-hour traffic impacts different from those originally considered. Potential impacts of proposed development on regional freeways and local roadways in conjunction with changing commute patterns and traffic intensities unrelated to the project may also cause potentially significant impacts not anticipated by the Eastern Dublin EIR. This topic will be addressed in the SEIR.

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?

No Impact. The project site is located outside of the Airport Influence Area of the Livermore Municipal Airport, as shown in Figure 3-1 of the Livermore Executive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. This condition precludes the possibility of the project from altering air traffic patterns at the airport. No impact would occur.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Approval of the proposed project and future development of the site would add new driveways, sidewalks and other vehicular and pedestrian travel ways where none currently exist. The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan and the Municipal Code contain design standards intended to assure that access to and from a development site and circulation within the site will be safe and efficient. Since project facilities will be required to be constructed to these design standards, impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would be served by five vehicular access points, all of which would be wide enough to accommodate a fire engine. As such, adequate emergency access would be provided in accordance with California Fire Code requirements. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.
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?

No Impact. The proposed development projects would be designed with sidewalks, pedestrian walkways, bus facilities, and bicycle routes to minimize potential hazards to pedestrians and bicyclists and to support these alternative transportation modes. In accordance with the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan, pedestrian facilities are included as part of the proposed project. The City and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan have standards by which bus turn-outs and sidewalks must be planned and constructed. LAVTA has indicated that a bus stop will be required along the south side of Martinelli Way adjacent to the project frontage. The project as designed can accommodate the requested bus stop. In accordance with City and LAVTA requirements, the project would install the bus stop. No impacts are therefore anticipated.
### Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 17. Tribal Cultural Resources

**Would the project:**

- **a)** Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
  - Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
  - A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

### Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site previously supported military uses associated with Camp Parks; however, all buildings were removed in the mid-1990s. The project site has been graded several times since 2007 in preparation for reuse. The project site is not listed on a state or local historical register and tribal cultural resources have not been previously encountered on the project site. Thus, the likelihood of undiscovered tribal cultural resources being present within the project site is very low. Nonetheless, implementation of standard inadvertent discovery procedures set forth in the Eastern Dublin EIR in the event cultural resources are encountered during earthwork activities (Mitigation Measures 3.8/B and 3.9/D) would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Utilities and Service Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Would the project:</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Evaluation**

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** DSRSD provides wastewater collection and treatment service to the City of Dublin, and it owns and operates the Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility in Pleasanton. The Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility has a treatment capacity of 17.0 million gallons per day (mgd). The facility currently treats an average of 10.5 mgd during dry weather and 10.9 mgd during wet weather. Using a standard industry assumption that wastewater effluent represents 90 percent
of domestic water consumption, the proposed project would generate approximately 8,524 gallons (0.008 mgd) of effluent per day. This would represent less than 1 percent of the 6.5 mgd of available treatment capacity at the Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility. Thus, the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements that apply to the Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in impacts a) and d), the proposed project can be served with potable water and wastewater service by DSRSD without needing to expand any existing treatment facilities. This precludes the possibility of physical impacts on the environment in this regard. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would install an on-site storm drainage system consisting of a network of street gutters, inlets, basins, and underground piping that would ultimately convey runoff to the municipal storm drainage system. In accordance with C.3 requirements, peak runoff flows would be detained during peak storm events and released at a rate no greater than the pre-development peak runoff flows. This would ensure that downstream drainage facilities are not inundated by project-related runoff, which precludes the need for new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Using DSRSD’s water consumption rate of 20 gallons per square foot per year for commercial retail land uses, the proposed project’s 432,099 square feet of commercial uses would demand 8.64 million gallons of water annually, which is equivalent to 26.5 acre-feet. DSRSD’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan indicates that potable water supply would range from 12,900 acre-feet in 2015 to 18,500 acre-feet in 2035. The proposed project’s annual demand of 26.5 acre-feet represents less than 1 percent of both the 2015 and 2035 supply totals. As such, sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the project from existing entitlements. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** DSRSD’s Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility has a treatment capacity of 17.0 mgd. The facility currently treats an average of 10.5 mgd during dry-weather and 10.9 mgd during wet-weather. Using a standard industry assumption that wastewater effluent represents 90 percent of domestic water consumption, the proposed project would generate approximately 8,524 gallons (0.008 mgd) of effluent per day. This would represent less than 1
percent of the 6.5 mgd of available treatment capacity at the Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility. Thus, the proposed project would be served with a wastewater treatment plant that has adequate capacity. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is estimated to generate 1,307 cubic yards of solid waste during construction and 1,451 cubic yards of solid waste annually during operations. The Altamont Landfill and Resources Recovery Facility near Livermore has 45.7 million cubic yards of remaining capacity. The proposed project’s construction and operational solid waste would represent less than 1 percent of the remaining capacity at the Altamont Landfill. Therefore, adequate landfill capacity is available to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

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

**No impact.** The City of Dublin and the solid waste hauler would ensure that developers of individual projects constructed in the project area would adhere to federal, state, and local solid waste regulations; therefore, no impact would result.
### Environmental Evaluation

#### 19. Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project 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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project 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)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Evaluation**

a) Does the project 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?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Please refer to the discussion in the Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Transportation. Potential impacts related to cultural resources would be less than significant. However, the project would have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts related to Air Quality, Biological Resources, and Transportation. Such impacts will be addressed in the SEIR.
b) Does the project 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)?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Eastern Dublin EIR addressed the cumulative impacts of development of the project area within its evaluation of the overall Eastern Dublin planning area. To the extent that potential impacts will be addressed in the SEIR, related cumulative impacts will also be examined as appropriate.

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Eastern Dublin EIR addressed potentially significant adverse impacts of development on the Project site through its evaluation of the proposed Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan. This Initial Study identifies certain potentially significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR that will be addressed in the SEIR.
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A.2 - Notice of Preparation
Notice of Preparation and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting
IKEA Retail Center Project

Date: Thursday, August 17, 2017

To: Public Agencies and Interested Parties

From: Amy Million, Principal Planner, City of Dublin

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting for the IKEA Retail Center Project

The City of Dublin will be the Lead Agency and will prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the project identified herein. The project description, location, and probable environmental effects of the IKEA Retail Center Project are described in the attached materials. The SEIR will “tier off” of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan EIR and evaluate the proposed project in light of the conclusions of that previous EIR.

The City of Dublin is soliciting comments from public agencies, organizations, and members of the public regarding the scope and content of the SEIR, and the environmental issues and alternatives to be addressed in the SEIR. Public agencies may need to use the EIR when considering permitting or other approvals that are germane to the agencies’ responsibilities in connection with the projects.

Because of time limits mandated by state law, public agencies must submit any comments in response to this notice at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. The City also will accept comments from other interested parties regarding this notice during this time period. Accordingly, please provide your written response to either the email or the physical address shown below by 5:00 p.m., Monday, September 18, 2017. If you wish to be placed on the notification list for this project, or if you have any questions or need additional information, please contact the person below.

City of Dublin Community Development Department
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA, 94568
Attn: Amy Million, Principal Planner

Phone: (925) 833-6610, Fax: (925) 833-6628, email: amy.million@dublin.ca.gov

Public Scoping Meeting

A public scoping meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 7, 2017 at the Dublin Civic Center “Regional Meeting Room,” 100 Civic Plaza, Dublin, CA 94568. At this meeting, public agencies, organizations, and members of the public will be able to review the proposed project and provide comments on the scope of the environmental review process.
IKEA RETAIL CENTER PROJECT

1.1 - Project Location

The project site is located at 5344 and 5411 Martinelli Way in the City of Dublin, Alameda County, California (Exhibit 1). The 27.446 gross-acre project site is bounded by Arnold Road (west), Martinelli Way (north), Hacienda Drive (east), and Interstate 580 (south); refer to Exhibit 2. The project site is located on the Dublin, California, United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map, Township 3 South, Range 1 East, Section 5 (Latitude 37°42'10" North; Longitude 121°53'27" West).

1.2 - Existing Conditions

1.2.1 - Land Use Activities

The project site contains mostly unimproved, undeveloped land. The project site was previously cleared and graded, and is regularly disked for weed abatement purposes. A fence surrounds the project site. The elevation ranges from approximately 350 feet in the north to approximately 340 feet in the south.

An unoccupied, single-story building is located in the northern portion of the project site on an asphalt pad. An asphalt driveway connects the building pad to a driveway on Martinelli Way. Ornamental landscaping is located around the building.

A single-story masonry block utility building is located in the southeast corner of the site along Arnold Road. This building is owned and operated by Dublin-San Ramon Services District.

The site contains areas where soil has been stockpiled. One of the stockpiles (Stockpile No. 2) contains approximately 500 cubic yards of soil that contains polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, diesel and oil range petroleum hydrocarbons, and polychlorinated biphenyls that must be removed prior to development activities. The other stockpiles have been tested for hazardous materials and determined to be within acceptable levels for commercial development.

The project site contains 1.92 acres of seasonal wetland depressions likely to be regulated by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) as Waters of the State. These wetlands were determined to be isolated and are therefore assumed to be non-jurisdictional under Federal Clean Water Act Section 404.

Vehicular access to the project site is currently available through three driveway stub-outs on Martinelli Way and three driveway stub-outs on Arnold Road. The middle driveway on Martinelli Way (which connects to the unoccupied building) is signalized and aligned with the main entrance to Persimmon Place retail center on the opposite side of the roadway. The project site is precluded from taking vehicular access on Hacienda Drive pursuant to a “No Access” easement.

An asphalt pedestrian path is located along the project frontages with Arnold Road and Martinelli Way. A concrete sidewalk is located along the Hacienda Drive frontage.
A storm drainage easement is located along the project frontage with Arnold Road and Interstate 580 (I-580). A water line easement is located along the project frontage with Arnold Road. A Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) easement is located along the project frontage with I-580. Several utility boxes and vaults are located within the easements along the I-580 frontage. In addition, a portion of the site has been dedicated (to the City) for the future extension to the Bay Area Rapid Transit line along the project’s I-580 frontage.

1.2.2 - Land Use Designations

The project site is designated “General Commercial” by the City of Dublin General Plan and the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. The site is currently zoned Planned Development PD Ordinance 34-08. The project site is located within the Hacienda Gateway planning subarea of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan.

1.3 - Project Background

1.3.1 - Project Site

The project site was originally part of the Parks Reserve Forces Training Area (known locally as “Camp Parks”), a United States Army Reserve installation that opened in 1943. The project site was located in a portion of the base that—at various times—contained a gatehouse, guest reception lounge, an athletic field, an athletic field house, a fuel depot, railroad spurs, and a warehouse receiving area. In the late 1960s, a portion of Camp Parks that included the project site was transferred to the County of Alameda for civilian use.

In the mid-1990s, the military buildings were demolished and the site was cleared. An underground storage tank (UST) associated with the past military uses was removed in 2008. The project site was graded several times between 2007 and 2009. The property owner has been pursuing soil, soil gas, and groundwater remediation efforts under the auspices of the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency, which has included removal of contaminated soil and pumping of contaminated groundwater. On October 30, 2014, Alameda County Health Care Services Agency issued a notice of “Potential Case Closure” that noted that the agency would consider closure of the case once the last soil stockpile is removed from the project site. No updated documentation of site remediation has been presented.

1.3.2 - Eastern Dublin Specific Plan

The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan serves as the zoning ordinance for approximately 4,200 acres in the eastern portion of the City of Dublin. Much of this acreage included former portions of Camp Parks that have been transferred to civilian use, including the project site. The Specific Plan (and associated General Plan Amendment) was adopted in 1993 and has been amended several times, most recently in 2014. The Specific Plan is organized into 10 chapters that set forth policy recommendations, design concepts, and implementation measures. The first three chapters are primarily descriptive, summarizing the Plan, the planning context, and the existing setting. The policies, standards, guidelines, and implementation measures that regulate future development are presented in subsequent chapters.

The project’s potential impacts are being reviewed to determine if mitigation measures from the East Dublin Specific Plan EIR apply and would adequately reduce impacts.
1.4 - Project Characteristics

1.4.1 - Project Summary

The project is proposing the development of approximately 432,099 square feet of commercial uses on 27.45 acres. The project would be anchored by an IKEA store of approximately 339,099 square feet and feature up to 93,000 square feet of lifestyle retail-restaurant uses. Table 1 summarizes the project and Exhibit 3 depicts the conceptual site plan.

Table 1: IKEA Retail Center Project Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major 1 (IKEA)</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>339,099</td>
<td>2 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle retail-restaurant</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Freestanding restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>Multiple buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td><strong>93,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication for Rail Line (BART)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27.31</td>
<td><strong>432,099</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GreenbergFarrow, 2017.

Major 1—IKEA

The IKEA store would consist of a two-story building located over a two-level parking structure.1 The building would be set against the Arnold Road frontage and face Hacienda Drive. The building would stand 61 feet above finished grade. The principal loading docks would be located in the rear of the building facing Arnold Road. A recycling and refuse collection area, trash compactor, and emergency diesel generator would also be located in the rear of the store. A two-bay loading dock for home deliveries would be located on the south side of the building facing I-580.

The building design reflects a contemporary theme incorporating blue and yellow.2 The building facades would be broken up by geometry, and building materials such as composite metal panels, steel elements and clear anodized glass, aluminum, and storefront glazing at the entrance. Covered walkways would be incorporated along the front of the building.

Operational Characteristics

The IKEA store is expected to be open for business 7 days a week from 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Longer operational hours may be applicable during holidays or to accommodate future operational needs/market conditions.

The project is anticipated to employ 150 employees per shift for a total of approximately 350 employees.

---

1 This store prototype has been used in Colorado and South Florida.
2 Blue and yellow are the national colors of Sweden and the corporate colors of IKEA
Approximately five to seven trucks (including 53-foot tractor-trailer combination units) daily.

**Lifestyle Retail-Restaurant Center**

The eastern portion of the site (would support a retail center consisting of up to 93,000 square feet of lifestyle retail-restaurant center uses. An 8,000-square-foot restaurant pad would be located at the intersection of Martinelli Way/Hacienda Drive. Multiple buildings totaling 85,000 square feet that would be organized around a pedestrian plaza would be located directly opposite the IKEA store entrance.

**Site Access and Parking**

**Vehicular Access**

The proposed project would result in modifications to access of the site as follows:

- **Martinelli Way:** The signalized full entry along Martinelli Way would remain in place and the main entry is proposed to be designated as “IKEA Place.” The existing west driveway stub-out would be eliminated. The existing east driveway stub-out would serve as a right-in, right-out access point.

- **IKEA Place:** IKEA Place would serve as a north-south internal street within the project and provide access to the IKEA parking structure and the lifestyle retail-restaurant center surface parking.

- **Arnold Road:** The median in Arnold Road that restricts movements at the driveway located in the approximate center of the site of the site would be modified to provide full access to the IKEA parking structure. Additionally, a right-out ramp from the IKEA parking structure would connect to northbound Arnold Road. The existing Arnold Road “T” intersection near I-580 would be converted to a cul-de-sac.

- **East-West Internal Road:** This would extend from Arnold Road east into the project site along the southern perimeter and connect to both the IKEA parking structure and IKEA Place.

**Parking**

The IKEA store would provide 1,026 parking spaces a two-level below-store structure. Access to the parking structure would be taken from either entrances/exits at the north and south ends. The lifestyle retail-restaurant uses would provide 568 surface parking spaces.

**1.5 - Proposed Approvals**

The proposed project requires the following discretionary approvals from the City of Dublin:

- **EIR Certification.**

- **Lot Line Adjustment or Lot Merger.** A Lot Line Adjustment or Lot Merger would shift and eliminate lots lines so that the only two parcels remain; one for the IKEA site and second parcel for the Retail Center. This may also be done as part of the Vesting Tentative and Final Map.

- **Vesting Tentative and Final Map.** A Vesting Tentative Parcel Map with multiple Final Maps would subdivide the IKEA parcel into four smaller parcels. The future owner of the Retail Center may also seek a Vesting Tentative Parcel Map in the future.
- **Site Development Review.** A Site Development Review would describe the specific design color, materials, parking and access, and landscaping for the project.

- **Master Sign Program/Site Development Review.** A Master Sign Program/Site Development Review for the entire project is required to ensure effective and attractive signage through the project.

- **Development Agreements.** The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan requires that developers enter into development agreements prior to development of a property. It is anticipated that two separate development agreements may be required, one for the IKEA store and one for the Retail Center. The development agreements would serve to “lock in” approved development on the project site for a number of years.

In addition, the proposed project would require ministerial approvals, including but not limited to grading, site work, and building permits.

### 1.6 - Environmental Review

#### 1.6.1 - Potential Environmental Effects

The EIR will evaluate whether the proposed project may potentially result in one or more significant environmental effects, which will be evaluated in the relevant EIR sections listed below.

- Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Biological Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Noise
- Transportation
- Urban Decay
- Utilities

#### 1.6.2 - Effects Found Not To Be Significant

Unless specific comments are received during the NOP public comment period that indicate a potential for the project to result in significant impacts, the following issues will be addressed in the Effects Found Not To Be Significant section of the EIR.

**Aesthetics, Light, and Glare**

The project site contains undeveloped, disturbed land that previously supported military uses associated with Camp Parks. The project site has been graded several times since 2007 in preparation for reuse. Both the City of Dublin General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan contemplate the development of commercial uses on the project site. Project buildings would be limited to two stories and setback a minimum of 120 feet from the I-580 right-of-way. Although the project site is adjacent to I-580—a General Plan-designated “Scenic Route”—it complies with policies that require new development to employ high quality design and preserve at least 50 percent of views of the Visually Sensitive Ridgelands designated by the General Plan (via the low building heights and setbacks).
Agriculture and Forest Resources
The project site does not support agricultural operations. The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program maps the project site as “Other Land,” which is a non-agricultural designation. Additionally, the site does not contain timberland or other forest resources. This condition precludes the possibility of adverse impacts to agricultural or forest resources.

Cultural Resources
The project site previously supported military uses associated with Camp Parks; however, all buildings were removed in the mid-1990s. The project site has been graded several times since 2007 in preparation for reuse. Thus, the likelihood of undiscovered historic resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or burial sites being present within the project site is very low.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
There are no active earthquake faults within or near the project site. The project site contains flat relief and is not susceptible to landslides. The project site previously supported military uses associated with Camp Parks; however, all buildings were removed in the mid-1990s. The project site has been graded several times since 2007 in preparation for reuse. As such, any potential issues with unstable geologic units or soils, or expansive soils were abated when those activities occur.

Hydrology and Water Quality
The Eastern Dublin EIR and applicable requirements for project-specific SWPPPs adequately address potential water quality impacts of the project. The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan also contains Policies 9-7 through 9-9 and Programs 9T through 9X that address the potential for erosion and changes in water quality, stormwater runoff, and storm drainage due to development of the project area. Compulsory adherence to these requirements ensures that adverse impacts to hydrology and water quality would not occur.

Land Use
The project site is designated “General Commercial” by the City of Dublin General Plan and is zoned “General Commercial” by the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. The proposed project’s hotel, restaurant, and retail uses are allowable uses within both “General Commercial” land use designations. Thus, no conflicts with the General Plan or Specific Plan would occur. Additionally, the project site does not contain any occupied structures and does not serve as a linkage between established communities. Lastly, the East Alameda County Conservation Strategy is used as guidance for mitigating biological impacts associated with public projects, but it is not an “adopted” plan for private projects and, therefore, does not require a consistency determination for the purposes of CEQA.

Mineral Resources
The project site does not support mineral extraction operations. Neither the State nor the City of Dublin designates the project site a location of known mineral deposits. This condition precludes the possibility of a loss of mineral resources of statewide or local importance. This condition precludes the possibility of the loss of mineral resources of statewide or local importance. No impacts would occur.
Population and Housing

The project site does not contain any existing dwelling units and, therefore, none would be displaced by the development of the proposed project. The proposed project’s commercial uses represent planned growth contemplated by the City of Dublin General Plan and are located within an area served by urban infrastructure and services. Moreover, such uses are “growth accommodating” because they are intended to serve population growth that has already occurred in the region. As such, they would not be considered growth-inducing. No impacts would occur.

Public Services

The project site is currently served by and would continue to be served by existing public services. The project site is located approximately 1.0 mile from Alameda County Fire Station No. 17. Using an average travel speed of 25 miles per hour, a fire engine responding to the project site from Station No. 17 would take 2 minutes, 30 seconds. This response time would be within acceptable standards, and, therefore, no new or expanded fire protection facilities would be required. The proposed project would incorporate safety and security measures such as parking lot lighting, video surveillance, and loss prevention measures to deter and prevent criminal activity. These measures would minimize demand for police protection services. As such, the project would not result in a significant need for additional fire and police services, such that new facilities would be required. The project does not include residential development that would require additional public school, park or other public facility services. As such, significant impacts to public services would not occur.

Recreation

The project site does not contain any existing recreational facilities. The proposed project does not include traditional residential uses and, therefore, would not directly result in increased demand for recreational facilities to the point that physical deterioration would occur. Employees at the site could take advantage of the walking paths and access to the adjacent water quality basin, but use of City recreational facilities to the point of creating an environmental impact is not expected. No impacts would occur.

Tribal Cultural Resources

The project site previously supported military uses associated with Camp Parks; however, all buildings were removed in the mid-1990s. The project site has been graded several times since 2007 in preparation for reuse. The project site is not listed on a state or local historical register and tribal cultural resources have not been previously encountered on the project site. Thus, the likelihood of undiscovered tribal cultural resources being present within the project site is very low.

1.7 - Scoping Meeting

A public scoping meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 7, 2017, at the following location: Dublin Civic Center “Regional Meeting Room,” 100 Civic Plaza, Dublin, CA 94568.

At this meeting, agencies, organizations, and members of the public will be able to review the proposed project and provide comments on the scope of the environmental review process.
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A.3 - Comments
## IKEA Retail Center Project
### Public Comment Received - Scoping Period
#### August 17 - September 18, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Native American Heritage Commission</td>
<td>28-Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Trans District 4</td>
<td>14-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pleasanton</td>
<td>14-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamenda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Zone 7</td>
<td>15-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Livermore</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin San Ramon Services District</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Aguirre</td>
<td>22-Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine &amp; William Kuo</td>
<td>7-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David DiVecchio</td>
<td>11-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle Marshall</td>
<td>12-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Koltz</td>
<td>12-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Ficarra</td>
<td>15-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.Satar</td>
<td>15-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora and Jerry SooHoo</td>
<td>15-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Duley</td>
<td>15-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Berger</td>
<td>15-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Schechter</td>
<td>15-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Marini</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrin Guess</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manish Raman</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomek</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Balaram</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Jemo</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jai Jayaraj</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jojo Clay</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Janken</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Heyer</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lianne Marshall</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukesh</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Butler</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jegadheesa Murugesan</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Cooper</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowena Morgan</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellman Ho</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie-Anne Poudret</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Situ &amp; Vick Tran</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minh Thai</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Adelin</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Nindorf</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine Vasa</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Camacho</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingemar Gaedeke</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrie Chabot</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Massetti</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle Blackman</td>
<td>18-Sep-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 24, 2017

Amy Million
City of Dublin
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA 94568

RE: SCH#2017082047 IKEA Retail Center Project, Alameda County

Dear Ms. Million:

The Native American Heritage Commission has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) or Early Consultation for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code section 21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit.14, § 15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (b))). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064 subd.(a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (a)(1))). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources with the area of project effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, “tribal cultural resources” (Pub. Resources Code § 21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.3 (a)). AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015. If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. § 800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC’s recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments. Consult your legal council about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.
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AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project: Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:
   a. A brief description of the project.
   b. The lead agency contact information.
   c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (d)).
   d. A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21073).

2. Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe’s Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report: A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1(b)).
   a. For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code § 65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (b)).

3. Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe: The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:
   a. Alternatives to the project.
   b. Recommended mitigation measures.
   c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

4. Discretionary Topics of Consultation: The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:
   a. Type of environmental review necessary.
   b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
   c. Significance of the project’s impacts on tribal cultural resources.
   d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

5. Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process: With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code sections 6254 (r) and 6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (c)(1)).

6. Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document: If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency’s environmental document shall discuss both of the following:
   a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
   b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (b)).
7. Conclusion of Consultation: Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
   a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
   b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (b)).

8. Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document: Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (a)).

9. Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation: If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (e)).

10. Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:
   a. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
      i. Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
      ii. Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
   b. Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
      i. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
      ii. Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
      iii. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
   c. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
   d. Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code § 21084.3 (b)).
   e. Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a nonfederally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code § 815.3 (c)).
   f. Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code § 5097.991).

11. Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource: An environmental impact report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
   a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.
   b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
   c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC’s PowerPoint presentation titled, "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices" may be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf
SB 18

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code § 65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf

Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. **Tribal Consultation:** If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.** (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (a)(2)).

2. **No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation.** There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.

3. **Confidentiality:** Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code section 65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 that are within the city’s or county’s jurisdiction. (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (b)).

4. **Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation:** Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
   a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
   b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and "Sacred Lands File" searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/

**NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments**

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. **Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search.** The records search will determine:
   a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
   b. If any known cultural resources have been already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
   c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
   a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRI5 center.

3. Contact the NAHC for:
   a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project's APE.
   b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.

4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
   a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
   b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
   c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code section 7050.5, Public Resources Code section 5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: frank.lienert@nahc.ca.gov

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Frank Lienert
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse
September 14, 2017

Amy Million
Planning Department
City of Dublin
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA 94568

Ikea Retail Center Project—Notice of Preparation (NOP) for draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Dear Ms. Million:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. In tandem with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), the Caltrans Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 includes targets to reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT), in part, by tripling bicycle and doubling both pedestrian and transit travel by 2020. Our comments are based on the NOP.

Project Understanding
The IKEA store would consist of a two-story building located over a two-level parking structure. The building would be set against the Arnold Road frontage and face Hacienda Drive. The building would stand 61 feet above finished grade. The principal loading docks would be located in the rear of the building facing Arnold Road. A recycling and refuse collection area, trash compactor, and emergency diesel generator would also be located in the rear of the store. A two-bay loading dock for home deliveries would be located on the south side of the building facing Interstate (I)-580. Covered walkways would be incorporated along the front of the building.

The eastern portion of the site would support a retail center consisting of up to 93,000 square feet of lifestyle retail-restaurant center uses. An 8,000 square-foot restaurant pad would be located at the intersection of Martinelli Way / Hacienda Drive. Multiple buildings totaling 85,000 square feet would be organized around a pedestrian plaza located directly opposite the IKEA store entrance.
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The IKEA store would provide 1,026 parking spaces in a two-level below-store structure. Access to the parking structure would be taken from either entrances/exits at the north and south ends. The lifestyle retail-restaurant uses would provide 568 surface parking spaces. Regional access to these parking spaces will be provided about a thousand feet from Interstate (I-) 580/Hacienda Drive interchange.

Lead Agency  
As the Lead Agency, the City of Dublin is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to the State Transportation Network (STN). The project’s fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

Travel Demand Analysis  
Please analyze VMT resulting from the proposed project. With the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 743, Caltrans is focusing on transportation infrastructure that supports smart growth and efficient development to ensure alignment with State policies through the use of efficient development patterns, innovative travel demand reduction strategies, multimodal improvements, and VMT as the primary transportation impact metric. Please ensure that the travel demand analysis includes:

- A vicinity map, regional location map, and site plan clearly showing project access in relation to the STN. Ingress and egress for all project components should be clearly identified. Clearly identify the State right-of-way (ROW). Project driveways, local roads and intersections, car/bike parking, and transit facilities should be mapped.

- A VMT analysis pursuant to the City’s guidelines or, if the City has no guidelines, the Office of Planning and Research’s Draft Guidelines. Projects that result in automobile VMT per capita greater than 15% below existing (i.e. baseline) city-wide or regional values for similar land use types may indicate a significant impact. If necessary, mitigation for increasing VMT should be identified. Mitigation should support the use of transit and active transportation modes. Potential mitigation measures that include the requirements of other agencies such as Caltrans are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally-binding instruments under the control of the City.

- A schematic illustration of walking, biking and auto conditions along the proposed roadway segment and nearby study area roadways. Potential issues for all road users should be identified and fully mitigated.

- The project’s primary and secondary effects on pedestrians, bicycles, disabled travelers and transit performance should be evaluated, including countermeasures and trade-offs resulting from mitigating VMT increases. Access to pedestrians, bicycle, and transit facilities must be maintained.

Transportation Impact Fees  
Please identify project travel demand or VMT and estimate the costs of public transportation improvements necessitated by the proposed project; viable funding sources such as development

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
and/or transportation impact fees should also be identified. We encourage a sufficient allocation of fair share contributions toward multi-modal and regional transit improvements to fully mitigate cumulative impacts to regional transportation. We also strongly support measures to increase sustainable mode shares, thereby reducing VMT.

**Multimodal Planning**
From Caltrans’ *Smart Mobility 2010: A Call to Action for the New Decade*, the project site is identified as **Place Type 4: Suburban Communities** (Dedicated Use Areas) where location efficiency factors, such as community design, are weak and regional accessibility varies. Given the project is surrounded by the Town Center (Dublin), Transit Center/Dublin Crossings (Dublin) and Hacienda (Pleasanton) Priority Development Areas (PDAs), the City of Dublin should consider coordinating with the Association of Bay Area Governments to extend a PDA into the project site.

The project should ensure the necessary pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements consistent with PDA requirements and surrounding transportation connections are provided. Specifically, we recommend the developer work with the City of Dublin to make the Class IIIB buffered bicycle lane connection across I-580 on Hacienda Drive (City of Dublin’s *Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*, page 96). Lastly, please ensure adequate wayfinding signage to and from transit connections is provided. We suggest presenting multi-modal transportation options available to patrons alongside their options for transporting purchases home.

**Vehicle Trip Reduction**
Given the project’s intensification of use, the low transportation efficiency factors of its place type and its characterization as a PDA, the project should include a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program to reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions. Such measures will be critical in order to facilitate efficient transportation access to and from the project location and reduce transportation impacts associated with the project. The measures listed below will promote smart mobility and reduce regional VMT.

- Project design to encourage walking, bicycling and transit access;
- Real-time transit information system;
- Transit, bicycle and trip planning resources such as a commute information kiosk;
- Ten percent vehicle parking reductions;
- Charging stations and designated parking spaces for electric vehicles;
- Carpool and clean-fuel parking spaces;
- Designated parking spaces for a car share program;
- Showers, changing rooms and clothing lockers for employees that commute via active transportation;
- Emergency Ride Home program;
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) coordinator;
- Secured bicycle storage facilities;
- Fix-it bicycle repair station(s);
- Participation/Formation in/of a Transportation Management Association (TMA) in

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
partnership with other developments in the area; and

- Aggressive trip reduction targets with Lead Agency monitoring and enforcement.
Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs should be documented with annual monitoring reports by an onsite TDM coordinator to demonstrate effectiveness. If the project does not achieve the VMT reduction goals, the reports should also include next steps to take in order to achieve those targets. Also, reducing parking supply can encourage active forms of transportation, reduce regional VMT, and lessen future transportation impacts on I-580 and other nearby State facilities. These smart growth approaches are consistent with the MTC’s Regional Transportation Plan/SCS goals and would meet Caltrans Strategic Management Plan sustainability goals.

For additional TDM options, please refer to the Federal Highway Administration’s Integrating Demand Management into the Transportation Planning Process: A Desk Reference (Chapter 8). The reference is available online at:


Cultural Resources
The project is on the edge of an area that is highly sensitive for both surface and buried prehistoric archaeological sites, and as a location of former military use, the project area is also potentially sensitive for historic-era archaeological deposits. Previous grading does not preclude the possible existence of historical resources that could be impacted by the project. In support of the EIR, we recommend that the City of Dublin conduct a cultural resource technical study that at a minimum includes a records search at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), as well as a field survey of the project area by a qualified archaeologist and a geo-archaeological sensitivity analysis.

Additionally, per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Assembly Bill (AB) 52, we recommend that the City of Dublin conduct Native American consultation with tribes, groups, and individuals who are interested in the project area and may have knowledge of Tribal Cultural Resources or other sacred sites. If an encroachment permit is needed for work within Caltrans ROW, we may require that cultural resource technical studies be prepared in compliance with CEQA, Public Resources Code (PRC) 5024, and the Caltrans Standard Environmental Reference (SER) Chapter 2 (http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/vol2/vol2.htm). Should ground-disturbing activities take place within Caltrans ROW and there is an inadvertent archaeological or burial discovery, in compliance with CEQA, PRC 5024.5, and the SER, all construction within 60 feet of the find shall cease and the Caltrans District 4 Office of Cultural Resource Studies (OCRS) shall be immediately contacted at (510) 622-1673.

Encroachment Permit
Please be advised that any work or traffic control that encroaches onto the State ROW requires an Encroachment Permit that is issued by Caltrans. Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process. To apply, a completed Encroachment Permit application, the adopted environmental document, and five (5) sets of plans clearly indicating State ROW must be submitted to the address below. Traffic-

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability."
related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process.

David Salladay, District Office Chief  
Office of Permits, MS 5E  
California Department of Transportation, District 4  
P.O. Box 23660  
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

See the following website for more information:  
http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/ep/index.html

Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Jannette Ramirez at 510-286-5535 or jannette.ramirez@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA MAURICE  
District Branch Chief  
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
September 14, 2017

Amy Million, Principal Planner
City of Dublin Community Development Department
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA  94568

RE:  IKEA Retail Center Project

Dear Ms. Million:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting for the IKEA Retail Center Project. The project site comprises approximately 27.31 acres located at 5344 and 5411 Martinella Way in the City of Dublin. The proposed retail center project would be anchored by an approximately 339,089-square-foot IKEA store and an up to 93,000-square-foot retail-restaurant uses. The City of Pleasanton commends Dublin for attracting such a prominent retailer to a location in close proximity to BART, and offers the following comments on the NOP:

The City is primarily concerned about the impacts to both the regional and local traffic circulation system. The proposed project will generate a significant amount of trips to major arterial streets and intersections such as I-580, Hopyard Road, Owens Drive, Santa Rita Road, Stoneridge Drive, Valley Avenue, and El Charro Road. These roadways have several intersections that currently operate at capacity in the AM and PM peak commute hours. The City is concerned that the proposed project will generate traffic that will lead to reduced levels of service at the freeway interchanges and on local Pleasanton roadways. These increases will likely be centered around Hopyard Road, Santa Rita Road and El Charro Road and may deteriorate arterial operations and local access to levels below City standards. In addition to the deterioration in level of service, lengthy queues may be found at the arterial intersections and freeway interchanges. Therefore, the City requests the following items be included in the draft SEIR:

1. A complete analysis of City of Pleasanton intersections impacted by the project.
   a. The City assesses the need to review intersections based on the number of trips a project will place onto an intersection and the intersections' existing level of service.
   b. We would also like to review the trip distribution, generation, and assignment of the proposed project to ensure the proper intersections are analyzed.
2. In addition to the LOS analyses, queue analyses at the analysis intersections, including the I-580 interchanges and gateway intersections; and
3. Traffic and circulation control measures during peak shopping seasons at I-580 interchanges and the City’s gateway intersections.
4. Noise impacts associated with increased congestion along City of Pleasanton roadways.

The City will also be interested in understanding how the project may affect Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in the area, as the project is obviously a significant generator of peak hour vehicle trips, but offers some potential for trips to be captured by the regional transit system. Mitigation measures should be identified that maximize use of transit to reduce vehicle trips (and associated greenhouse gas and air pollutant emissions).

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns. The City looks forward to our continued cooperative and proactive effort in addressing possible future impacts of this project. The City will reserve its comments on these areas when the draft SEIR becomes available.

If you have any questions, please contact Mike Tassano, Traffic Engineer, at (925) 931-5670.

Sincerely,

Gerry Beaudin, AICP
Community Development Director

Cc: Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager
    Mike Tassano, Traffic Engineer
City of Dublin
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA, 94568
Attn: Amy Million, Principal Planner
Email: amy.million@dublin.ca.gov

Re: IKEA Retail Center Project

Zone 7 Water Agency (Zone 7, or Zone 7 of the Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District) has reviewed the referenced Notice of Preparation in the context of Zone 7’s mission to provide water supply, flood protection, and groundwater and stream management within the Livermore-Amador Valley. We have a few comments for your consideration:

1. **Groundwater Quality.** The project area lies over a groundwater basin (Livermore Valley Groundwater Basin) that is used for municipal, industrial, and irrigation supply. To support protection of groundwater quality, the project should be consistent with or comply with appropriate plans and regulations such as Zone 7’s Salt and Nutrient Management Plan and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Ordinance, the State’s Water Recycling Policy (and associated orders), the State’s storm water protection measures, and the County’s Water Wells Ordinance.

2. **Onsite Groundwater Well.** There appears to be an open contamination case at the project site (GeoTracker # T10000005547) that should be investigated by the applicant / City.

3. **Site Drainage.** The project area drains within Zone 7’s service area. The EIR should include, as appropriate, hydrologic and hydraulic analysis of the potential geomorphic and flood impacts as a result of the project with mitigation measures identified where appropriate. Also note that any increase in impervious surfaces is typically mitigated through the collection of Development Impact Fees. Please contact Jeff Tang for information at (925) 454-5075.

4. **Recycled Water for Irrigation.** Expanding the use of recycled water in the Livermore-Amador Valley is a critical part of a diversified water supply portfolio that assures reliable supplies even during drought periods and, as such, is fully supported by Zone 7. Use of recycled water not only relieves stress on the potable water supplies of the community but also enhances quality of life for residents by providing an uninterruptible irrigation supply to parks and greenbelts. The project
should consider where recycled water may be applied to reduce demands on the potable water system.

5. **Water Supply & Demand.** The analysis should address the water requirements of the project.

6. **Zone 7 Water Infrastructure.** There are Zone 7 facilities in the Southwest corner of the proposed development (see drawing below). First, the IKEA footprint appears to include a Zone 7 turnout (DSRSD T/O 4). Second, the pipeline serving this turnout runs along the frontage road and crosses Arnold Dr. An encroachment permit may be required of IKEA, including bonding requirements in the event of a pipeline breakage. Please call John Koltz at (925) 454-5067 regarding the water system infrastructure.

On behalf of Zone 7, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions on this letter, please feel free to contact me at (925) 454-5005 or via email at erank@zone7water.com.

Sincerely,

\[\text{Elke Rank} \]

cc: Carol Mahoney, Amparo Flores, Matt Katen, Joe Seto, Jeff Tang, Colter Andersen, Jarnail Chahal, John Koltz, file
September 18, 2017

City of Dublin Community Development Department
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA 94568
Attn: Amy Million, Principal Planner

RE: Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the
IKEA Retail Center Project

Dear Ms. Million:

Thank you for sending the City of Livermore the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the
proposed IKEA Retail Center in Dublin. The City of Livermore understands the City of
Dublin will be the Lead Agency in preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact
Report (EIR) for the proposed project. The City has reviewed the NOP and has the
following comments:

1. The City of Livermore is currently engaged in a multi-agency effort to facilitate a
Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) extension to Livermore. The Draft EIR for the
BART to Livermore Extension was released for public review on July 31, 2017.
The City of Livermore requests that the City of Dublin consider potential right-of-
way expansion necessary to extend BART to Livermore in planning and
approving proposed developments along the I-580 corridor. The City of
Livermore requests that the City of Dublin coordinate with BART staff to ensure
adequate right-of-way is available for the BART extension to Livermore.

2. As a separate but related project, the City of Livermore is developing a land use
and circulation plan for the area surrounding the proposed BART station at the
Isabel Avenue interchange. The Isabel Neighborhood Plan area (also referred
to as the "Plan Area") covers approximately 1,132 acres and surrounds the
proposed Isabel BART station. Most of the Plan Area is north of the freeway. As
the Lead Agency, the City of Livermore is in the process of completing a
Program-level EIR that addresses the potential environmental impacts related
to implementation of the Isabel Neighborhood Plan. The City expects the draft
EIR to be available for public review this fall. City of Livermore staff is available
to provide additional information regarding the planning process and timing.
Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the NOP. Please continue to inform the City of Livermore regarding the status of this application, the EIR process, and any other CEQA related notices and documents.

Sincerely,

Steve Stewart
Planning Manager

cc: Bob Vinn, Assistant City Engineer
    Steve Riley, Principal Planner
    Ashley McBride, Assistant Planner
September 18, 2017

City of Dublin Community Development Department
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA 94568
Attn: Amy Million, Principal Planner

Subject: Comments on Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting for the IKEA Retail Center Project

Dear Ms. Million:

Thank you for providing Dublin San Ramon Services District (DSRSD) the opportunity to review and comment on the IKEA Retail Center Project. DSRSD had a representative at the scoping meeting held on May 31, 2017, who reviewed the information presented at the meeting and has reviewed the information in the Notice of Preparation.

DSRSD will be directly concerned with the utilities and service systems details of this project. The proposed project is within DSRSD’s service area for providing potable water, recycled water and wastewater collection and treatment services. DSRSD will review and offer comments on the sections of the SEIR dealing with utilities and service systems as they impact our role for this site. Secondly, this development may fall into the category of a “project” as defined by SB 610 and thus may require a Water Supply Analysis per the California Department of Water Resources. The applicant should be prepared to coordinate with DSRSD for completion of a Water Supply Analysis if one is required. In addition, DSRSD operates an important potable water facility in the southeast corner of the site along Arnold Road as noted in Section 1.2.1 – Land Use Activities of the NOP. This is a turnout facility in which DSRSD receives potable water from Zone 7, our potable water wholesaler, and directs the water to DSRSD’s distribution network. This is a critical DSRSD facility. Continued operation of the turnout facility must not be restricted or hindered in any way by construction or operation of the IKEA project.

DSRSD looks forward to continuing our rewarding collaboration with the City of Dublin through this project. If you have any questions, please contact Stan Kolodzie at (925)8875-2253 or kolodzie@dssrd.com.

Sincerely,

RHODORA N. BIAGTAN
Principal Engineer

SK/ST

cc: Stan Kolodzie, Associate Engineer
Ryan Pendergraft, Junior Engineer
Bonifacio Duenas, Engineering Tech/GIS Specialist II
Dublin needs to think about a 2nd high school and cut out on more retail or housing. If this is Dublin’s statement:

Mission Statement: The City of Dublin promotes and supports a high quality of life, ensures a safe and secure environment, and fosters new opportunities.

Then a 2nd school needs to be priority. Education fosters new opportunities, not more retail.

Thank You

Brian Aguirre
Hi Amy,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the IKEA Retail Center Project.

We are against the project in general and do not feel that it is a 100% fit for Dublin. It would be more suited to the types of retail in Livermore. However, we have lived in Dublin for 18 years and see certain open retail and commercial spaces in Dublin and realize that the city is having trouble filling it.

We would like to see the Ikea center match Persimmon Place in color and theme. It would be wonderful if they are given a height restriction as well, so as not to visually swallow up surrounding retail and residential projects. The worst case scenario is ending up with a gigantic neon blue and yellow beacon building like Emeryville.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Catherine & William Kuo
Hi Amy, it was nice to meet you at Thursday's meeting. Thank you for providing updates and reaching out to our community regarding the application of the IKEA development.

Based on my review of the initial environmental report and First Carbon Solutions presentation, the following subjects should be expanded and included in their EIR:
1. A review and statistical analysis of current IKEA stores should be conducted to see what affects they have had on their cities - a real life case study would give more accurate results than theory (i.e. Emeryville, Palo Alto):
   - local vs non-local service/benefit
   - crime
   - traffic
   - pollution
   - air quality
   - noise
   - aesthetics
   - recreation
   - animal and wildlife

2. The EIR should also go further than just the immediate site area in reviewing its affect on traffic:
   - it needs to look at the affects on the hacienda, hopyard, Santa Rita and all Dublin freeway exits
   - 580/680 interchange
   - 580/680 traffic impact
   - a breakdown and distance of traffic a store of this type bring to Dublin, local or non-local traffic details

3. Finally the city of Dublin needs to provide more notice of the IKEA planning commission process, timeline, meetings, dates, etc.
   - the 300 or 500 foot radius is insufficient...residents/businesses/owners/etc. in a minimum 1 mile radius need to be notified (after all a 300,000 sqft building is over 500ft x 500ft)
   - Nextdoor.com was suggested and I myself am not involved in social media, yet within 10 minutes I was able to create a Nextdoor account and figured out how to post upcoming events (in this day in age it would be a huge disservice and mistake if the City of Dublin did not utilize social media to keep its residents informed!)

--

David DiVecchio
Dublin, California
Homeowner/Resident/Voter
(925) 595-9194  Cell
Dear Amy Million,

I wanted to share my views on the proposed IKEA store on 5344 and 5411 Martinelli Way in Dublin. As a resident of Dublin for 17 years, I do not wish to oppose an IKEA development in Dublin, but I think the currently proposed location is completely wrong and short sighted. The area of Dublin on Tassajara would make more sense given the space and traffic. Currently Dublin Blvd is very congested, and more so with the addition of the Persimmon Place. Being accessible by Bart is not a huge value for IKEA shoppers who mostly buy large items and need a vehicle of some sort. I personally would avoid the entire area of Dublin blvd & Hacienda drive if an IKEA goes in there, as the traffic will become worse. If IKEA went to the area around Fallon Road (between Fallon Gateway & Lowe's) that would have less of an impact on local traffic, and be more accessible to shoppers coming from Livermore & Tracy.

Thank you,
Gabrielle Marshall

"Be who you are and say what you feel, because those who mind don't matter and those who matter don't mind." --Theodor Seuss Geisel, aka Dr. Seuss
Amy Million

From: john koltz <jkoltz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2017 2:56 PM
To: Amy Million
Subject: IKEA Comments

Amy,

I attended the Sept. 7th Public Scoping Mtg. for the proposed IKEA development and have the following comments/requests:

- In our discussions of Sept. 7th, traffic impacts outside the immediate cross streets were considered "not a significant traffic impact on the regional/1580 corridor". I disagree and request that the traffic impacts be analyzed/studied to include 1580 on the weekends. An example of increased non-local weekend traffic impacts already exists, namely the Outlet Mall at 1580 and Fallon Rd. Through traffic on 1580 is negatively impacted on the weekends.

- The proposed development drawings indicate that a 2-story IKEA structure will be constructed on top of a 2-story parking garage. Although the garage will be constructed underground, the presenter stated the top elevation of IKEA would be 60 ft. above existing ground. Even if this is inaccurate, I request that a more thorough view-shed study be initiated for the building. Again an example exists for this issue, namely the Outlet Mall, but this time in a positive manner. The view-shed restrictions at the Outlet Mall have preserved a community view vs. a high density urban landscape.

Thank you in advance for your responses to these comments.

John Koltz
925.858.8535
I am a Dublin Resident and strongly oppose the building of IKEA in Dublin. I would like for the EIR to reflect the following information.

How is the EIR going to include the addition of the traffic that is not already hear. In "The Blvd" there will be 2,000 homes. This equates to a minimum of 2,000 vehicles at a minimum. However, most homes have more than 1 vehicle so there can be up to 4,000 extra vehicles from this development alone.

Also, the Government center down the road is now open. This new Government Center will be holding arraignments for all of Alameda County. Oakland, Hayward, Pleasanton, Fremont. All of these cities will be using the Government Center in Dublin.

A year ago there was a news report that mentioned the 580/680 interchange. This story was done around October, 2016. At that time there were a total of 71 accidents with no timeline for when Caltrans was going to even begin working on fixing this problem. How does the City think IKEA is going to impact this intersection?

There are a lot of folks in the community that think that IKEA is the fix to all of Dublin's money problems. Please give us a real comparison on what taxes other types of businesses can bring in and do not make it a Car Lot like the city did at the first Open House. Real businesses such as Persimmon Place or Hacienda Crossings. What type of taxes do they bring in?

Also, I know the City is going to get a proposal on the DiManto property. Funny how their developer has indicated that more shoppers are moving away from the Big Box type of business and into more experiences which they included Theater, small shopping and restaurants. If this is the case then it would make no sense for the City of Dublin to allow a Big Box like IKEA to even be built in the first place.

These are just a few of the questions I have for now and would like them to be addressed

Thank you,

Tammy Ficarra
Hello Amy,

The residents do not want IKEA plain and simple. We have voiced our concerns on deaf ears it seems. Being told that the land was sold by a private party is not a good answer and I believe the city can and should deny them the project.

Has the city council seen the change.org petition signed by thousands of Dublin residents voicing their opposition? Do you take my feedback from residents in making decisions? We pay taxes hear and would hope so.

The traffic is already unbearable. What is the city doing in terms of planning to address traffic with what existing conditions are already?

Would appreciate a reply with some information.

Also, please share feedback on Nextdoor as I understand the city is now on it. Thank you.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
Ms Million,

We have been residents of Dublin for over 20 years. The city is now very congested with new housing projects still launching. Adding an IKEA store will terribly overloading the existing overloaded traffic system. It is making the city very hostile to Dublin residents and degrading our quality of life. It is very important that the city planning department do diligent research into the negative impact of IKEA store and disapprove their moving in. Please treat Dublin as your own city that you live in. If other neighboring cities in Tri-valley can protect the residents from overcrowding with mega store like this, why don't you care and do a great job at city planning. We are the tax payers who are funding your department and treat us nice please.

Nora and Jerry SooHoo
We know the pressure a big retailers they always want to jam their stores in our communities but as a citizen of Dublin the traffic is terrible. With new construction apartment buildings town houses along with target Center and Kaiser medical this is a nightmare please for the sake of our citizens no to IKEA.
Ever since I have lived in this valley, "the word on the street" has always been that the City of Dublin has never met a developer it did not like.

Judging by the uncontrolled growth in this city the last number of years, that statement seems to be true. To be honest, to the untrained eye, there does not seem to be any plan or any system in place that would control or govern the growth of Dublin. All one has to do is look at the traffic on Dublin Blvd at almost anytime of the day. The City has outgrown Dublin Blvd.

And yet the growth continues, most of it along the one major east-west artery in Dublin, Dublin Blvd.

So it seems almost fitting that the ultimate development would be to build a monster Ikea store in the middle of all this other congestion. We might as well label Dublin as the home of that big blue and yellow box along highway 580. Living up to its reputation, the city of Dublin continues to having never met a developer it did not like.

No to Ikea! We do not need it and we do not want it.

Thank you.

Dennis Berger
3620 Finnian Way
Dublin Ca. 94568
Hello Amy,

I understand you are collecting inputs as to what impacts should be considered for inclusion in the IKEA EIR. I suggest including the following:

1) Impact on all surrounding traffic routes, especially I-580, I-680, Dublin Blvd, and Hacienda Blvd. Please consider specific impacts to rush hour, weekends, and holidays, especially the Christmas shopping season. Will it lead to backups on I-580 during peak shopping periods?

2) Impact on parking in the surrounding area. Will overflow from the IKEA parking lot end up in surrounding parking lots or street parking? Again, please consider the impacts specific to the periods above in item 1).

3) Impact on the aesthetics of Dublin.

As I've recommended before, I urge the city to hold a public referendum on the IKEA project once the EIR is done, considering the profound impact this project will have on Dublin.

Richard
NO TO IKEA IN CENTRAL DUBLIN. IF YOU'RE GOING TO BUILD IKEA, PLEASE BUILD ON THE EAST DUBLIN/LIVERMORE BORDERLINE.

Please excuse any typos...

Sent from Angie's iPad
Please vote no on IKEA in Dublin!
Thank you
Sent from my iPhone
Amy Million

From: Perrin Guess <perrin.guess@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 8:05 AM
To: Amy Million
Subject: No To Ikea

Amy,

As a resident of Dublin I have no formal training in urban planning processes, permitting or planning amendments. However living in the city I believe the roadway infrastructure is insufficient for more extensive commercial use off of I-580. My experiences may be subjective but I'm sure if I ask any Dublin resident they will have express similar experiences.

I have read Ikea's claims that their stores are empty during the day and high traffic only occurs on the weekend. Even if that is the case it is still undesirable. 580 (Hopyard to Fallon) is consistently congested at the moment during midday and afternoons on the weekend. I have also read Ikea's claims that distribution will occur during off peak hours. Its hard for me to believe that with certainty given the fact that I have personally seen other commercial retail stores (Target and Lowes) off of 580 receive distribution during peak hours.

From an aesthetic point of view, Ikea stores' physical appearance is the epitome of visual pollution. Not saying this is a risk but what if Ikea went out of business. Dublin would be left with a big blue empty warehouse for sometime. The physical building would not be easily repurposed.

Lastly, do you have any detail as to what percentage of commercial planning request the city of Dublin has said "No" to in the past 5 years? From the looks of the rapid construction, not much I would guess.

In summary I am against the Ikea for the obvious reasons. Its big, ugly and unnecessary. Additionally as a resident it does feel like other planning interest, i.e. 2nd high school, within the city are going by the wayside and commercial interest are fast tracked.

Perrin
Hi Amy,

I believe you are the right person for this kind of email. I have lived in Dublin/Pleasanton for last 12 years and in Dublin for last 7 years. This is the first time I am writing to a government/city official to raise my concern.

I believe IKEA in Dublin is just wrong. There are so many things ton which it will have a really adverse effect. To begin with, Traffic will be a nightmare. East and West Dublin already feel like disconnected due to the traffic during peak time. With IKEA, the entire day will be a pick time. Getting to and from the BART and getting on the highway from Hacienda will be especially painful.

Those extra cars will definitely make the air quality poor around tri-valley area. Dublin has grown in recent years and is still growing. Coupled with this, IKEA is going to put a lot of strain on our infrastructure.

Please consider all these facts as we consider IKEA.

-manish
Hi,

I saw request for suggestion of environmental study. I'm probably restaging the obvious for a 100 times but we have to understand how this going to affect traffic and mostly we have to understand amount of large vehicle doing furnitures deliveries in and out of ikea and how this vehicle going to affect quality of our roads.

Thanks,

Tomek
Hello,

My name is Kris, resident of Dublin. I would like to make a request to city of Dublin council members to focus on below noted important issues in IKEA EIR.

1. Short term and long term forecast the significant impact likely to result from the IKEA development especially for the DUBLIN residents in terms of mass transportation and traffic congestion
2. Ensure it is easily understood, no ambiguity and timely
3. Seriously evaluate the effectiveness of the short term and long term mitigation measures
4. Evaluate alternatives

Thanks,
Kris
650.954.4295 (m)
As a resident of Dublin I want you to know I do not want an IKEA built in Dublin. The impact on our already terrible traffic would be horrific. We said no previously. Why is this on the agenda again. Please vote no.

Wendy Jemo
11561 Fenwick Court
Dublin, CA 94568
Good Day Ms. Million,

I have been a resident of Dublin for almost 10 years now and have seen how this area has drastically changed just in last five years.

There are a lot of housing projects in and around the area, which by itself is crowding this community. The infrastructure of our town is not built to handle this fast paced growth, which is unhealthy in one sense.

Bringing in a huge furniture store in middle of Dublin will only worsen things. Along with the IKEA furniture store will be
1) A surge in traffic (both foot and vehicular)
2) Making entry and exit in to the 580 extremely difficult
3) lot of people coming from other neighboring areas consistently
4) this increase in number of people will eventually increase attracting unnecessary anti-social elements, increasing in crime rates
5) the value of property will start declining And so on..

IKEA is welcome to open a store in Livermore which probably has more land and relatively manageable crowd.

If the city council is particular about opening a furniture store in our community, let it be something like West Elm, Crate & Barrel, or CB2, or Scandinavian Designs etc. These stores will be more in alignment with the city's current image. Having IKEA will be an eye-sore in Dublin.

Please consider this e-mail and say "NO TO IKEA".

Thank you for your service as our City’s Principal Planner.

Best Regards,
Jai Jayaraj
As a tri-valley resident, I would LOVE ikea.

Sent from my iPhone
Hi Amy,

What I would like to comment most about is the potentially severe traffic impact of this project. Anyone who does a regular 580/680 drive will remark that these freeways are frequently crowded. Not just during peak commute hours, where things are ridiculously clogged, but even during weekends. An addition of an IKEA to this space would turn it into a real madhouse. I've seen the traffic around the Palo Alto and Emeryville IKEAs, and it is not something I would like to have in my neighborhood. As a resident of Dublin, I will be paying attention to who is voting yes on this project during the city council meeting and making sure they do not have my vote in the next election.

Regards,
Nathan

--------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Tom Cignarella via Change.org <change@mail.change.org>
Date: Fri, Sep 15, 2017 at 3:38 PM
Subject: IKEA wants to build a monstrosity in the heart of Dublin. Say NO at Splatter this weekend.
To: njanken@gmail.com

Tom Cignarella shared an update on Dublin Cit... Check it out and leave a comment:

PETITION UPDATE

IKEA wants to build a monstrosity in the heart of Dublin. Say NO at Splatter this weekend.
UPDATE: The city of Dublin requests residents and surrounding areas to email regarding the scoping of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for IKEA Retail Center Project by 5pm Monday 9/18/17. Please email what items you would like the City Planners to research before placing their recommendation to the city council’s vote of the IKEA project. This is very important if you’d like to make a...


The person (or organization) who started this petition is not affiliated with Change.org. Change.org did not create this petition and is not responsible for the petition content. Click here to stop receiving updates about this petition.

Unsubscribe · Manage your email preferences · Privacy policy

This email was sent by Change.org to njanken@gmail.com, because you are a registered user of Change.org. We’d love to hear from you! Send us feedback or contact us through our help center.

Change.org · 548 Market St #29993, San Francisco, CA 94104-5401, USA
Dear Ms. Million
The proposed IKEA development is not consistent with the City of Dublin, Eastern Dublin Specific Plan and so the EIR should not even proceed. The huge yellow and blue eyesore does not fit in with the surrounding buildings. It will substantially degrade the visual character of the site and surroundings. At approximately sixty feet it will block the view of the beautiful hills. Traffic is another significant issue. Dublin Boulevard is the sole street connecting both sides of the city. With thousands of new homes going in across the street there will be thousands of additional cars. Commuters flow on to Dublin Boulevard, when 580 is backed up. Cars visiting IKEA will adversely affect the traffic flow. There should be a financial study by an independent analyst to determine if an alternative development would be more beneficial to the city. The EIR must consider aesthetics, land use, and traffic repercussions of the proposed development. I and many other Dublin residents are strongly opposed to this project and would like to see the parcel developed with amenities we can all utilize.

Sent from my iPad
Dear Ms Million

I do not think the City should proceed with the EIR for the IKEA project because it is not consistent with the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan, which calls for a high quality, attractive and distinctive gateway project at this entrance to our city. The huge blue and yellow monstrosity that IKEA proposes for this site clearly does not meet the Specific Plan requirements. If the EIR does proceed, the aesthetics of this project must be studied as it will have a significant adverse impact on this entire area. At 60 feet high it will obliterate all views of the surrounding hills. The traffic impacts will also be tremendous on Dublin Blvd., which is already severely impacted by the traffic spillover from 580.

This project is strongly opposed by many Dublin residents. I hope the City will take that into consideration as they evaluate it. Please notify me of future meetings regarding the project. Thank you.

Sent from my iPad
Hi Amy,

IMHO, IKEA is not a good match for our town, it will create traffic nightmares and will only elevate the traffic issues which we have on Dublin blvd at time of the day.

Thanks

Mukesh
Hi Amy,

I'm emailing you about my concerns regarding the proposed IKEA. I live in the Summerglen neighborhood and would like there to be a study of the impact on traffic in the proposed area. I 580 is always busy but significantly backed up on weekends as well as week days. Dublin Blvd and Hacienda are very busy increasing the time just to cross town. We also have the newly opened courthouse with all the extra traffic from that and I'm concerned that IKEA will just compound these issues. Also, I feel that building an IKEA in the proposed location will greatly affect the overall look of the area in a negative way, it is just too large and unappealing. I'm concerned about parking, it's already hard enough to park at Persimmon place and Hacienda crossings and with limited BART parking the overflow from IKEA will just compound this problem. Lastly I'm concerned that IKEA will draw people from all parts of the Bay Area to Dublin, we are already experiencing an increase in crime and I'm concerned that with IKEA we will see more crime and less desirable people drawn to our area. I urge the city to hold a public referendum on the IKEA project as this is something that will greatly affect Dublin and in my opinion, make it a less desirable place to live,

Thanks,
Jennifer Butler
Hi Amy,

I am really concerned about the IKEA proposal and the location in the area. This area has 2000 homes coming in the next 2-3 years and a costco in the next exit. As one can see in the weekend, 580 and dublin blvd is grid locked most of the times.

With 1025 parking spaces it will attract a floating car traffic of 8000 in the weekends.

Does citizen impact studied with quality of life, emergency movement during grid locks done?

With 1-2m in city revenues easily offsets the negative impacts it is going to bring in to the city in terms of traffic, loss of property values etc.

A good commercial area with downtown type of development is good in that area than a magnet IKEA which benefits its business than the city or the residents.

Don't make change the city tagline for America's neighborhood to America's parking lot.

Thanks
Jega
I am completely against having IKEA in the middle of Dublin. It will bring the value of our homes and the perception of our town down. The traffic on 580 is already a mess and it will be substantially worse if we have thousands of shoppers in our city. Dublin would much better be served with shops that locals want to visit.

Thank you,
Danielle Cooper
925-895-5366

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone
Amy Million

From: Rowena Morgan <rowenamusic@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 8:56 PM
To: Amy Million
Subject: Environmental impact of soles

Good evening, I am a 20 yr resident if the tri-valley, living in Dublin Ranch is Dublin since 2000 and for three years in Pleasanton prior to that.
My objections to IKEA just of the 580 include the following 1/ Large blue and yellow eyesore to be seen for miles around 2/ additional traffic on already very crowded route of 580 and Dublin Boulevard 3/ additional dust and pollution during construction of the site.
I hope my objection can be registered.
Thank you
Rowena

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,

I don’t believe having an IKEA in Dublin is a good idea. The traffic on 580 is already bad and this will just make it worse.

A concern citizen,

Wellman Ho
1651 N. Terracina Dr.

Sent from my iPhone
Hello Amy,

I'm a Dublin resident since 2014.

I am opposed to the presence of an IKEA building in the Center of Dublin, by the BART station.

Even if on one hand I would appreciate a IKEA closer than Emeryville or East Palo Alto, on the other hand it's a very bad idea to build it at the core of Dublin where something much more wholesome should be built, like a decent size Performing Art Center, so Dublin doesn't look like the poorest sister of Pleasanton or Livermore.

IKEA could go at the Eastern edge of Dublin, across the Fallon Gateway commercial unit. There is already a lot of 580 Highway Traffic coming out there due to the presence of the Livermore outlets. Ikea could throw into the bucket a police department, in order to keep the crime in check on this side of the hills.

Reflection for the environment: can IKEA build an environment friendly building in a flooding zone, and something that illustrates the heritage of the TriValley and not an ugly blue and yellow cube?

Working to make Dublin a wholesome city.

Respectfully,

Marie-Anne Poudret

Marie-Anne Poudret
3387 Vittoria Loop
Dublin, CA 94568
USA
Hi Amy,

We are 16 years Dublin residents, and we don't want IKEA because the increase traffic.

After the outlet mall opened, we can't use the Tassajara on ramp to go to Costco between thanksgiving and the Christmas holiday. I don't want my hacienda on ramp to be blocked by IKEA traffic. Please no IKEA unless traffic and congestion issues are resolved. Thank you for listening to Dublin residents.

Best regards,

Jennifer Situ
Vick Tran
4204 Belcarra Court
Dublin, CA 94568
925-997-0955
Hi Amy

I am writing about the proposed Ikea development.

I wonder how many floor will the Ikea 340,000 SQFT building have?

Will the building be similar to the other Blue Boxy Ikea buildings?

If it is, it would violate the City of Dublin Superstore Ordinance Chapter 8.42 SUPERSTORES and other Dublin building codes, isn't it?

Many Dubliners are concerned about the image Ikea may bring. We all dislike the look of a "large blue boxy building" visible from freeway and the traffics it will bring.

To address these concern, I suggest Ikea and Dublin city do the following:

1) change the Ikea building architecture and coloring style to make it looks high end and blend in with the surrounding buildings and landmark. Instead of one large blue boxy building, build two or three nicely looking buildings that blend well with surrounding with glass covered tropical plants or salt water aquarium corridors between the buildings instead. A salt water aquarium corridor between buildings will definitely make Ikea Dublin unique and attracts families and customers.

2) right now, 580 West bound to 680 traffic jams almost very hour and every day including weekend. City needs to build an interchange overpasses for 580 West bound to both South and North 680 before Ikea building is completed (We definitely need 580 West to 680 South first) This will relieve many 580 West bound traffics before the Ikea freeway exits.

3) City give all the tax revenue from Ikea to DUSD to help build the 2nd HS in East Dublin until the HS is completely build for 2500 students.

4) Stop all other housing developments until 2nd HS is opened with full facilities to house 1000 students.

5) At the mean time, City and DUSD declare School overcrowded

Here are some bad looking Walmart and good looking Walmart examples

Bad looking
Cheap looking
Better looking

Great looking in Washington DC Walmart
Great looking in Washington DC Walmart
Regards

Minh Thai
Huge concern is over traffic which is already getting too troublesome and with Ikea will be unmanageable. Quality of life will deteriorate as it really only benefits people living in the Central Valley at our expense.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
Ms Million,

Our family is especially concerned about the environmental impacts to traffic/roads (from customers, delivery trucks), noise, water usage, power, etc. that would come along with the construction and operation of an IKEA. We've lived here five years and have seen Dublin grow into a town we don't recognize any longer, with crowding issues that make our commutes much worse, schools overcrowded, water scarce, and errands across town painful. We are extremely concerned about the addition of an IKEA.

Sincerely,

Hilary Nindorf and family
Hello!

This email is to provide my discontent and objection to having IKEA in Dublin. I am a long term resident of east bay in San ramon. I am very concerned with having this huge shopping store on the area, that is already so congested with traffic. Any time of the day it takes atleast 20 minutes to travel between Fallon to 680 interchange. It is a big impact to our community with so much congestion, traffic, and impacts the quality of life. It increases our stress every day as we try to go about the city for our normal activities.

I sincerely and humbly request the council to consider the impact to the quality of life of the residents before approving this.

Thanks!
Jasmine.
408.242.4792

--
Excuse the brevity and typos. Thumb typed.
Amy Million

From: Rick <aauto@pacbell.net>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 9:04 AM
To: Amy Million
Subject: IKEA

Good morning, my name is Rick Camacho I have been running my business in Dublin starting 1980. We moved to Dublin blvd from Village Parkway in 2009 and have been a part of Dublin's growth on the east side. My concern with future build out in east Dublin in particular is level of service road ways, as it is now we are at level D at all major intersections on Dublin blvd so much so that it impacts the existing businesses. For instance if I want to go to habit at persimmon center for lunch I have to arrive there at 11 am to park, parking in that center is maxed out.

The IKEA model being built on the sight in Dublin would be an unmitigated project. The impact to local business, The impact to infrastructure roadways would damage the Quality of life of all residents and business.

If you look at the General Plan it is for planning that takes in consideration the impacts to existing business.

Thank You
Rick Camacho
Automotive Consultants
6225 Dublin blvd
Dublin Ca.
925-829-8432
Please do not allow IKEA to build a store in Dublin. Traffic congestion on Dublin Blvd. and surrounding streets has already gotten worse with all the other commercial and residential development in the area. Not to mention the mess that is I-580.

Also, IKEA puts up ugly, cheap-looking, blue structures. We don’t need or want this eyesore in Dublin.

Thank you.

Ingemar Gaedeke
6313 Bray Court
Dublin, CA 94568
925-479-0845
ingemar44@comcast.net
Hello Ms. Million,

I am writing to request the EIR is

1) conducted at all hours of the weekend Friday afternoon through Sunday evening, as well as weekdays 8am -8pm so that we have a true idea across the work- week and weekend hours of traffic.

2) allows to figure in the approx 4000 cars which will be at the Dublin Crossings "Boulevard" housing currently under construction.

3) comments on the Dublin city ordinance Dublin currently has against Big Box retail

4) explains how they will have a connectivity piece to Persimmon Place and Hacienda crossings which would be aesthetically appealing.

5) is willing to use Neutral colors instead of Blue and Yellow, to fit with a more pleasing view/ Gateway to our city of Dublin

6) How they would allow for safety in the parking lot

7) Compare this proposal to more of a "pop up" Ikea - where folks could order/shop online and only drive to "pick up" items from this location- which had been delivered from warehouse. Or a showroom where they could look at items, then have them delivered to their home from another location.

Thank you,
Kerrie Chabot, resident Dublin
Ms. Million:
Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the initial Study by First Carbon Solutions on the "IKEA Retail Center Project" in preparation for the SEIR.

My comments regarding the proposed scope and content of the study in preparation for the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) are as follows:

The Initial Study Reports:

1) Project site includes 1.92 acres of seasonal wetlands
"The project site contains 1.92 acres of seasonal wetland depressions likely to be regulated by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) as Water of the State. These wetlands were determined to be isolated and are therefore assumed to be non-jurisdictional under Federal Clean Water Act Section 404."

Comment: No specific or potentially significant impacts to the wetlands were identified in the initial study. For the City to simply state the wetlands "may be regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board" is insufficient if there are ANY impacts to the wetlands resulting from the IKEA project.
Request: All potential impacts to the wetlands need to be identified and analyzed in the final SEIR report.

2) Discretionary approval required of EIR. (Section 1.6):
"The following discretionary approvals are required by the City of Dublin for approval of the proposed project:
o EIR Certification...."

Comment: Arguably there have been changes (many significant) since the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan (EDSP) was adopted over 20 years ago. Those changes in conditions should be analyzed in the SEIR. There is considerably more information on environmental conditions now and on projects developed subsequent to the EDSP that may have been approved with "overriding considerations" due to their unavoidable and unmitigable impacts. These changes/additions to the EDSP, EIR baseline should be analyzed as well.
Request: Given the many environmental changes since the EDSP was adopted 20 years ago, a new EIR is required.

3) Initial Study Reports Stockpiles of Toxins:
"The site contains areas where soil has been stockpiled. One of the stockpiles (Stockpile No. 2) contains approximately 500 cubic yards of soil that contains polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, diesel
and oil range petroleum hydrocarbons, and polychlorinated biphenyls that must be removed prior to
development activities. The other stockpiles have been tested for hazardous materials and
determined to be within acceptable levels for commercial development."

Comment: The position that this site is for commercial development and was previously one of the
Camps Parks' sites should in no way preclude full consideration of all of the toxins that are known at
this site and their environmental impact.
Request: Any and all toxic materials located at the IKEA Retail Project site should be detailed
with a full analysis provided in the SEIR that identifies potential, significant environmental
impacts that may result from the project.

4) Mandatory Findings of Significance: (Section I9, pg 62)

a) "Does the project 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) "Does the project 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) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects
on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Comment: The Initial Study evaluated the above (3) environmental findings and ranked each one as
having a
"Potentially Significant Impact" to our environment if IKEA is approved. Reportedly, "the project
would have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts related to Air Quality, Biological
Resources, and Transportation."
Request: The SEIR must include a detailed analysis of SPECIFIC effects that may occur under
the Mandatory Findings of Significance, above, including impacts to human beings, wildlife
and for the"potential to degrade the quality of the environment."

As a follow-up to the scoping meeting on August 17th, I'm requesting the SEIR evaluation factor in the
effect "toll pay lanes" (under construction on 680 & others planned) will have on traffic. Additionally,
I'm requesting meetings on IKEA (and other planned projects) be posted on NextDoor for the benefit
of Dublin residents who reside outside the required 300 foot notice requirement.

In closing, the aesthetics and architecture of the IKEA retail project appear to be inconsistent with the
requirements under the General Plan and EDSP in regard to acceptable architectural standards. This
project does not reflect or meet the acceptable architectural standards identified in Dublin's plans and
if approved will set a precedent for what is acceptable in future projects. Additionally, the project does
not appear to be in compliance with the City's ordinance that prohibits "big box" stores in that IKEA's
square footage exceeds what's allowable under the city's ordinance.

Marlene Massetti
Dublin Resident
Ms. Million,

It is my understanding that the city is seeking public comments to be incorporated / help shape the city's EIR for the proposed IKEA project. Here are my thoughts:

Alignment w/Dublin General plan:
- Non-compliance with unifying principles re Dublin's streetscape: IKEA's plan places parking along periphery of the site, including along Hacienda Drive just off of its intersection with 580...a key "gateway" into Dublin. As planned IKEA's proposal completely disregards Dublin's plan that gateways be defined (typically by buildings/spacial landscaping/signage..even gateway markers)...instead IKEA places a large parking lot along a key Dublin gateway entry. There won't be a "gateway" at Hacienda if this proposal is built.
- In addition the IKEA submittal ignores creating a visual barrier btwn key Dublin corridors & parking lots. This can be accommodated via "walls", or dense landscaping...to create a visual barrier btwn roads and parking.
- IKEA plan is isolated. As shown the retail layout makes no inviting pedestrian connection with adjacent retail developments (Persimmon/HaciendaXing). Instead the proposal embraces a "mote" of parking concept that inherently will prevent pedestrian flow btwn adjacent parcels. It's an indication IKEA wants visitors, but doesn't want them visiting other retail developments (i.e.: IKEA proposal is not planned-out to provide any benefit to tangential businesses).
- It's an "island" scheme...& only thing it will bring for tangentially located businesses...is more traffic. This poses a huge risk fiscally ..if traffic is not adequately mitigated & consumers become frustrated attempting to access tangential businesses/retail developments...consumers will go elsewhere. This hurts small businesses.
- Traffic-wise..No one wants to sit in traffic just to get groceries, or lunch, or coffee, or workout...adjacent developments have the most to loose if vehicular access around Hacienda/580/Dub Blvd becomes vehicular congestion because of IKEA. The result very well will be that these businesses will become mostly dependent on foot traffic from nearby residential (Elan/etc now...& eventually the Boulevard, sometime in the future). Question is can these smaller businesses survive long enough until there is enough residential based foot traffic to offset the revenue loss due to vehicular access loss?

-GP Community Development / Sustainability Elements section 10.7.3.1 A/B/C/E: as depicted IKEA's big blue box does not meet design standards set in GP...not at all. GP encourages bldgs with varied massing, requires avoiding long straight walls, ..bldg ht/scale/design MUST be comparable with character...of area. The big blue box does not in any way meet these standards. This is a square peg in a round hole.
> From a functional pov: the smaller cluster of retail blocks is poorly planned. One has to question
the streetscape of these blocks & how inviting these shops will be: the interior court as shown
presumably will be where visitors traverse between the shops....thus relegating the outer edge to
service. Will the face to the public of this smaller bldg cluster be its back door? Not attractive nor
appealing. The IKEA bldg itself shows service route separate from pedestrian: prudent.....yet there is
clearly no service plan for the smaller interior-oriented retail blocks shown. Are consumers visiting
the site to overlap with delivery vehicles? ...with Garbage trucks? Is this safe? Is this prudent?
>
> Regarding safety...the outlet mall a few exits west on 580 utilized a similar island shopping area
surrounded by a mote of parking ...approach. This attracts crime because the vehicles & parking lot
are not visible to the pedestrians walking btwn bldgs. More eyes = greater safety. Given this, how
safe is the parking area around this retail? Will the parking closest to the freeway will be the least
visible by pedestrians & therefore attract more criminal activity. & given that crime is more likely to
happen when visibility is low..garages tend to be even less safe than parking lots. What proven-safety
features is Ikea providing to ensure their built-in garage is safe? Not interested in after-the-fact
cameras...is Ikea limiting parking deck sizes, increasing visibly to access points, providing a mobile
security service?

Lastly, would ask the city investigate the impact the additional vehicles will have on air quality
...specifically the adjacent housing.
>
> I recognize that as a planner you are not directly in control of this outcome, however the IKEA plan
clearly ignores many components of Dublin's General Plan. Furthermore the lack of adequate care in
the planning of the site relative to safety & pedestrian access, impact to tangential businesses is
appalling. I never considered Dublin to be a "mark"...desperate enough to consider a wolf-in-sheeps
cloths proposal, but this proposal is a new low. I feel for the small businesses in our city, for the
residents using our roads, if Dublin approves this. We can do better, we have to..for the sake of our
residents & businesses.
>
> Sincerely,
> Gabrielle Blackman
>
> (Pardon the typos & grammar...scribing off a phone can be well..interesting).
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone