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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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Source: Bing Imagery, 2015
Exhibit 3: Site Photograph
View of project site from Arnold Road.
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: IKEA Retail Center Project Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 1 (IKEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle retail-restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication for Rail Line (BART)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></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 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.
Exhibit 4: Conceptual Site Plan
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

### Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Hazards/Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities/Services Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Findings of Significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
- [x] 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: ___________________
Environmental Issues | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---|---
1. **Aesthetics, Light, and Glare**
*Would the project:*

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

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

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

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

---

**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, 3.8I, 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Checklist and City of Dublin—IKEA Retail Center Project
Environmental Evaluation
Initial Study

<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>3. Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</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) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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>4. Biological Resources</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) 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>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>5. Cultural Resources</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.
6. Geology and Soils
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) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
Initial Study

<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 &lt;br&gt;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.
<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><em>Would the project:</em></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</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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,</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.
<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>
| **9. Hydrology and Water Quality**
*Would the project:* |                               |                                                        |                            |           |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?) | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d) Substantially 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
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.
Environmental Issues | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---

10. Land Use and Planning  
*Would the project:*  

| a) Physically divide an established community? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☒ |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | ☒ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☒ |

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.
Environmental Checklist and Initial Study

Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Evaluation

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 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>12. Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 CNEL 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 CNEL 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.
### Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Population and Housing</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.
### 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>

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?*

- **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.

**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 Checklist and Initial Study

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>15. Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Checklist and City of Dublin—IKEA Retail Center Project Environmental Evaluation

16. Transportation/Traffic

<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) 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.
17. **Tribal Cultural Resources**

*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) 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:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 Resources 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.
18. Utilities and Service Systems
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) 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 Checklist and City of Dublin—IKEA Retail Center Project
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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