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On May 10, 1993, the Dublin City Council adopted Resolution No. 51-93, certifying an Environmental Impact Report for the Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan (Eastern Dublin EIR, SCH #91103064). The certified EIR consisted of a Draft EIR and Responses to Comments bound volumes, as well as an Addendum to the Eastern Dublin EIR dated May 4, 1993, assessing a reduced development project alternative. The City Council adopted Resolution No. 53-93 approving a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan for the reduced area alternative on May 10, 1993. On August 22, 1994, the City Council adopted a second Addendum updating wastewater disposal plans for Eastern Dublin. The Eastern Dublin EIR evaluated the potential environmental effects of urbanizing Eastern Dublin over a 20 to 30 year period. Since certification of the EIR, many implementing projects have been proposed, relying to various degrees on the certified EIR.

As part of the certification of the Eastern Dublin EIR, the Dublin City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the following impacts: cumulative traffic, extension of certain community facilities (natural gas, electric and telephone service), regional air quality, noise and visual.

The certified EIR contains mitigation measures that would be applied to any development within the project area, including the proposed project. Specific mitigation measures are noted in the Initial Study for the proposed project.

The project site was also the subject of a previous Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the proposed Cisco Systems project in 2003. Cisco withdrew their application prior to entitlement; however, the property owner (Alameda County Surplus Property Authority) decided to move forward with the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan amendments for the project site. In 2003, the City Council amended the General Plan and EDSP from High Density Residential to Campus Office and adopted the Cisco IS/MND. The IS/MND assumed 430,090 square feet of office and Research and Development (R&D) space to accommodate 3,000 employees. The Cisco IS/MND was adopted by the City Council in April 2003.

This Supplemental MND has been prepared for the project pursuant to the rules for supplemental environmental review under Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, as described below.
Project Description

Carl Zeiss, Inc. (ZEISS) has applied for a Planned Development Zoning with a related Stage 1 and Stage 2 Development Plan and a Site Development Review (SDR) Permit for the Zeiss Innovation Center (the proposed project). Figures illustrating the proposed project are shown at the end of this Initial Study and are referenced therein.

The proposed project would be developed in two phases. Phase 1 would consist of a three-story, 208,650 gross square feet (GSF) Research and Development (R&D) building with an entry plaza and 663 surface parking spaces. Phase 2 would consist of an additional five-story, 224,440 GSF R&D building with 167 surface parking spaces, and a five story, 1,229-space parking garage.

At build-out, the proposed project would include two low-to-mid-rise (three-story and five-story) R&D buildings totaling 433,090 GSF and used for research, development and testing, light assembly and dry laboratories, and supporting office spaces. Other internal uses would include conference rooms, an employee cafeteria, and a demonstration center/showroom on the ground floor. Parking would include one parking garage with 1,229 spaces and 167 surface parking spaces, for a total of 1,396 spaces. Other miscellaneous exterior features would include a utilities enclosure, trash/recycling enclosure, nitrogen pad enclosure, bike storage enclosure, loading areas and landscaping.

Seasonal wetlands are located on 1.03 acres of the project site and occur as nine separate topographic depressions where seasonal inundation and/or saturation occur during the rainy season. Vegetation within the seasonal wetlands is sparse, and dominated by a mixture of predominantly non-native grasses and forbs, all of which are adapted to high levels of disturbance. Implementation of the proposed project would result in permanent impacts to 0.45 acres of seasonal wetlands and preserve the remaining 0.58 acres. In addition to the seasonal wetlands, two locally rare plant species were identified, namely; Congdon’s tarplant and California dock.

The project site would accommodate approximately 1,500 employees at build out. To help reduce drive-alone trips, the Applicant has agreed to implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program with a goal of reducing travel trip by 20% from the estimated average daily trips as identified in the Traffic Consistency Analysis (Kimley-Horn, December 2017). Trip reduction measures to be considered may include the following:

- Provide complementary BART and bus passes and provide guaranteed ride home services for emergencies.
- Provide dedicated on-campus parking (5% of supply) for high occupancy vehicles (HOVs).
- Provide staggered working hours.
- Provide additional bike racks and lockers on-campus, including shower facilities.
- Conduct educational outreach and marketing to promote the use of non-automotive options for commuting by having an on-site TDM kiosk and TDM coordinator.

The proposed project is consistent with the current General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan Land Use Designation of Campus Office.

Prior CEQA Analyses and Determinations

As summarized above and discussed in more detail in the attached Initial Study, the project site has been planned for urbanization since the Eastern Dublin EIR approval in 1993 (and subsequent addenda in May 1993 and August 1994).

The project site was also the subject of a previous IS/MND for the proposed Cisco Systems project in 2003. Cisco withdrew their application prior to entitlement; however, the property owner (Alameda County Surplus Property Authority) decided to move forward with the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan (ESDP) amendments for the project site. In 2003, the City Council amended the General Plan and ESDP from High Density Residential to Campus Office and adopted the Cisco IS/MND which assumed 430,090 square feet of office and R&D space to accommodate 3,000 employees.

The Eastern Dublin EIR identified various environmental impacts, and mitigations were adopted upon approval of the Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan. For identified impacts that could not be mitigated to insignificance, the City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations. All previously adopted mitigation measures for development of Eastern Dublin identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco Systems IS/MND that are applicable to the project and project site continue to apply to the currently proposed project as further discussed in the attached IS/Supplemental MND.

Current CEQA Analysis and Determination that a Supplemental Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate for this Project.

The City of Dublin has determined that a Supplemental MND is the appropriate CEQA review for the project. The proposed project is consistent with the general plan land use designation for the project site (commonly referred to as Site 15A) and is similar in size to the 430,090-square foot research and development project analyzed in the Cisco Systems IS/MND. Through the IS/Supplemental MND for the proposed project, the City has determined that a Supplemental MND is required.

Because the Cisco Systems IS/MND was prepared in 2001, updates to biological resources, cultural (historic) resources and transportation/traffic are included in this IS/Supplemental MND to confirm previous findings. It was concluded that biological resources are the only environmental issue where a potential new significant impact could occur. This new significant impact has been analyzed and mitigation proposed as described in the IS/Supplemental MND.
CEQA Guidelines Section 15162

CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 identifies the conditions requiring subsequent environmental review. After a review of these conditions, the City has determined that a Supplemental MND is required for this project. This is based on the following analysis:

a) Are there substantial changes to the project involving new or more severe significant impacts?

There are no substantial changes to the project analyzed in the Cisco Systems IS/MND and Eastern Dublin EIR. As demonstrated in the Initial Study, the proposed land uses on the project site is not a substantial change from the Cisco Systems IS/MND analysis and would not result in additional significant impacts, and no additional or different mitigation measures are required.

b) Are there substantial changes in the conditions which the project is undertaken involving new or more severe significant impacts?

The only substantial changes in the conditions assumed in the Cisco Systems IS/MND and Eastern Dublin EIR relates to biological resources located on the project site. The prior CEQA documents did not identify any biological resources on the site. Recent surveys (2017) of the site have identified wetlands and certain protected plant species as located on the site. The proposed project may cause significant impacts on these resources. Therefore, a Supplemental MND has been prepared to analyze these impacts and include mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant. This is documented in the attached Initial Study/Supplemental MND.

c) Is there new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time of the previous EIR that shows the project would have a significant effect not addressed in the previous EIR; or previous effects are more severe; or, previously infeasible mitigation measures are now feasible but the Applicant declined to adopt them; or mitigation measures considerably different from those in the previous EIR would substantially reduce significant effects but the Applicant declines to adopt them?

As documented in the attached IS/Supplemental MND, there is no new information showing a new or more severe significant effect beyond those identified in the prior CEQA documents except for biological resources (as discussed above). Cultural Resources were further analyzed based on the Section 106 Report prepared by the Applicant, as required for their federal permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers for the proposed fill of wetlands. However, this additional information does not identify any new or significant impact of the project on cultural resources. A traffic consistency analysis also was prepared for the project. The traffic analysis does not identify any new or significant impact of the project on transportation. All previously adopted mitigations continue to apply to the project. The
CEQA documents adequately describe the impacts and mitigations associated with the proposed development on the project site for all areas except biological resources.

d) Should a subsequent or supplemental EIR or negative declaration be prepared?

A Supplemental Mitigated Negative Declaration is required because of new impacts and mitigation measures for biological resources. Other than biological resources, there are no new or substantially more severe significant impacts of the project beyond those identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco Systems IS/MND, as documented in the attached IS/Supplemental MND.

Conclusion

This Supplemental MND is prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 based on the attached IS/Supplemental MND. The City further determines that the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco Systems IS/MND adequately address the potential environmental impacts for the project site, except for biological resources, as documented in the attached IS/Supplemental MND.

This Supplemental MND will be circulated for public review for 30 days in accordance with CEQA requirements.

The IS/Supplemental MND, Eastern Dublin EIR, Cisco Systems IS/MND and all resolutions cited above are incorporated herein by reference and are available for public review during normal business hours in the Community Development Department, Dublin City Hall, 100 Civic Plaza, Dublin CA.
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Background & Project Description

Project Title
Zeiss Innovation Center

Lead Agency Name and Address
City of Dublin
Community Development Department
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA 94568

Contact Person and Phone Number
Martha Battaglia
Associate Planner
Phone: 925-452-2152
martha.battaglia@dublin.ca.gov

Project Location & Setting
The project site is in eastern Dublin, on the northeast corner of Dublin Boulevard and Arnold Road in the City of Dublin, CA, and encompasses 11.36 net acres of land (APN: 9860014-010-00). See Figure 1: Project Vicinity and Location. The project site is currently vacant, relatively flat and contains native and introduced species of grass. There are six existing trees at the southwest corner of the Central Parkway and Park Place intersection. One of these trees is located off-site and five are located within the project boundary. Seasonal wetlands are located on 1.03 acres of the project site and occur as nine separate topographic depressions where seasonal inundation and/or saturation occur during the rainy season. Vegetation within the seasonal wetlands is sparse, and dominated by a mixture of predominantly non-native grasses and forbs.

The project site is bordered by Central Parkway to the north, Park Place to the east, Dublin Boulevard to the south, and Arnold Road to the west. The project site is commonly referred to as Site 15A.
Property north of Site 15A has been developed with an office complex (Microdental); the property east of the project site was developed as the Sybase Corporate Headquarters complex, then as the SAP regional office, and is currently unoccupied. Property south of the project site is developed with commercial uses. Properties west of the project site are undergoing development as residential uses (Boulevard).

Project Applicant’s Name and Address

Carl Zeiss, Inc.
Site 15A (Northeast corner of Dublin Boulevard/Arnold Road)
APN: 986-0014-010-00

Dublin, CA 94568

General Plan Designation

Campus Office

Specific Plan Designation

Campus Office

Zoning

PD – Planned Development- Campus Office

Project Context

The project site is located within the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan area, which was the subject of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the General Plan Amendment and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan (SCH # 91103064), certified by the City Council in Resolution No. 51-93 and Addenda dated May 4, 1993 and August 22, 1994. This document is referred to in this Initial Study as the "Eastern Dublin EIR."

The project site was also the subject of a previous Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the proposed Cisco Systems prepared in 2001. Cisco withdrew their application prior to entitlement; however, the property owner (Alameda County Surplus Property Authority) decided to move forward with the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan amendments for the project site. In 2003, the City Council amended the General Plan and EDSP from High Density Residential to Campus Office and adopted the Cisco IS/MND. The IS/MND assumed 430,090 square feet of office and Research and Development (R&D) space to accommodate 3,000 employees. Cisco IS/MND was adopted by the City Council in April 2003.

The project site is currently zoned “PD- Planned Development” as shown on the Dublin Zoning Map (as amended through December 9, 2014). The land use is “Campus Office” as shown on the Dublin General Plan – Land Use (as amended through October 6, 2015).
Subsequent Technical Studies

Because this Initial Study “tiers” off the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, it relies on the technical studies and analysis presented in those prior CEQA documents. Supporting that analysis, three additional technical studies were completed in support of the current (Zeiss) project application. These are summarized below.

Biological Resources

Subsequent to the certification of the Cisco IS/MND, and as part of on-site analysis associated with the current Zeiss development application, nine seasonal wetlands (totaling 1.03 acres) were identified. As a result, the project site was surveyed for biological resources by WRA, Inc. in April 2017. In addition to the seasonal wetlands, two locally rare plant species were identified, namely; Congdon’s tarplant and California dock. The results of WRA’s analysis were documented in a Biological Resources Assessment Report (2017), Delineation of Potential Jurisdictional Wetlands Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (WRA 2017) and Rare Plant Survey Report (WRA 2017), and are included as an appendix to this IS/Supplemental MND.

Cultural Resources

As part of the regulatory federal permit application for the project, an historic survey of the project site was conducted by Tom Origer & Associates. The results of the survey and archival research did not identify any historic resources. Tom Origer & Associates’ analysis is documented in a Historical Resources Survey of APN 986-0014-010, and is included as an appendix to this IS/Supplemental MND.

Traffic Consistency Analysis

Kimley-Horn & Associates prepared a Traffic Consistency Analysis in 2017 to evaluate the proposed project’s conformance with the traffic impacts analyzed in the Cisco Systems IS/MND and Eastern Dublin EIR. The Traffic Consistency Analysis concluded that the proposed project would generate less traffic than previously analyzed and no new impacts, since the proposed project would accommodate 1,500 employees, as compared to the estimated 3,000 employees analyzed for the Cisco project. The Traffic Consistency Analysis is included as an appendix to this IS/Supplemental MND.

Project Description

Carl Zeiss, Inc. (ZEISS) has applied for a Planned Development Zoning with a related Stage 1 and Stage 2 Development Plan and a Site Development Review (SDR) Permit for the Zeiss Innovation Center (the proposed project). Figures illustrating the proposed project are shown at the end of this IS/Supplemental MND.

ZEISS is an internationally leading technology enterprise operating in the optics and optoelectronics industries. The ZEISS Group develops, produces and distributes measuring technology, microscopes, medical technology, eyeglass lenses, camera and cine lenses,
binoculars and semiconductor manufacturing equipment. The new ZEISS Innovation Center in Dublin would bring together scientists and researchers as well as operations from multiple business groups under one roof. Research and development groups for: 1) Ophthalmic Diagnostics of Medical Technology, 2) ZEISS 3D X-ray microscopes (XRM) research and industry, 3) Semiconductor & Electronics process control systems and 4) Corporate Innovation & Research; would be brought together in the new center. For the Medical Technology Business Group, the Zeiss Innovation Center would also serve as the headquarters for its U.S. subsidiary which represents all ZEISS Medical Technology in the U.S.

**Building Program**

The proposed project would be developed in two phases. Phase 1 would consist of a three-story, 208,650 gross square feet (GSF) R&D building (approximately 62 feet in height to roof), with an entry plaza and 663 surface parking spaces (see Figure 2a: Site Plan – Phase 1). Phase 2 would consist of an additional five-story, 224,440 GSF R&D building (approximately 82 feet in height to roof and 97 feet to the top of the screen), and a five story, 1,229-space parking garage (see Figure 2b: Site Plan – Phase 2).

At build-out, the proposed project would include two low-to-mid-rise (three-story and five-story) R&D buildings totaling 433,090 GSF and would be used for research, development and testing, light assembly and dry laboratories, and supporting office spaces. Other internal uses would include conference rooms, an employee cafeteria, and a demonstration center/showroom on the ground floor. At build-out parking would include one parking garage with 1,229 spaces and 167 surface parking spaces, for a total of 1,396 spaces. Other miscellaneous exterior features would include a utilities enclosure, trash/recycling enclosure, nitrogen pad enclosure, bike storage enclosure, loading areas and landscaping.

The proposed project is consistent with the current General Plan Land Use Designation of Campus Office.

**Landscaping**

As shown in Figure 3: Preliminary Landscape Plan – Phase 1, the primary landscape features are located on the north side of the Phase 1 building. This would include the avoided and enhanced seasonal wetland (W6) and a surrounding buffer planted with wetland and native plants. An impervious pathway would also be constructed within the buffer surrounding the seasonal wetland. West of the seasonal wetland is a 20-foot wide pedestrian boardwalk, landscaped garden, and permanent water feature. South of the Phase 1 building, landscaping would include shrubs surrounding a landscaped bio-retention basin. Shrubs and trees would also be planted around the perimeter of the project site.

The project site currently contains nine seasonal wetlands that compromise approximately 1.03 acres as shown in Figure 4: Existing Wetlands. Implementation of the proposed project would result in permanent impacts to 0.45 acres of seasonal wetlands. The proposed project would
avoid and enhance the largest 0.58-acre seasonal wetland (W6) by planting native wetland vegetation, and preserving an upland buffer around its perimeter.

**Site Access & Circulation**

For both phases of development, primary access to the project site would be via Park Place, just south of Central Parkway.

A second service entrance would be from an easement through a drive aisle in an existing parking lot accessed from Park Place, just north of Dublin Boulevard. This access point would be limited to service deliveries and emergency vehicles.

The project site would accommodate approximately 1,500 employees at build out. To help reduce drive-alone trips, the Applicant has included as part of the project a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program with a goal of reducing travel trip by 20% from the estimated average daily trips as identified in the Traffic Consistency Analysis (Kimley-Horn, December 2017). Trip reduction measures to be included to reach the 20% reduction will be chosen from the following:

- Provide complementary BART and bus passes and provide guaranteed ride home services for emergencies.
- Provide dedicated on-campus parking (5% of supply) for high occupancy vehicles (HOVs).
- Provide staggered working hours.
- Provide additional bike racks and lockers on-campus, including shower facilities.
- Conduct educational outreach and marketing to promote the use of non-automotive options for commuting by having an on-site TDM kiosk and TDM coordinator.

The project Applicant also has committed to providing a shuttle service to and from the East Dublin/Pleasanton BART station. This shuttle would access the project site via Park Place, just south of Central Parkway. Shuttles would pick-up and drop-off in the parking lot.

**Infrastructure and Utilities**

Detailed engineering design has been completed for Phase 1 and conceptually only for Phase 2. Subsequent Phase 2 building plan level review and approvals would include detailed engineering design.

**Grading**

The project site is essentially flat, sloping slightly downward from the northeast to the southwest. Earthwork would include minimal grading and contouring to accommodate drainage and elevation requirements. Grading would result in elevations contours changing from 354 feet (above mean sea level) in the northeast corner, to 345 feet fronting Dublin Boulevard (nine-foot grade change in elevation). The project would require the cut of 9,500
cubic yards of soil, and the import of 9,000 cubic yards of soil; for a net export of 500 cubic yards. See Figure 5: Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan – Phase 1.

Water
Existing domestic water mains available for connection adjacent to the project site include a 12” main in Dublin Boulevard, a 14” main on Central Parkway, and a 16” main on Arnold Drive. As part of the proposed project, a new domestic water service lateral would be constructed from Arnold Drive to the Phase 1 R&D building. Phase 2 would tie into these existing on-site extensions.

The proposed project would utilize an existing 24” recycled water main on Dublin Boulevard and a 6” service line stubbed onto the property from Dublin Boulevard. The project would use recycled water for landscape irrigation.

Sewer
There is an existing 36” sewer on Dublin Boulevard, and a 15” sewer on Arnold Road that enlarges to 27” at a manhole located midblock with Central Parkway. A new proposed sanitary sewer lateral would connect with the existing 27” sewer main on Arnold Way. See Figure 6: Preliminary Utility Plan – Phase 1.

Stormwater
The project site is currently almost entirely pervious. Because the project would be creating or replacing greater than 10,000 square feet of impervious area, it is considered a Regulated Project, and would be required comply with Provisions C.3 (New Development & Redevelopment) of the State Water Resources Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Because the project would create or replace more than one acre of impervious surface, it would also be required to incorporate hydromodification management measures.

Per the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan (BKF, 2017), construction of the proposed project would create 352,306 square feet of impervious surface area. Total bio-retention area required to meet Alameda County C.3 requirements (4% of effective impervious area) is 14,663 square feet. The project is providing 12,461 square feet of bio-retention area. The Alameda County C.3 Technical Guidance Manual allows bio-retention areas to be sized using a combination flow and volume method. Providing ponding height allows for some reductions to the overall footprint area of the bio-retention planter.

Impervious surfaces include building rooftops, roadways, surface parking lots, and the Phase 2 parking garage. As shown in Figure 7 Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan – Phase 1, most of the stormwater run-off would gravity flow via underground collector pipes to the southwest corner of the project site, where it would then be pumped into an 11,709 square foot primary bio-retention basin and be treated. During heavy storm events, flows that exceed the design treatment flow would bypass this primary bio-retention basin and be directed to an adjacent existing 36” storm drain pipe located in the Dublin Boulevard right-of-way.
The initial sizing of this basin is based on a minimum of four percent of the contributing impervious area and has been adequately sized to accommodate the impervious drainage requirements necessary for the construction of Phase 2 as well.

To assist in maintaining and enhancing the overall environmental quality features of seasonal wetland (W6), a separate drainage management system would be constructed. Rooftop drainage from 18,500 square feet of northwest corner of the Phase 1 building would be directed to 752 square feet secondary biorentention basin that would be incorporated as a landscape feature in the adjacent garden. Drainage from this portion of the rooftop would be treated and gravity flow into the adjacent wetland.

Both biofiltration basins have been conceptually designed to be constructed with 18-inches of sandy loam soil over 12-inches of drain rock. Like the primary biofiltration basin, excess stormwater during heavy storm events would drain from two inlets constructed on the east side of wetland, and be discharged into the City’s storm drain system on Dublin Boulevard.

Project Approvals

PD-Planned Development Zoning and Stage 1 and 2 Development Plans

The Applicant has proposed a PD-Planned Development zoning for Site 15A. Existing zoning for Site 15A is Planned Development-Campus Office. The proposed PD-Planned Development would include a Development Plan that would establish standards and regulations governing the future use, development, improvement and maintenance of the project site, in accordance with Chapter 8.32 of the Dublin Zoning Ordinance.

As part of the PD-Planned Development zoning application, a Stage 1 and Stage 2 Development Plan has been prepared for City approval describing in detail the proposed development program for the proposed project. Details of the development plan are described above.

Site Development Review Permit

Approval of a Site Development Review Permit is also required as part of the entitlement process for the project, pursuant to Chapter 8.104 of the Dublin Zoning Ordinance. The purpose of Site Development Review is to promote orderly, attractive and harmonious development within the City and to ensure compliance with all applicable development regulations of the Zoning Ordinance.
Environmental Checklist

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected by the Project

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.

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

Instructions

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No New Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question (see Source List, attached). A "No New Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No New Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less-than-significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that any effect may
be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when
the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: applies
where incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially
Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must
describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to
a less-than-significant level.

5. Earlier Analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other
CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR
or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a discussion should
identify the following on attached sheets:

a. Earlier analysis used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available
   for review.

b. Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist
   were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document
   pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were
   addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c. Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation
   Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or
   refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-
   specific conditions for the project.

d. A “No New Impact” finding means that there would be no new or substantially
   more severe significant impacts to the impact area beyond what has been
   analyzed in Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards
   for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is
   required for the impact area.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to
information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances).
Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate,
include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources
used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats;
however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist
that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   o the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question;
and

- the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

10. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.
## Determination

Based on this initial evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that the proposed project MAY have a potentially significant or a potentially significant unless mitigated impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that a Supplemental Mitigated Negative Declaration is required due to changed circumstances and new impacts to biological resources (wetlands and certain protected plant species). For all other environmental impact areas, 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, no further environmental review is required.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITY OF DUBLIN

________________________________________________________________________  _____________________________________________________________________
Martha Battaglia, Associate Planner                                      Date
## Explanation of Environmental Checklist Responses

### Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Setting

The project site is vacant and consists of generally flat land with a distinct but gentle slope from north to south, towards the I-580 freeway. The Eastern Dublin EIR classifies the project site as "valley grasslands," which are located on the areas near I-580 in the south and southwest portion of Eastern Dublin. None of the major visual features identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR (hillsides and ridges or watercourses) exist on the project site.

The project site is not located within a scenic corridor as identified in the General Plan or EDSP. The nearest scenic corridor to the project site is the I-580 freeway, which is located approximately a third of a mile south of the project site.

### Regulatory Framework

**Dublin General Plan**

The project site is included in the Eastern Dublin Planning Area. Implementing Policy C.2 of the General Plan states that "proposed site grading and means of access will not disfigure ridgelands." Further, Implementing Policy C. 5 requires development projects to be consistent with all applicable General Plan and Specific Plan policies."
Eastern Dublin Specific Plan

The City of Dublin adopted the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan (EDSP) in 1993 to guide the future development of approximately 7,200 acres of land in the eastern Dublin area. The Specific Plan includes several policies and programs dealing with visual resources, including but not limited to protection of ridgelines and ridgelands, scenic corridors, and hillside development.

**Goal**: To establish a visually distinctive community which preserves the character of the natural landscape by protecting key visual elements and maintaining views from major travel corridors and public spaces.

**Policy 6-28**: Preserve the natural open beauty of the hills and other important visual resources, such as creeks and major stands of vegetation.

**Policy 6-30**: Structures built near designated scenic corridors shall be located so that views of the back-drop ridge (identified in Figure 6.3 as “Visually Sensitive Ridgelands - no development”) are generally maintained when viewed from the scenic corridors.

**Policy 6-31**: High quality design and visual character will be required for all development visible from designated scenic corridors.

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR

The Eastern Dublin EIR contains several mitigation measures to reduce anticipated visual resource impacts from the General Plan and EDSP project. These include:

- Mitigation Measure 3.8/1.0 reduced project impacts related to standardized tract development (IM 3.8/A) to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation requires future developers to establish visually distinct communities which preserves the character of the natural landscape by protecting key visual elements and maintaining views from major travel corridors.

- Mitigation Measure 3.8/2.0 reduced the impact of converting the rural and open space character of the General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan area (IM 3.8/B) but not to a less-than-significant level. The mitigation measure requires implementation of the land use plan that emphasizes retention of predominant natural features. Even with adherence to this measure, IM 3.8/B would remain significant and unavoidable on both a project and cumulative level.

- Mitigation Measure 3.8/3.0 would reduce the impact of obscuring distinctive natural features of the General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan area (IM 3.8IC) but not to a less-than-significant level. The mitigation measure requires implementation of the land use plan that emphasizes retention of predominant natural features.
IM 3.8/F analyzed alteration of the visual character of the Eastern Dublin flatlands. No mitigation measures were identified and the impact was identified as significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures 3.8/7.0 and 7/1 reduced impacts on scenic vistas (IM 3.8/1) to a less-than-significant level. These mitigation measures require protection of designated open space areas and directs the City to conduct a visual survey of the EDSP area to identify and map viewsheds.

The Cisco Systems IS/MND contains one mitigation measure to reduce anticipated visual impacts. This includes:

- Mitigation Measure 1 would reduce potential glare impacts. The mitigation measure requires pole-mounted street lights to be equipped with cut-off lenses and oriented down toward interior streets to minimize unwanted light and glare spill over, building security lighting and other lights would be required to be directed downward, and all exterior glass panels shall be of non-glare manufacture.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to applicable mitigation measures related to aesthetics set forth in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco Systems IS/MND.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Scenic vistas, views

No New Impact. Approval and construction of the proposed project would convert an existing vacant site to an urban use. This potential impact was addressed in the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan (EDSP EIR (Impact 3.8C, Obscuring Natural Features and Impact 3.8F, Alteration of Visual Character of Flatlands) and it was determined that no mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the EIR concluded this impact would be a potentially significant irreversible change and a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for this impact. The impacts of the proposed project with respect to scenic vistas are within the scope of the impacts associated with the project covered by the Eastern Dublin EIR. The proposed project would not change the urban scale of development anticipated in the Eastern Dublin EIR for this project site.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to scenic vistas beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b) Scenic resources

No New Impact. The project site is not located adjacent to the I-580 freeway, which is a state-designated scenic highway, nor is it located adjacent or near other local scenic routes, including
Tassajara Road or Fallon Road and is therefore not within a scenic corridor. No impacts are anticipated since the project site is not located near an identified scenic corridor. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to scenic resources beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(c) Substantially degrade the visual character of the project site or surrounding area

**No New Impact.** The proposed project would consist of three buildings. During Phase 1, one 3-story R&D building would be constructed with a height of approximately 62 feet to the roof. As part of Phase 2, a second five-story R&D building that is approximately 82 feet in height to roof and 97 feet to the top of the screen, and a separate five-story parking structure with a building height of approximately 60 feet would be constructed. Perspective views of the proposed project are shown in Figure 8: Conceptual Renderings.

These proposed land uses, and their building height and scale, are consistent with those land uses in the surrounding area. For example, the former Sybase office building complex (east and adjacent to the project site) consists of two six-story buildings. Additionally, four- to five-story office buildings are located directly north or the project site (across Central Parkway). These buildings are consistent in use, visual character, scale, mass and height, as compared to the proposed project.

Additionally, this impact was addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and in an associated Statement of Overriding Considerations. The proposed project would not change the urban scale of development anticipated in the Eastern Dublin EIR for this project site, therefore no additional discussion or analysis is necessary. The impacts of the proposed project with respect to degradation of existing visual character and quality are within the scope of impacts associated with the project covered by the Eastern Dublin EIR.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to visual character of the project site or surrounding area beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare

**No New Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would increase the amount of light and glare due to new street lighting, parking lot lighting and building security lighting. In some instances, the additional lighting could result in negative aesthetic impacts through the "spill over" of unwanted lighting onto adjacent properties, streets and other areas that are not intended to be lighted. Mitigation Measure 1 from the Cisco Systems IS/MND was included to reduce spillover of lighting impacts to a level of less-than-significant.
Similarly, glass may be used as one of the primary exterior materials for the two buildings. Depending on the type of glass used, potential glare could result onto adjacent sites and nearby roadways. Mitigation Measure 1, would also reduce potential glare impacts to a less-than-significant level. Consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND, the project would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure 1.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to light and glare beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


### Agricultural and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Setting
The Eastern Dublin EIR notes that the project site is an "approximate urbanized area" and is therefore not prime farmland.

Based on information contained in the Eastern Dublin EIR (Figure 3.1-C), no portion of the project site is encumbered with a Williamson Act Land Conservation Agreement contract.

Regulatory Framework
There are no ordinances, regulations, or standards applicable to the proposed project for this section.

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR
The Eastern Dublin EIR identified several potential impacts related to agricultural resources. Impact IM 3.1/C stated that discontinuation of agricultural uses would be an insignificant impact due to on-going urbanization trends in Dublin and the Tri-Valley area. Impact 3.1/D identified a loss of lands of Farmlands of Local Importance with approval and implementation of the General Plan and Specific Plan. This was also noted as an insignificant impact. Impact 3.1/F stated that buildout of Specific Plan land uses would have a significant and unavoidable impact on cumulative loss of agricultural and open space lands. Finally, Impact IM 3.1/E noted indirect impacts related to non-renewal of Williamson Act contracts. This impact was also identified as an insignificant impact.

Cisco IS/MND
There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Cisco IS/MND.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a-c) Convert farmland or conflict with zoning

No New Impact. The project site was previously used for governmental purposes and is not identified as prime farmlands in the Eastern Dublin EIR. No impacts are therefore anticipated regarding prime farmland or loss of agricultural production.

This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND. There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to farmland or zoning beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.
Source(s)


Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</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 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 Setting
Dublin is in the Tri-Valley Air Basin. Within the basin, state and federal standards for nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and lead are met. Standards for other airborne pollutants, including ozone and suspended particulate matter (PM-10) are not met in at least a portion of the basin.

Regulatory Framework
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
The agency for air pollution control for the basin is the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD is responsible for controlling emissions primarily from
stationary sources and maintaining air quality monitoring stations throughout the basin. BAAQMD, in coordination with Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments, is also responsible for developing, updating, and implementing the Bay Area Clean Air Plan for the basin. A Clean Air Plan is a plan prepared and implemented by an air pollution district for a county or region designated as nonattainment of the national and/or California Ambient Air Quality Standards. The term non-attainment area is used to refer to an air basin where one or more ambient air quality standards are exceeded. The Clean Air Plan, once submitted to and approved by the Air Resources Board, becomes an integral part of the State Implementation Plan.

A State Implementation Plan is a federal requirement; each state prepares one to describe existing air quality conditions and measures that would be followed to attain and maintain the national ambient air quality standards.

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR

The Eastern Dublin EIR contains several mitigation measures to reduce anticipated air quality impacts from the General Plan and EDSP project. These include:

- Mitigation Measure 3.11 / 1.0 reduced impacts related to emission of construction generated dust to a less-than-significant level by requiring construction projects to water graded areas in the late morning and end of the day, cleanup mud and dust onto adjacent streets daily, covering of haul trucks, avoiding unnecessary idling of construction equipment, revegetating graded areas and similar measures.

- Mitigation Measures 3.11 / 2.0-4.0 reduced project and cumulative impacts related to vehicle emission from construction equipment (IM 3.11IB) but not to a less-than-significant level. These mitigations require emission control from on-site equipment, completion of a construction impact reduction plan and others. Even with adherence to these mitigations, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

- Mitigation Measures 3.11/5.0-11.0 reduced mobile source emission from Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) (IM 3.11/C) but not to a less-than-significant level. These measures require coordination of growth with transportation plans and other measures, many of which are at a policy (not a project) level. Even with adherence to adopted mitigations, IM 3.11/C remained significant and unavoidable.

- Mitigation Measures 3.11/12.0-13.0 reduced project and cumulative impacts related to stationary source emissions (IM 3.11/E) but not to a less-than-significant level. The two adopted mitigations require reduction of stationary source emissions to the extent feasible by use of energy conservation techniques and recycling of solid waste material. Even with adherence to the two measures, stationary source emissions remained significant and unavoidable.
Cisco IS/MND

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Cisco IS/MND. The proposed project would be required to adhere to applicable air quality mitigation measures contained in the previous CEQA documents prepared for the project site.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Consistent with air quality plans

No New Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with the Clean Air Plan adopted by the BAAQMD, since the proposed amount of development has been included in Dublin’s planned growth as part of General Plan/Eastern Dublin Specific Plan, which is the basis of the Clean Air Plan.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to air quality plans beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b) Violate air quality standards

No New Impact. Short-term construction impacts related to implementation of the project, including grading and excavation, could result in exceedances of air quality standards established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Eastern Dublin EIR, Impacts 3.111A and B). With adherence to Mitigation Measure 3.11/1.0, Mitigation Measure 3.11/2.0 contained in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Bay Area Air Quality Management District requirements, short-term project-level air quality impacts would be less-than-significant. These mitigation measures minimize the creation of fugitive dust during grading and construction activities and mandate that construction equipment be kept in proper running order.

With adherence to these mitigation measures and regulatory requirements, project-level impacts would be less-than-significant, and no additional analysis is required. The Eastern Dublin EIR concluded that potential cumulative air quality impacts related to construction equipment could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant impact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for this impact.

Similarly, potential air quality cumulative impacts related to mobile source emissions of ROG and NOx, both precursor indicators of smog, and stationary source emissions were found to exceed regional air quality standards even with mitigation measures, and were included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Eastern Dublin EIR Impacts 3.11/C and E). The air quality impacts of the proposed project are within the scope of the project impacts covered by the Cisco MND and the Eastern Dublin EIR, for which a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for long-term, cumulative impacts.
With adherence to previous mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to air quality standards beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(c) Cumulatively considerable air pollutants

**No New Impact.** The Eastern Dublin EIR identifies Mobile Source Emissions and Stationary Source Emissions related to the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan as significant irreversible impacts. Generally, such impacts are based on vehicular emission from future traffic within the sub-region as well as from stationary sources. The air quality impacts of the proposed project are within the scope of the project impacts covered by the Cisco IS/MND and Eastern Dublin EIR, for which a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for long-term impacts.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to air pollutants beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(d, e) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors

**No New Impact.** There are no sensitive receptors (e.g. residential, schools, churches, hospitals) proposed or surrounding the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur to sensitive receptors.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to pollutant concentrations or creation of objectionable odors beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

Wetlands and Other Waters

As shown in Figure 4: Existing Wetlands, seasonal wetlands are located on 1.03 acres of the project site and occur as nine separate topographic depressions where seasonal inundation and/or saturation occur during the rainy season. Vegetation within the seasonal wetlands is
sparse, and dominated by a mixture of predominantly non-native grasses and forbs, all of which are adapted to high levels of disturbance.

**Special Status Species**

**Special-status Plant Species**

Based on field surveys conducted by WRA, Inc. in April 2017, two locally rare plant species: Congdon’s tarplant (*Centromadia parryi* ssp. *congdonii*) and California dock (*Rumex californicus*), were observed on the project site. Ten square feet of California dock was identified on the northwestern edge of the largest seasonal wetland. Congdon’s tarplant was observed sporadically throughout the project site.

**Special-status Wildlife Species**

Based on field surveys conducted by WRA, Inc. in April 2017, two special-status wildlife species, Western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) and Loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) have been observed or have the potential to occur in the project area.

**Regulatory Framework**

**Federal and California Endangered Species Acts**

The Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) of 1973 prohibits federal agencies from authorizing, permitting, or funding any action that would jeopardize the continued existence of a plant or animal species listed or a candidate for listing as Threatened or Endangered under the ESA. If a federal agency is involved with a proposed action or project that may adversely affect a listed plant or animal, that agency must enter into consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) under Section 7(a)(2) of the FESA. Individuals, corporations, and state or local agencies with proposed actions or projects that do not require authorizing, permitting, or funding from a federal agency but that may result in the "take" of listed species or candidate species are required to apply to the USFWS for a Section 10(a) incidental take permit.

The State of California enacted similar laws to the FESA, the California Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) in 1977 and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) in 1984. The CESA expanded upon the original NPPA and enhanced legal protection for plants, but the NPPA remains part of the California Fish and Wildlife Code. To align with the FESA, CESA created the categories of "threatened" and "endangered" species. The State converted all animal species listed as "rare" under the FESA into the CESA as threatened species, but did not do so for rare plants. Thus, these laws provide the legal framework for protection of California-listed rare, threatened, and endangered plant and animal species. The California Department of Wildlife (CDFW) implements NPPA and CESA, and its Wildlife and Habitat Data Analysis Branch maintain the California Natural Diversity Database, a computerized inventory of information on the general location and status of California's rarest plants, animals, and natural communities.
During the CEQA review process, CDFW is given the opportunity to comment on the potential of the proposed project to affect listed plants and animals.

**Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) implements international treaties between the United States and other nations devised to protect migratory birds, their parts, eggs, and nests from activities such as hunting, pursuing, capturing, killing, selling, and shipping, unless expressly authorized in the regulations or by permit. The USFWS administers the MBTA. The State of California has incorporated the protection of birds of prey in Sections 3800, 3513, and 3503.5 of the Fish and Game Code (FGC).

All raptors and their nests are protected from take or disturbance under the MBTA (16 United States Code [USC], section 703, et seq.) and California statute (FGC section 3503.5). The golden eagle and bald eagle are also afforded additional protection under the Eagle Protection Act, amended in 1973 (16 USC, section 669, et seq.).

**Waters of the United States**

The United States Army Corp of Engineers regulates “Waters of the United States” under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Waters of the U.S. are defined in the Code of Federal Regulations as waters susceptible to use in commerce, including interstate waters and wetlands, all other waters (intrastate waterbodies, including wetlands), and their tributaries (33 CFR 328.3). Potential wetland areas, according to the three criteria used to delineate wetlands as defined in the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (Environmental Laboratory 1987), are identified by the presence of (1) hydrophytic vegetation, (2) hydric soils, and (3) wetland hydrology.

Areas that are inundated at a sufficient depth and for a sufficient duration to exclude growth of hydrophytic vegetation are subject to Section 404 jurisdiction as “other waters” and are often characterized by an ordinary high water mark, and herein referred to as non-wetland waters. Non-wetland waters, for example, generally include lakes, rivers, and streams. The placement of fill material into Waters of the U.S. generally requires an individual or nationwide permit from the Corps under Section 404 of the CWA.

**Waters of the State**

The term “Waters of the State” is defined by the Porter-Cologne Act as “any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state.” The RWQCB protects all waters in its regulatory scope and has special responsibility for wetlands, riparian areas, and headwaters. These waterbodies have high resource value, are vulnerable to filling, and are not systematically protected by other programs. RWQCB jurisdiction includes wetlands and waters that may not be regulated by the Corps under Section 404.

Waters of the State are regulated by the RWQCB under the State Water Quality Certification Program which regulates discharges of fill and dredged material under Section 401 of the CWA.
and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Projects that require a Corps permit or fall under other federal jurisdiction and have the potential to impact Waters of the State are required to comply with the terms of the Water Quality Certification determination. If a proposed project does not require a federal permit but does involve dredge or fill activities that may result in a discharge to Waters of the State, the RWQCB has the option to regulate the dredge and fill activities under its state authority in the form of Waste Discharge Requirements.

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR
The Eastern Dublin EIR contains several mitigation measures to reduce anticipated impacts to biological resources from the General Plan and EDSP project. These include:

- Mitigation Measures 3.7/1.0-4.0 reduced impacts related to direct habitat loss (IM 3.7IA) to a less-than-significant level. These mitigations require minimization of direct habitat loss due to development, preparation of vegetation management and enhancement plans for open space areas and development of a revegetation plan for disturbed areas that remain undeveloped.

- Mitigation Measure 3.7/5.0 reduced indirect impacts related to vegetation removal (IM3.7/B) to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure 3.7/5.0 requires revegetation of graded or disturbed areas as quickly as possible and with native species.

- Mitigation Measures 3.7/6.0-17.0 reduced impacts related to loss or degradation of botanically sensitive habitats (IM 3.7/C) but not to a less-than-significant level. These measures require a wide range of steps to be taken by future developers to minimize impacts to sensitive habitat areas, including preserving natural stream corridors, incorporating natural greenbelts and open space into development projects, preparation of individual wetland delineations, preparation of individual erosion and sedimentation plans and similar actions.

- Mitigation Measures 3.7/20.0-22.0 reduced impacts related to the red-legged frog, California tiger salamander, western pond turtle and tri-colored blackbird (IM 3.7/F-I) to a less-than-significant level. These measures require preconstruction surveys for the species and protection of impacted habitat areas.

- Mitigation Measures 3.7/20.0 and 27.0 reduced impacts related to burrowing owl and American badger (IM 3.7/M, N) to a less-than-significant level. This measure mandates preconstruction surveys and a minimum buffer of 300 feet around burrowing owl nesting sites and American badger breeding sites during the breeding season.

- Mitigation Measure 3.7/28.0 reduced impacts related to special status invertebrates (IM 3.7/S) to a less-than-significant level. This measure requires follow-on special surveys for these species during appropriate times of the year.
Cisco IS/MND

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Cisco IS/MND.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to applicable biological resource mitigation measures contained in the previous CEQA documents prepared for the project site, except as modified below.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Substantial adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special status species

Special Status Wildlife Species – Mammals

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated. As determined in the project site survey conducted on April 12, 2017 by WRA, Inc., the project area is not currently inhabited by Western burrowing owls. Due to a moderate potential of the species to inhabit ground squirrel burrows, the project area has the continued potential to support this species. Implementation of the proposed project could result in the displacement of burrowing owls during construction activities, and once completed could result in the removal of suitable burrowing owl habitat. Permanent loss of occupied burrows and habitats would be considered potentially significant.

This potential impact was previously identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR and a mitigation measure was included in the EIR. That mitigation measure is being updated as part of this IS/Supplemental MND as MM BIO-1. Implementation of MM Bio-1 would reduce this potentially significant impact to the Western burrowing owl to a less-than-significant level and replaces the mitigation measure in the Eastern Dublin EIR.

MM BIO-1 Burrowing Owl Survey and Impact Assessment

Prior to obtaining the first site grading, building or other permit for development activities involving ground disturbance, the project Applicant shall prepare the documentation acceptable to the Community Development Department that demonstrates compliance with the following:

Conduct a Burrowing Owl Survey and Impact Assessment

Prior to the first ground-disturbing activities, the project Applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct two pre-construction surveys for the Western burrowing owl for the project site.

The first survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to ground-disturbing activities and the second survey shall be conducted within 48 hours of initial ground disturbance. The surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. If the surveys determine owls are present, then the measures set forth in this mitigation shall be followed.
Implement Avoidance Measures

If direct impacts to owls can be avoided, prior to the first ground-disturbing activities, the project Applicant shall implement the following avoidance measures during all phases of construction to reduce or eliminate potential impacts to California burrowing owls.

- Avoid disturbing occupied burrows during the nesting period, from February 1 through August 31.
- Avoid impacting burrows occupied during the non-breeding season by migratory or non-migratory resident burrowing owls.
- Avoid direct destruction of burrows through chaining (dragging a heavy chain over an area to remove shrubs), disking, cultivation, and urban, industrial, or agricultural development.
- Develop and implement a worker awareness program to increase the on-site worker’s recognition of and commitment to burrowing owl protection.
- Place visible markers near burrows to ensure that equipment and other machinery do not collapse burrows.
- Do not fumigate, use treated bait or other means of poisoning nuisance animals in areas where burrowing owls are known or suspected to occur (e.g., sites observed with nesting owls, designated use areas).

Conduct Burrow Exclusion

If avoidance of burrowing owl or their burrows is not possible, prior to the first ground-disturbing activities, the project Applicant, in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, shall prepare a Burrowing Owl Relocation Plan as indicated and following the CDFW 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. Monitoring of the excluded owls shall be carried out as per the California Department of Fish and Wildlife 2012 Staff Report.

Prepare and Implement a Mitigation Plan

If avoidance of burrowing owl or their burrows is not possible and project activities may result in impacts to nesting, occupied, and satellite burrows and/or burrowing owl habitat, the project Applicant shall consult with the CDFW and develop a detailed mitigation plan that shall include replacement of impacted habitat, number of burrows, and burrowing owl at a ratio approved by CDFW. The mitigation plan shall be based on the requirements set forth in Appendix A of the CDFW 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation and the plan shall be reviewed and accepted by CDFW and the City prior to the first ground-disturbing activities.

Special-Status Plant Species

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Based on a project site survey conducted by WRA, Inc., two locally rare species were observed in the project area: Congdon’s
tarplant and California dock. The potential loss of Congdon’s tarplant and California dock within the project area would be considered a potentially significant impact.

Congdon’s tarplant populations were observed throughout the project site, occurring in seasonal wetlands and mesic areas. California dock were also observed on-site and may be disturbed. Disturbance or removal of wetland habitat could potentially result in the loss of this special status species, which would be considered a potentially significant impact.

Implementation of MM BIO-2 would reduce this potentially significant impact to Congdon’s Tarplant and California dock to a less-than-significant level.

**MM BIO-2 Collect Congdon’s Tarplant and California Dock Seed Stock**

Prior to obtaining the first grading or building permit for development activities involving subsurface disturbance, the project Applicant shall prepare the documentation acceptable to the Community Development Department that demonstrates compliance with the following:

*Conduct Rare Plant Surveys*

The project Applicant shall retain a qualified botanist to conduct rare plant surveys within the construction zone for Congdon’s tarplant or other species with potential habitat within the project area during the appropriate time of year in accordance with agency protocols. Impacts to special-status plant species shall be avoided to the maximum extent feasible and habitat that supports special-status plant species shall be preserved. Rare plant surveys shall be conducted at the proper time of year when rare or endangered species are both “evident” and identifiable. Field surveys shall be scheduled to coincide with known blooming periods, and/or during periods of physiological development that are necessary to identify the plant species of concern. If no special-status plant species are found, then the proposed project would not have any impacts to the species and no additional mitigation measures are necessary.

Where surveys determine that special-status plant species are present within or adjacent to the proposed project site, direct and indirect impacts of the project on the species (e.g., Congdon’s tarplant and/or California Dock Seed Stock) shall be avoided where feasible through the establishment of activity exclusion zones, where no ground-disturbing activities shall take place, including construction of new facilities, construction staging, or other temporary work areas. Activity exclusion zones for special-status plant species shall be established in accordance with regulatory agency standards prior to construction activities around each occupied habitat site, the boundaries of which shall be clearly marked with standard orange plastic construction exclusion fencing or its equivalent.

Where avoidance of impacts to Congdon’s tarplant and California dock is not feasible, seed or plant propagules shall be collected from these species. Under the direction of the qualified botanist, seed or plant propagules shall be harvested from at least 50 percent of plants within areas of impact.
The project Applicant shall follow the mitigation guidelines as established in the East Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS; 2010), including:

- An adequate floristic survey of the site shall have been completed within the preceding 3 years (under normal rainfall conditions), and spatially explicit data on the extent of the focal plant population shall be available.
- To mitigate impacts on a plant population, a parcel where the focal plant species occurs may be acquired through fee title purchase or conservation easement (PLA-2).
- An assessment of the plant population on both the impact site and the proposed mitigation site shall be conducted by a qualified botanist. The mitigation population shall be equivalent in terms of population size and vigor than the population affected at the project site.
- As identified in table 3-12 of the EACCS, mitigation for focal plant species within the Livermore Valley Mitigation Area is 5:1 and refers to the size of the population that is affected or protected.

The qualified botanist shall demonstrate that the harvested seeds have been planted and are surviving at a rate pursuant to the EACCS. The Applicant will submit an annual monitoring report to the City of Dublin, which details monitoring methods and maintenance for successful establishment, and reporting protocols. The plan shall be developed in consultation with the City of Dublin prior to the start of local construction activities. Contingency measures should be included in the plan if it appears the success criterion will not be met after three years. Monitoring reports shall include photo-documentation, planting specifications, a site layout map, descriptions of materials used, and justification for any deviations from the monitoring plan.

**Nesting Birds**

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed project includes construction activities that may affect nesting birds including ground disturbance activities which would require grading and vegetation removal. Loggerhead shrike is a special-status bird known to nest in the project area. Trees, fresh emergent wetland vegetation and grassland could provide potentially suitable habitat for this species, which is protected under the MBTA and the California Fish and Wildlife Code. Project activities that may affect nesting birds include vegetation removal and ground disturbance activities which would require grading, and vegetation removal. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project could result in the loss of active nests, which would be considered a potentially significant impact on special-status bird species and birds protected under the MBTA.

This potential impact was previously identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR and a mitigation measure was included in the EIR. That mitigation measure is being updated as part of this IS/Supplemental MND as MM BIO-3. Implementation of MM BIO-3 would reduce this potentially significant impact to nesting birds to a less-than-significant level and replaces the mitigation measure in the Eastern Dublin EIR.
MM BIO-3  Protect Birds Covered by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Prior to obtaining the first site, building or other permit for development activities relevant to the timing identified below, the project Applicant shall prepare the documentation acceptable to the Community Development Department that demonstrates compliance with the following:

*Pre-construction Breeding Bird Surveys*

No more than 14 days prior to initial ground disturbance and vegetation removal during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31), the project Applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to perform pre-construction breeding bird surveys. If any nests are found, they shall be flagged and protected with a suitable buffer. Buffer distance would vary based on species and conditions at the project site, but is usually at least 50 feet, and up to 250 feet for raptors. Note that this mitigation measure does not apply to ground disturbance and vegetation removal activities that occur outside of the nesting season (September 1 to January 31).

With adherence to these new mitigation measures, the project’s direct impacts to sensitive or special-status species would reduce impacts to less-than-significant. For other impacts not addressed specifically above, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to biological resources beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for those other impact areas.

**(b, c) Substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat, natural community, or wetlands**

**Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Based on site surveys by WRA in April 2017, 1.03 acres of seasonal wetlands were identified. Implementation of the proposed project would result in permanent impacts to 0.45 acres of seasonal wetlands and preserve the remaining 0.58 acres. Since fill of wetlands and “other waters of the U.S.” are prohibited without first obtaining permits and approvals from the federal and state agencies, fill of wetlands waters of the State would result in a potentially significant impact.

Implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce this potentially significant impact to wetlands to a less-than-significant level.

**MM BIO-4  Wetland Mitigation Plan**

Prior to obtaining the first site grading or building permit for development activities involving ground disturbance, the project Applicant shall prepare the documentation acceptable to the Community Development Department that demonstrates compliance with the following:

The project Applicant shall obtain all required resource agency permits and shall prepare and obtain resource agency approval of a wetland mitigation plan that ensures no-net-loss of wetland and waters habitat.

The wetland mitigation plan shall include measures for avoidance, minimization, and compensation for wetland impacts. Avoidance and minimization measures may include the
designation of buffers around wetland features to be avoided, or project design measures. Compensation measures shall include the preservation and/or creation of wetland or waters. The final mitigation ratios (the amount of wetlands and waters created or preserved compared to the amount impacted) shall be determined by the applicable resource agency(s). The wetland mitigation and monitoring plan shall include the following:

a) Descriptions of the wetland types, and their expected functions and values;
b) Performance standards and monitoring protocol to ensure the success of the mitigation wetlands over a period to be determined by the resource agencies;
c) Engineering plans showing the location, size and configuration of wetlands to be created or restored;
d) An implementation schedule showing that construction or preservation of mitigation areas shall commence prior to or concurrently with the initiation of construction; and
e) A description of legal protection measures for the preserved wetlands (i.e., dedication of fee title, conservation easement, and/or an endowment held by an approved conservation organization, government agency or mitigation bank).

(d) Interfere or impede the movement of migratory fish or wildlife

No New Impact. The project site is substantially surrounded by urban development and was previously developed for governmental uses. There are no stream courses on or near the project site that could be used as a wildlife migration corridor. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated regarding movement of fish or wildlife species.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to migratory fish and wildlife beyond what has been analyzed in Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(e, f) Conflict with local policies or ordinance include tree preservation or any adopted habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans

No New Impact. There are six existing ornamental street trees at the southwest corner of the Central Parkway and Park Place intersection. One of these trees is located off-site and five are located within the project boundary. The one tree located off-site may need to be removed to accommodate a proposed sidewalk – details of which would be shown on the on-site / off-site improvement plan submittal. All the trees are relatively small (< 8-inch truck diameter) and would not be considered significant and in need of protection per the Dublin Municipal Code Chapter 7.56.090 – Tree Protection, which requires protection of certain species of trees which have a twenty-four (24) inch or greater diameter.

The project site is not located within the boundaries of any Habitat Conservation Plans, but it is located within the Eastern Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS) boundaries. The
City adopted the EACCS as guidance for public infrastructure/capital improvement projects and uses the document to provide input on managing biological resources and conservation priorities during public project level planning and environmental permitting. For privately sponsored development projects such as the project, proponents are encouraged to consult the EACCS for guidance, but compliance with the document is not mandatory.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to tree preservation, adopted habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans beyond what has been analyzed in Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

Source(s)

CA Department of Fish and Wildlife, Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, March 7, 2012.


Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Setting

The Eastern Dublin area was surveyed in 1988 as part of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan and associated EIR. Several potentially significant archeological resources were identified in the Specific Plan area, several which were located near the former Santa Rita Rehabilitation Center. None of these sites have been recorded on the project site.

Regulatory Framework

City of Dublin General Plan

The City of Dublin General Plan establishes the following guiding policy associated with cultural resources that is relevant to the proposed project:

**Guiding Policy 7.7.1.A.2:** Follow State regulations as set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 regarding discovery of archaeological sites, and Historical Resources, as defined in Section 5020.1 of the Public Resources Code.

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR

The Eastern Dublin EIR contains several mitigation measures to reduce anticipated impacts to cultural resources from the General Plan and EDSP project. These include:

- Mitigation Measures 3.9/5.0-6.0 reduced impacts related to the disruption or destruction of unidentified prehistoric resources (IM 3.9B) to a less-than-significant level. These measures required that grading or construction activity be stopped if historic resources were discovered, until the significance of the find could be ascertained.

- Mitigation Measures 3.9/7.0-12.0 reduced impacts related to disruption or destruction of identified historic resources to a less-than-significant level (Impact 3.9IC). These measures would include preparing site-specific archival research for individual resources, encourage adaptive reuse of historic resources, recordation of historic sites on local state and federal registers, as appropriate and development of preservation programs for significant resources.
Mitigation Measures 3.9/5.0 and 6.0 reduced impacts related to disruption or destruction of unidentified historic resources to a less-than-significant level (Impact 3.9/D). These measures would include preparing site-specific archival research.

Cisco IS/MND

The Cisco Systems IS/MND identifies one mitigation measure to reduce anticipated impacts to cultural resources. This includes:

- Mitigation Measure 2 would address the possibility that undetected prehistoric archaeological resources might exist on the property must be recognized and a contingency plan shall be developed in conformity with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 to handle discoveries during project construction. Should any prehistoric material be discovered, work shall be halted in the immediate vicinity of the project site until a qualified archeologist inspects the discovery, and, if necessary, implements plans for further evaluative testing and/or retrieval of endangered materials.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to applicable cultural mitigation measure contained in the previous CEQA documents prepared for the project site.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Historic resources

No New Impact. As part of the federal regulatory permit application, a historic survey of the project site was conducted by Tom Origer & Associates. The results of the survey and archival research did not identify any historic resources. Tom Origer & Associates analysis is documented in a Historical Resources Survey of APN 986-0014-010, and is included as an appendix to this Initial Study.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to historic resources beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b, c) Archaeological or paleontological resources

No New Impact. The project site is located near the former Santa Rita Rehabilitation Center site and development of the project could have an impact on subsurface archeological and/or paleontological resources. This would be a potentially significant impact. If such resources are encountered, Mitigation Measure 2 from the Cisco Systems IS/MND would reduce any potential impacts to archeological or paleontological impacts to a less-than-significant level.

With adherence to previous Mitigation Measure 2, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for
supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(d) Human remains

**No New Impact.** A remote possibility exists that human resources could be uncovered on the project site during construction activities. This would be a potentially significant impact. If such resources are encountered, Mitigation Measure 2 from the Cisco Systems IS/MND and applicable regulatory requirements would reduce any potential impacts to human remains impacts to a less-than-significant level.

With adherence to previous Mitigation Measure 2 and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to human remains beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


**Geology and Soils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

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

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? ☒

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? ☒

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including ✗
### Environmental Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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) Would the project 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) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Setting

This section of the Initial Study addresses seismic safety issues, topography and landform, drainage and erosion and potential impacts to localized soil types.

#### Seismic

The project site is a part of the San Francisco Bay area, one of the most seismically active regions in the nation. The Eastern Dublin EIR notes the presence of several nearby significant faults, including the Calaveras Fault, Greenville Fault, Hayward Fault, and San Andreas Fault. The likelihood of a major seismic event on one or more of these faults within the near future is believed to be high. Per the report prepared by Lowney Associates for the Cisco Systems IS/MND, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone as identified by the State of California.

A surface fault rupture study was prepared in the area in 1999 and referenced in the Cisco Systems IS/MND. No evidence of fault-related disruption to the project site soils was identified in this analysis. Based on this and other recent geotechnical information considered by Lowney Associates, a fault rupture on the project site is not anticipated.
Site Soils
The project site is underlain by stiff to very stiff and sandy clay to the maximum depth explored (80 feet below ground surface). Near surface soils are highly expansive. Test pits dug as part of the Cisco Systems IS/MND geotechnical investigation found scattered fill material, primarily gravelly clay, as well as abandoned utility lines and below-grade structures. Groundwater was encountered at depths of 9 to 20 feet from ground surface, although this may vary due to rainfall and other factors.

Landform and Topography
The project site is part of a broad north-south trending plain known as the Livermore-Amador Valley. The project site is relatively flat.

Drainage
Existing drainage on the project site is generally sheet flow in a north to south direction.

Regulatory Framework

International Building Code
The International Building Code (IBC) is the national model building code providing standardized requirements for construction. The IBC replaced earlier regional building codes (including the Uniform Building Code) in 2000 and established consistent construction guidelines for the nation. In 2006, the IBC was incorporated into the 2007 California Building Code, and currently applies to all structures being constructed in California. The national model codes are therefore incorporated into the building codes of local municipalities, such as the California Building Code discussed below. The California Building Code includes building design and construction criteria that take into consideration the State’s seismic conditions.

California Building Code
The California Building Code (also known as the “California Building Standards Code” or CBC) is promulgated under the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24 (Parts 1 through 12) and is administered by the California Building Standards Commission. Local agencies must ensure the development complies with the guidelines contained beyond the CBC. Cities and counties can adopt additional building standards beyond the CBC. CBC Part 2, named in the California Building Code is based upon the 2012 International Building Code with necessary California amendments, and Part 11, named the California Green Building Standards Code, and is also called the CalGreen Code.

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR
The Eastern Dublin EIR contains several mitigation measures to reduce anticipated impacts related to Soils, Geology and Seismicity from the General Plan and EDSP project. These include:
Mitigation Measure 3.6/1.0 reduced impacts related to primary effects of earthquake ground shaking (IM 3.6/B) but not to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation measure requires that future structure and infrastructure facilities be designed to applicable local and state building codes.

Mitigation Measures 3.6/2.0-7.0 reduced impacts related to the secondary effects of earthquake ground shaking (IM 3.9/C) to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures mandate building setbacks from landslides, stabilization of unstable land forms, removal and reconstruction of unstable soils, use of engineered retaining structures, use of appropriately designed and engineered fill, and design of structures to account of potential soil failure.

Mitigation Measures 3.6/14.0-16.0 reduced impacts related to expansive soils (IM 3.6/H) to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures require formulation of site-specific designs to overcome expansive soils, reducing the amount of moisture in the soil and by appropriate foundation and pavement design.

Mitigation Measures 3.6/17.0-19.0 reduced impacts related to natural slope stability (IM 3.6/I) to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures mandate formulation of use of site-specific designs based on follow-up geotechnical reviews of individual developments, limiting the location of improvements on downslopes of unstable soils, removal/reconstruction of potentially unstable slope areas and installation of surface and subsurface slope drainage improvements.

Mitigation Measures 3.6/20.0-26.0 reduced impacts related to cut and fill slope stability (IM 3.6/J) to a less-than-significant level. These measures include developing grading plans for hillside areas that minimize grading and associate cuts and fills, ensuring that grading plans comply with appropriate building codes, utilizing keys and benches as part of grading to ensure slope stability and minimizing use of unreinforced fill slopes, appropriate compaction of fill areas and on-going maintenance of slope drainage areas.

Mitigation Measure 3.6/27.0 reduced the impact related to short-term construction-related erosion and sedimentation (IM 3.6/K) to a less-than-significant level. This measure includes limiting timing of construction to avoid the rainy season and implementing several other specific erosion control measures.

Mitigation Measure 3.6/28.0 reduced the impact related to long-term erosion and sedimentation (IM 3.6/L) to a less-than-significant level. This measure includes installation of erosion control facilities into individual development projects, including sediment catch basins, creek bank stabilization, revegetation of graded areas and similar measures.

Cisco IS/MND

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Cisco IS/MND.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to applicable geology and soils mitigation measures contained in the previous CEQA documents prepared for the project site.
Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Seismic hazards

No New Impact. The project site is subject to ground shaking caused by regional faults identified above. Under moderate to severe seismic events which are probable in the Bay Area over the next few decades, buildings, utilities and other improvements constructed on the project site would be subject to damage caused by ground shaking.

Since the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, the potential for ground rupture is anticipated to be minimal. Adherence to MM 3.6/1.0 through 7.0 contained in the Eastern Dublin EIR would ensure that new structures built on the project site would comply with generally recognized seismic safety standards so that ground shaking impacts would be less-than-significant.

As part of the project, the project site is proposed to be graded to accommodate building pads, roads, parking areas and other development areas. Grading would also occur to improve and control site drainage. Mitigation Measures 3.6/17.0-26.0 have been adopted as part of the Eastern Dublin EIR to reduce potential geotechnical impacts to a level of less-than-significant. These mitigation measures require the preparation of site-specific soils and geotechnical reports and adherence to Uniform Building Code and other City requirements for grading. The proposed project would be required to be comply with the mitigation measures described in the Eastern Dublin EIR.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures and regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to seismic hazards beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b) Erosion/topsoil loss

No New Impact. Impacts 3.6/K and L of the Eastern Dublin EIR note that an impact of constructing all the land uses identified in the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan/ would be an increase of erosion and sedimentation caused by grading activities. Related Mitigation Measures 3.6/27.0 and 3.6/28.0 require that project Applicants prepare and implement interim erosion plans as part of grading permits. The proposed project would be required to be comply with the mitigation measures described in the Eastern Dublin EIR.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to erosion/topsoil loss beyond what has been analyzed in Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.
(c-d) Soil stability

No New Impact. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 3.6/A of the Eastern Dublin EIR, the Cisco project Applicant’s geotechnical consultant (Lowney Associates) prepared a geotechnical analysis of the project site. Based on the Lowney Associates report, the project site could support a similar type of building (multi-story office/R&D) as is proposed. Expansive soils were encountered on the project site, and therefore the recommendations made by the geologist to include special grading techniques and building foundation designs would continue to be required.

With adherence to geotechnical recommendations by Lowney Associates as required under Mitigation Measure 3.6/A, potential lateral spreading and related soil hazards impacts to proposed structures would be less-than-significant. There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to soil stability beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(e) Soil capability to support waste water disposal, including septic

No New Impact. The proposed development would be connected to a sanitary sewer system within streets adjacent to the project site. Therefore, no impact is anticipated regarding septic tanks. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to waste water disposal beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

Source(s)


Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

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

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

Environmental Setting

The topic of the project's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change was not analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR in 1993 or Cisco Systems IS/MND in 2001. Since the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco Systems IS/MND have been approved, the determination of whether greenhouse gasses and climate change needs to be analyzed for this proposed project is governed by the law on supplemental or subsequent EIRs (Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15163).

Greenhouse gas emissions and climate change is not required to be analyzed under the CEQA standards for supplemental or subsequent EIRs unless it constitutes "new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete" (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15162 (a)(3)).

The issue of climate change and greenhouse gasses was widely known prior to the approval of the prior CEQA documents for this project in 1993 and 2003. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was established in 1992. The regulation of greenhouse gas emissions to reduce climate change impacts was extensively debated and analyzed throughout the early 1990s. The studies and analyses of this issue resulted in the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997. In the early and mid-2000s, greenhouse gas emissions and climate change were extensively discussed and analyzed in California. In 2000, SB 1771 established the California Climate Action Registry for the recordation of greenhouse gas emissions to provide information about potential environmental impacts.

Therefore, the impact of greenhouse gases on climate change was known at the time of the certification of the Eastern Dublin EIR in May 1993 and the Cisco Systems IS/MND in 2003. Under CEQA standards, it is not new information that requires analysis in a supplemental EIR or Negative Declaration. No supplemental environmental analysis of the project's impacts on this issue is required under CEQA.
Regulatory Framework
See above for applicable regulatory setting.

Previous CEQA Documents
There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Eastern Dublin EIR or Cisco Systems IS/MND.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures
(a, b) Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or conflict with GHG plans or regulations
As discussed above, no additional environmental analysis is required under CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163.

Source(s)
None.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

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

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ☒

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school? ☒

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ☒

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the | ☒
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The project site is vacant and currently contains no structures. It was previously used as a federal government installation, which may have involved the use or storage of potentially hazardous material. A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the Cisco project to assess the existence of hazardous materials from past uses of the property. The results of the ESA are discussed below.

Regulatory Framework

City of Dublin General Plan

The City of Dublin General Plan establishes the following guiding and implementing policies associated with hazards and hazardous materials that are relevant to the proposed project:

Guiding Policy 8.3.4.A.1: Maintain and enhance the ability to regulate the use, transport, and storage of hazardous materials and to quickly identify substances and take appropriate action during emergencies.

Guiding Policy 8.3.4.A.2: Minimize the risk of exposure to hazardous materials from contaminated sites.

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR

Hazards and hazardous materials were not analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR.
Cisco IS/MND

The Cisco IS/MND identifies one mitigation measure to reduce anticipated impacts to hazards and hazardous materials. This includes:

- Mitigation Measure 3 would address removal of asbestos wrapped piping. The mitigation measure requires all asbestos wrapped piping be removed and deposited off Site 15A prior to the issuance of a building permit. Heavy petroleum hydrocarbons would also be required to be removed to the extent required by the appropriate regulatory agencies.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to applicable hazard and hazardous materials mitigation measures contained in the previous CEQA documents prepared for the project site.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a-c) Exposure to hazardous materials, upset/accident, near school

No New Impacts.

Existing Hazards

The ESA indicated that project site was part of an Army Base and Naval Hospital during World War II. All of the buildings and related structures were demolished between the late 1940s and early 1950s. Facilities included barracks and two former diesel or gasoline fueling stations. The underground tanks and piping have been removed. However, some heavy petroleum hydrocarbons were discovered near one of the former fueling stations during the ESA investigation. In addition, approximately 1,200 feet of metal pipe wrapped with tar paper containing small amounts of asbestos were also discovered. Mitigation Measure 3 would reduce potential health hazard impacts to a less-than-significant level.

A plume of groundwater with concentrations of perchloroethylene (PCE) and other solvents was also detected beneath portions of Site 15A. The source of the PCE and solvent contamination is believed to be a former laundry facility which existed on Site 15B during the 1940s. A Health Risk Assessment prepared by Lowney Associates for the Cisco Systems IS/MND, dated November 2000 concluded that the PCE contaminated groundwater does not pose an unacceptable risk to future office, maintenance or construction workers as levels of contaminants are within the acceptable risk range established by the EPA National Contingency Plan.

Operational Hazards

Apart of standard hazardous materials (e.g. cleaning supplies) that are used in commercial and office uses, limited quantities of nitrogen would be stored and used on site to clean equipment (e.g. dust removal). Although nitrogen is non-toxic, when released into an enclosed space it can displace oxygen, and therefore presents an asphyxiation hazard.
A report with supporting floor plans would be provided as part of the project’s building permit to identify the maximum quantities of hazardous materials and their methods of protection in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC), Section 414.1.3.

Furthermore, the use of any hazardous materials would be regulated by federal, state and local agencies, including the Alameda County Fire Department. Other minor quantities of potentially hazardous materials would also be kept on the project site, including normal and customary amounts of lawn chemicals, solvents and similar items used for building and grounds maintenance. With adherence to applicable federal, state and local transport and use requirements, creation of a potentially hazardous condition would be less-than-significant.

With adherence to Mitigation Measure 3 and existing regulations, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts from exposure to hazardous materials beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(d) Listed as a hazardous materials site

**No New Impact.** As described in the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that was prepared for the Cisco project to assess the existence of hazardous materials from past uses of the property, the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to the project site listed as a hazardous materials site beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(e-f) Proximity to a public or private airport

**No New Impact.** The project site is located northwesterly of the Livermore Municipal Airport but outside of any safety or referral zone for this airport. No impacts are therefore anticipated regarding airport safety issues. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to airports beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(g) Impair implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan

**No New Impact.** Adequate emergency access has been provided via proposed driveways on adjoining streets. Due to the provision of adequate access, there would be no impact regarding emergency evacuation plans. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.
There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(h) Expose people or structures to wildland fires

**No New Impact.** The project site is currently a vacant field and is subject to grassland fires during the dry portions of the year. However, the long-term plan for the area is for urbanization. Development of the project site and the surrounding area pursuant to the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan would include adding new water lines for firefighting purposes as well as new fire stations and personnel. No impacts are therefore anticipated. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to people or structures due to wildland fires beyond what has been analyzed in Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


**Hydrology and Water Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No New Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the local ground water table level (for example, the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood-hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood-hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The project site is generally flat and contains no riparian features. Seasonal wetlands are located on 1.03 acres of the project site and occur as nine separate topographic depressions where seasonal inundation and/or saturation occur during the rainy season. The Project impacts on wetlands are addressed in the Biological Resources section.
The project site is located within the Tassajara Creek watershed, which drains the eastern portion of Dublin. Site drainage is by sheet flow to the south, towards the I-580 freeway. Stormwater from the Eastern Dublin area generally flows to the south, under the I-580 freeway and into regional drainage facilities maintained by Alameda County Zone 7. The ultimate disposal of stormwater runoff is Alameda Creek that drains into San Francisco Bay.

The City requires stormwater discharges to comply with San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permit requirements and establishes non-point source pollution control measures as required by federal and state law. Stormwater pollution prevention measures for new development projects, such as swales, retention ponds, erosion, and sediment control, are incorporated in the planning, design, construction, and operation of projects with the potential to create pollutants in stormwater runoff.

The Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program (CWP) provides guidance to cities with respect to establishing programs to implement RWQCB requirements. The City of Dublin participates in the CWP and adheres to the regionally established guidelines. New development requirements are intended to include mechanisms into project proposals that prevent pollutants such as soil, petroleum products, pesticides, litter and construction materials from entering the storm drain system. The Zeiss Innovation Center provides 12,461 square feet of bio-retention to meet water quality requirements. In addition, the new development requirements mandate flow control measures to prevent an increase in the erosion potential of the receiving stream over the pre-project (existing) condition. The flow control requirements are imposed on commercial, industrial, and residential developments that create one acre or more of impervious surfaces.

According to information contained in the Soils, Geology and Seismicity chapter of the Eastern Dublin EIR, no portion of the project site contains historic landslides or mudflows (See Figure 3.6-C). The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area per the current FIRM (Flood Insurance Rate Map) Flood Map for the East Dublin area.

**Regulatory Framework**

**City of Dublin General Plan**

The City of Dublin General Plan establishes the following guiding and implementing policies associated with hydrology and water quality that are relevant to the proposed project:

**Guiding Policy 7.3.1.A.1:** Maintain natural hydrologic systems.

**Implementing Policy 7.3.1.B.1:** Enforce the requirements of the Municipal Regional Permit for stormwater issued by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board or any subsequent permit as well as Chapter 7 (Public Works) and Chapter 9 (Subdivisions) of the Dublin Municipal Code for maintenance of water quality and protection of stream courses.
Implementing Policy 7.3.1.B.2: Review development proposals to ensure site design that minimizes soil erosion and volume and velocity of surface runoff.

Guiding Policy 12.3.5.A.1: Protect the quality and quantity of surface water and groundwater resources that serve the community.

Implementing Policy 12.3.5.B.6: Maximize the runoff directed to permeable areas or to stormwater storage by appropriate site design and grading, using appropriate detention and/or retention structures, and orienting runoff toward permeable surfaces designed to manage water flow.

Implementing Policy 12.3.5.B.7: Review development plans to minimize impervious surfaces and generally maximize infiltration of rainwater in soils, where appropriate. Strive to maximize permeable areas to allow more percolation of runoff into the ground through such means as bio-retention areas, green strips, planter strips, decomposed granite, porous pavers, swales, and other water permeable surfaces. Require planter strips between the street and the sidewalk within the community, wherever practical and feasible.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

Pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, municipal stormwater discharges in the City of Dublin are regulated under the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems NPDES Permit (MRP), Order No. Order No. R2-2015-0049, NPDES Permit No. CAS612008, adopted November 19, 2015. The MRP is overseen by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Provision C.3 (New Development & Redevelopment) of the MRP addresses post-construction stormwater management requirements for new development and redevelopment projects that meet certain impervious surface area thresholds. Provision C.3 requires the incorporation of site design, source control, and low impact development stormwater treatment measures in development projects to minimize the discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff and prevent non-stormwater discharges.

MRP Provision C.3.g pertains to hydromodification management. This MRP provision requires that stormwater discharges not cause an increase in the erosion potential of the receiving stream over the existing condition. Increases in runoff flow and volume must be managed so that post-project runoff does not exceed estimated pre-project rates and durations, where such increased flow and/or volume is likely to cause increased potential for erosion of creek beds and banks, silt pollutant generation, or other adverse impacts on beneficial uses due to increased erosive force. Projects that create or replace one acre or more of impervious surface area and are located within sensitive areas identified in the Hydromodification Management Susceptibility Map, developed by the Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program and approved by the RWQCB, are required to incorporate hydromodification management controls into project design. Projects within the Community Plan area drain primarily to earthen channels and therefore must meet the hydromodification management requirements if they create
and/or replace one acre or more of impervious surface and increase impervious surface area over pre-project conditions. This project would have to implement hydromodification management requirements and is planning to install flow control devices.

**Previous CEQA Documents**

**Eastern Dublin EIR**

The Eastern Dublin EIR contains several mitigation measures to reduce anticipated impacts related to hydrology and storm drainage from the General Plan and EDSP project. These include:

- Mitigation Measures 3.5/44.0-48.0 reduced impacts related potential flooding (IM 3.5/Y) to a less-than-significant level. These mitigation measures require new storm drainage facilities as part of new development, requires developers to prepare storm drain plans for individual development projects and requires new flood control facilities to alleviate downstream flooding potential.

- Mitigation Measures 3.5/49.0-50.0 reduced impacts related to loss of groundwater recharge area. These mitigation measures require adherence to management practices to protect and enhance water quality and directs the City to support on-going groundwater recharge efforts in the Central Basin.

- Mitigation Measures 3.5/51.0 to 55.0 reduced impacts related to non-point source pollution (IM 3.5/AA) to a less-than-significant level. These mitigation measures mandate that specific water quality investigations be submitted as part of development projects and that the City should develop community-based programs to educate residents and businesses to reduce non-point source pollution. These mitigation measures also require all development to meet the requirements of the City's Best Management Practices, the City's NPDES permit and the County's Urban Runoff Ocean Water Program to mitigate stormwater pollution.

**Cisco Systems IS/MND**

The Cisco Systems IS/MND contains one mitigation measure to reduce anticipated impacts related to hydrology and storm drainage:

- Mitigation Measure 5 would require the project Applicant prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The mitigation measure requires the SWPPP to list Best Management Practices to reduce construction and post-construction activities to a less-than-significant level. Measures may include, but shall not be limited to revegetation of graded areas, silt fencing, use of biofilters (i.e. grassy swales) and other measures. The SWPPP shall conform to standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and City of Dublin and shall be approved by the City of Dublin Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits.
Specific development projects containing five acres or more are also required to obtain a Notice of Intent from the State Water Resources Control Board prior to commencement of grading.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to applicable mitigation measures related to hydrology and water quality set forth in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco Systems IS/MND.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a, f) Violate water quality or waste discharge requirements, degrade water quality

**No New Impact.** Construction of improvements anticipated as part of the proposed project would necessitate grading and overcovering of the soil to construct building pads, utility connections and similar features. Proposed grading could contribute to increased soil erosion into creeks and other bodies of water, off the project site. This could be a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure 5, proposed in the Cisco Systems IS/MND, would ensure that potential water quality impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. The project would be required to comply with this mitigation measure. Compliance with provision C.3 and C.3g of the National Pollution Disposal Elimination System (NPDES) Permit would also minimize impacts from stormwater runoff.

With adherence to Mitigation Measure 5 and applicable regulatory measures, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to water quality or waste discharge requirements beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b) Substantially deplete or interfere with groundwater supplies

**No New Impact.** Although the currently vacant site would be converted to an urban use, this impact has been addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR (Impact 3.5/Z) and Mitigation Measure 3.5/49.0 adopted as part of the EIR, which requires the project to adhere to applicable City policies and ordinances regarding water quality and to comply with the NPDES permit.

With adherence to previous Mitigation Measure 3.5/49.0 and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to groundwater supplies beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(c) Substantially alter existing drainage patterns re: erosion/siltation

**No New Impact.** The Eastern Dublin EIR acknowledges that implementation of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan would change existing natural drainage patterns on individual sites. In this instance, proposed changes would include grading and re-contouring much of the project site and filling surface drainage swales with underground pipes and culverts to accommodate storm
water runoff. However, the overall direction of stormwater flow in a southwesterly direction would not significantly change.

According to the hydrological information prepared for the proposed project, the quantity and rate of stormwater flow projected is consistent with the City's master drainage plan for Eastern Dublin and complies with all regulatory requirements.

The proposed project would not change the urban scale of development anticipated in the Cisco Systems IS/MND for this project site. Consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND, including compliance with regulatory requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to existing drainage patterns regarding erosion/siltation beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(d) Substantially alter existing drainage patterns re: flooding

No New Impact. Construction of the project would not significantly change drainage patterns within the project site area. Existing surface drainage flows would be slightly altered due to anticipated site grading. As shown in Figure 7: Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan – Phase 1, the storm drain improvements would be constructed to connect with existing drainage improvements within the Eastern Dublin area. In addition, the project site lies above the 100-year flood elevation so no significant site flooding is anticipated.

The proposed project would not change the urban scale of development anticipated in the Cisco Systems IS/MND for this project site. The Cisco Systems IS/MND determined that impacts to drainage patterns related to flooding would be considered less than significant with compliance with regulatory requirements.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to existing drainage patterns regarding flooding beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(e) Runoff exceed drainage capacity, or add pollution

No New Impact. Construction of on-site improvements is anticipated to lead to greater quantities of stormwater runoff. Per the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan (BKF, 2017), construction of the proposed project would create 352,306 square feet of impervious surface area. Total bio-retention required to meet Alameda County C.3 requirements (4% of effective impervious area) is 14,663 square feet. The project is providing 12,461 square feet of bio-retention. The Alameda County C.3 Technical Guidance Manual allows bio-retention areas to be sized using a combination flow and volume method. Providing ponding height allows for some reductions to the overall footprint area of the bio-retention planter.
The Dublin Public Works Department determined that the amount of stormwater runoff anticipated to be generated from the project site for the project site would be consistent with the approved Master Drainage Plan for the Eastern Dublin area and the stormwater plan complies with all regulatory requirements.

The proposed project would not change the urban scale of development anticipated in the Cisco Systems IS/MND for this project site. Consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND, impacts would be less-than-significant.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to stormwater drainage capacity beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(g) Housing flood hazard

No New Impact. The proposed project does not include a housing component, so there would be no impacts placing housing within a 100-year flood plain. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to flood hazard beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(h-i) 100-year flood hazard, dam/levee failure

No New Impact. The proposed project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area nor within an area considered vulnerable to a dam or levee failure. The Cisco project was designed to be consistent with the Eastern Dublin Master Drainage Plan and comply with all regulatory requirements, and the proposed project would not change the urban scale of development anticipated in the Cisco Systems IS/MND for this project site, and there would be no impacts regarding redirection of flood flows.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts from flood hazard, dam/levee failure beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow

No New Impact. The project site is not located near a major body of water that could result in a seiche. The risk of potential mudflow is considered low since no historic landslides or mudflows have been identified on the project site (see Figure 3.6-c of the Eastern Dublin EIR). There would be no impact with implementation of the proposed project.
There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

Source(s)


### Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Setting

The project site is presently regulated by the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. The General Plan and Specific Plan designates Site 15A for Campus Office. Surrounding uses include a combination of developed and undeveloped properties within the Eastern Dublin Planning area.
Regulatory Framework

City of Dublin General Plan
The City of Dublin General Plan serves as a guide for the day-to-day physical development decisions that shape the social, economic, and environmental character of the City’s Planning Area. The General Plan’s policies are legally binding for new development and land use activities that occur within the Dublin City limits, which currently total 14.62 square miles. The City of Dublin General Plan is organized as follows:

Land Use and Circulation Section: The Land Use and Circulation section includes the Land Use Element; Parks and Open Space Element; Schools, Public Lands, and Utilities Element; and, Circulation and Scenic Highways Element. The Schools, Public Lands, and Utilities Element is an optional Element.

Housing Section: The Housing section includes the Housing Element, which is a separately bound document.

Environmental Resources Management Section: The Environmental Resources Management section includes the Conservation Element; Seismic Safety and Safety Element; Noise Element; Water Resources Element; and Energy Conservation Element. The Water Resources and Energy Conservation Elements are optional Elements.

Community Design and Sustainability Section: The Community Design and Sustainability section includes the Community Design and Sustainability Element, which is an optional Element.

Economic Development Section: The Economic Development section includes the Economic Development Element, which is an optional Element.

Campus Office Land Use Designation
The General Plan designates the project site “Campus Office.” The General Plan establishes a Floor Area Ratio range of 0.25 to 0.80 and an employment density range of 220 to 490 square feet per employee. This designation is intended to provide an attractive, campus-like setting for office and other non-retail commercial uses that do not generate nuisances related to emissions, noise, odors, or glare. Allowed uses include but are not limited to professional and administrative offices, administrative headquarters, research and development, business and commercial services, limited light manufacturing, and assembly and distribution activities. Ancillary uses that provide services to businesses and employees in the Campus Office area are permitted. These uses include restaurants, gas stations, convenience shopping, copying services, branch banks, and other such services.

Previous CEQA Documents
There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Eastern Dublin EIR or Cisco Systems IS/MND.
Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Physically divide an established community

**No New Impact.** The project is vacant, located in an area planned for and developing with similar land uses to the project. Therefore, there would be no disruption of any established community and no impact would occur. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to an established community beyond those analyzed in Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b) Conflict with general plan

**No New Impact.** The proposed project would be consistent with environmental goals and policies contained in the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. No impacts would result regarding consistency with applicable land use plans and policies. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to conflicts with the City of Dublin General Plan beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan

**No New Impact.** No such plan has been adopted within the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. There would therefore be no impact to a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan for the proposed project. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to applicable habitat conservation plan(s) or natural community conservation plan(s) beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:**

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? [☒]

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? [☒]

**Environmental Setting**

The project site contains no known mineral resources.

**Regulatory Framework**

There are no ordinances, regulations, or standards applicable to the proposed project for this section.

**Previous CEQA Documents**

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Eastern Dublin EIR or Cisco Systems IS/MND.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a-b) Loss of known or identified mineral resource

**No New Impact.** The Eastern Dublin EIR does not indicate that significant deposits of minerals exist on the project site, so no impacts would occur. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


## Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. NOISE. Would the project result in:</strong></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 ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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 Setting

Major sources of noise on and adjacent to the project site include distant noise generated by vehicles passing the Eastern Dublin planning area on I-580, traffic sources on Dublin Boulevard and from aircraft flyovers.

### Regulatory Framework

**City of Dublin General Plan**

The Noise Element of the City of Dublin General Plan establishes residential, commercial, and industrial land use compatibility standards for noise measured at the property line of the receiving land use. The land use compatibility noise criteria provide the basis for decisions on
location of land uses in relation to noise sources and for determining noise mitigation requirements.

The Noise Element of the Dublin General Plan identifies "normally acceptable" noise levels for non-residential uses as 70 dBA or less. Noise levels over 75 dBA CNEL are considered normally unacceptable for new development of these types of land uses.

Table 1. City of Dublin Land Use/Noise Compatibility Standards (decibels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Normally Acceptable</th>
<th>Conditionally Acceptable</th>
<th>Normally Unacceptable</th>
<th>Clearly Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>60 or less</td>
<td>60 – 70</td>
<td>70 – 75</td>
<td>75+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging Facilities</td>
<td>60 or less</td>
<td>61 – 80</td>
<td>71 – 80</td>
<td>Over 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, churches, nursing homes</td>
<td>60 or less</td>
<td>61 – 70</td>
<td>71 – 80</td>
<td>Over 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parks</td>
<td>60 or less</td>
<td>61 – 65</td>
<td>66 – 70</td>
<td>Over 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Retail</td>
<td>70 or less</td>
<td>71 – 75</td>
<td>76 – 80</td>
<td>Over 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>70 or less</td>
<td>71 – 75</td>
<td>Over 75</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dublin General Plan Noise Element, Table 9-1, 2012

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR

The Eastern Dublin EIR contains one mitigation measure to reduce anticipated noise impacts from the General Plan and EDSP project:

- Mitigation Measures 3.10/4.0 and 5.0 reduced impacts related to construction noise (IM 10/E) to a less-than-significant level. These mitigation measures require developers to submit construction noise management plans and to limit hours of construction operations and similar items.

Cisco IS/MND

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Cisco IS/MND.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to the applicable noise mitigation measure contained in the previous CEQA documents prepared for the project site.
Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Exposure to or generation of noise exceeding standards

**No New Impact.** Operation of the proposed project would be subject to the General Plan noise standard of 70 dBA or less. Residential uses are subject to more stringent noise standards. However, the proposed project does not include any residential uses. With adherence to the General Plan noise standards, operational impacts of the project related to increases in permanent noise levels would be less than significant. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to exposure to or generation of noise exceeding standards beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b) Exposure to ground borne vibration or ground borne noise

**No New Impact.** Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in long-term increases in groundborne vibration, since office uses would not generate groundborne vibration or noise. Therefore, this impact would be considered less-than-significant. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to ground borne vibration or ground borne noise beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(c) Permanently increasing ambient noise levels

**No New Impact.** Impact 3.10/B identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR identified future exposure of housing within the Planning Area to future roadway noise as significant and unavoidable. Future traffic generated by the proposed project would contribute to this condition. However, the impacts of the proposed project with respect to increases in permanent noise levels are within the scope of the impacts associated with the project covered by the Eastern Dublin EIR and analyzed in the Cisco System IS/MND. The type and intensity of development proposed as part of the proposed project, and the noise generated and associated impacts on residential uses have been identified and analyzed in the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan EIR; no new impacts would occur. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts from permanently increased ambient noise levels beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.
(d) Substantial temporary noise increase

**No New Impact.** Construction of the proposed office complex would increase short-term noise levels during the construction period for the project. Mitigation Measures 3.10/4.0 and 5.0 contained in the Eastern Dublin EIR would require individual project Applicants to prepare construction noise management plans to minimize noise to existing and future housing as well as adhere to construction hour limitations. Therefore, short-term construction noise impacts would be considered less-than-significant. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

With adherence to required mitigation measures, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts from a substantial temporary noise increase beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(e, f) Excessive noise level near a public or private airport

**No New Impact.** The project site would not be affected by Livermore Municipal Airport because the airport is located approximately two miles southeasterly of the project site. The project site lies outside the airport referral area. No impacts are therefore anticipated. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to public or private airports beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


---

### Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Setting

From a population of approximately 14,350 in 1982, the City of Dublin has grown to a resident population of 53,836 (per the California Department of Finance, 2016). The City is projected to have a total population of 76,000 at build out.

Regulatory Framework

There are no ordinances, regulations, or standards applicable to the proposed project for this section.

Previous CEQA Documents

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Eastern Dublin EIR or Cisco Systems IS/MND.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Population growth

No New Impact. The proposed project is consistent with the type and scale of development anticipated in the approved General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. The potential to increase substantial population growth would be considered less-than-significant since the proposed project does not include any residential units and the office/commercial square footage is consistent with the densities allowed under the General Plan and Specific Plan. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to population growth beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.
(b-c) Housing and resident displacement

**No New Impact.** The project site is vacant. Implementation of the proposed project would therefore displace neither housing units or people. No impacts are therefore anticipated to population displacement. This is consistent with the determination in the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to residential displacement beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


**Public Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New 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 or need for new or physical 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? ☒

b) Police protection? ☒

c) Schools? ☒

d) Parks? ☒

e) Other public facilities? ☒
Environmental Setting

Fire Protection
Fire protection services are provided by the Alameda County Fire Department, which contracts with the City of Dublin for fire suppression and emergency response, and includes three specialized response teams including a Hazardous Materials Unit, an Urban Search and Rescue Unit, and a Water Rescue Unit. The Dublin Fire Prevention Bureau provides plan review and inspections of new construction to ensure compliance with City codes and regulations.

Police Protection
Police and security protection is provided by Alameda County Sheriff Department, which contracts to the City of Dublin for patrol services, criminal investigations, and crime prevention. Dispatch services and some data processing functions are handled at Sheriff Office facilities in Oakland and San Leandro.

Schools
The Dublin Unified School District provides primary and secondary educational services to the City of Dublin.

Parks
The Parks and Community Services Department develops and implements parks related programs for the City of Dublin.

Libraries
The Alameda County Library Service provides library services for the City of Dublin.

Maintenance
Maintenance of streets, roads and other governmental facilities are the responsibility of the City of Dublin Public Works Department.

Regulatory Framework
Ordinances, regulations, or standards applicable to the proposed project for this section are discussed in the below analysis.

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR
Applicable mitigation measures contained in Eastern Dublin EIR addressing fire and police protection include:
Mitigation Measure 3.4/1.0: Provide additional personnel and facilities and revise beats as necessary to establish and maintain City standards for police protection service in Eastern Dublin.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/2.0: Coordinate with the City Police Department regarding the timing of annexation and proposed development, so that the Department can adequately plan for the necessary expansion of services to the area.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/3.0: Incorporate into the requirements of project approval Police Department recommendations on project design that affect traffic safety and crime prevention.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/4.0: Incorporate into the requirements of project approval Police Department recommendations on project design that affect traffic safety and crime prevention.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/5.0: As a part of the development approval process in Eastern Dublin, the City shall require the Police Department to review and respond to the planned development with respect to: a) Project design layout relating to visibility, security and safety, b) Project circulation system and access issues, c) Project implications for emergency response times. Prior to final approval of non-residential development and improvement plans, the City Police Department shall review the proposed use, layout, design, and other project features for police surveillance/access, security devices, such as alarms and lighting, visibility, and any other police issues or concerns.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/6.0: Time the construction of new facilities to coincide with new service demand to avoid periods of reduced service efficiency. The first station would be sited and begin construction concurrent with initial development in the planning area.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/7.0: Establish appropriate funding mechanisms to cover up-front costs of capital fire improvements.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/8.0: Coordinate with Dougherty Regional Fire Authority (DRFA) to identify and acquire specific sites for new fire stations. The westernmost site in the Specific Plan area must be acquired prior to the approval of the first development plans in Eastern Dublin. Timing for acquisition of the subsequent sites will be determined by DRFA.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/9.0: Incorporate Fire Department recommendations on project design relating to access, water pressure, fire safety and prevention into the requirements of development approval.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/10.0: Ensure, as a requirement of project approval, that an assessment district, homeowners association or other mechanism is in place that will provide regular long-term maintenance of the urban/open space interface.
Mitigation Measure 3.4/11.0: Integrate fire trails and fire breaks into the open space trail system. Meet fire district standards for access roads in these areas while minimizing environmental impacts.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/12.0: The City shall work with the Fire Department and qualified biologists to prepare a wildfire management plan for the project area.

Mitigation Measure 3.4/13.0: The City shall consult with the DFRA to determine the number, location and timing of any additional fire station(s) needed to serve the GPA Increment area at such time when the GPA Increment area is proposed for annexation.

Cisco IS/MND

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Cisco IS/MND.

The proposed project will be required to adhere to applicable mitigation measures contained in the previous CEQA documents prepared for the project site.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a) Fire

**No New Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would increase demand for fire and emergency services by increasing the amount of permanent daytime population on the project site. This impact from development on the proposed project site was addressed in the Eastern Dublin EIR. Features which would be incorporated into the project as part of existing City ordinances and development requirements and to assist in reducing impacts would include installation of on-site fire protection measures such as fire sprinklers, installation of new fire hydrants and meeting minimum fire flow requirements contained in the Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code.

Mitigation Measures 3.4/6.0-13.0 contained in the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan EIR address increased demand for fire and emergency services based on new development envisioned in the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. These mitigation measures relate to funding new fire facilities in eastern Dublin, ensuring adequate water supplies and pressure for fire suppression, and minimizing wildland fire hazards. The proposed project is required to comply with applicable programs and standards implementing previously adopted mitigation measures. With such compliance and normal City fire protection requirements, impacts related to fire protection would be less-than-significant. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures and regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to fire services beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.
(b) Police

**No New Impact.** Incremental increases in the demand for police service could be expected should the project be approved and constructed. This increase in calls for service would be offset through adherence to City of Dublin safety requirements from Dublin Police Services, including the Non-Residential Security Ordinance. The project Applicant would also be required to adhere to applicable Mitigation Measures 3.4/1.0-5.0 set forth in the Eastern Dublin EIR. These measures address establishing funding mechanisms for additional police personnel and facilities and require the inclusion of security provisions into individual development projects. With adherence to previously adopted mitigation measures and City regulatory requirements, impacts related to police protection would be less-than-significant. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to police services beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(c) Schools

**No New Impact.** The proposed project involves the development of an office complex. Since this is a non-residential land use, limited and less-than-significant impacts are anticipated on local schools. Consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND, the project Applicant would be required to pay fees required under State law to the Dublin Unified School District to offset any indirect impacts that could result from secondary inducement of future employees moving into the District to work within the office complex. Payment of school impact fees is considered full mitigation of impacts under CEQA. Impacts to schools would therefore be less than significant.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to schools beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(d, e) Parks and other facilities

**No New Impact.** Approval and construction of the project would incrementally increase the long-term maintenance demand for roads, parks, and other public facilities. However, such additional maintenance demands would be offset by additional City fees and property tax revenues accruing to the City of Dublin and therefore impacts would be less than significant. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

With compliance with regulatory requirements (including payment of fees), there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to parks and other facilities beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards
for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


### Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. RECREATION. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 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) 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 Setting**

The project site is currently vacant and contains no parks or other recreational amenities.
Regulatory Framework

Ordinances, regulations, or standards applicable to the proposed project for this section are discussed in the below analysis.

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR

The Eastern Dublin EIR contains one applicable mitigation measure to reduce anticipated recreation impacts from the General Plan and EDSP project. This includes:

- Mitigation Measure 3.4/31.0: Calculate and assess in-lieu park fees based on the City's parkland dedication ordinance. Credit towards parkland dedication requirements will only be given for level or gently sloping areas suitable for active recreation use.

Cisco IS/MND

There are no additional mitigation measures from the Cisco IS/MND.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to applicable recreation mitigation measures contained in the previous CEQA documents prepared for the project site.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Increase the use of existing recreation facilities causing deterioration

No New Impact. The proposed project would not result in new residences being constructed within the Eastern Dublin area. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact to neighborhood or regional park facilities due to limited use by employees. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b) Propose or require new facilities that cause physical effect

No New Impact. The proposed project does not include residential development. There would be a less than significant impact on City park or recreational facilities due to limited use by employees. The proposed project does include on-site recreational facilities for use by employees. Therefore, no impact would result due to construction of new neighborhood or regional park facilities caused by the proposed project. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts that would require new park facilities beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and
no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


**Transportation/Traffic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 (for example, sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (for example, 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 Setting

Existing Transportation Network
The project site is served by several regional freeways and sub-regional arterial and collector roadways, including:

**Interstate 580**
Interstate 580 (I-580) is part of the interstate freeway system and extends in an east-west direction, from San Rafael in the west to Tracy in the east. I-580 forms the southern city boundary with four to five lanes in each direction. A high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane exists in the eastbound direction from Hacienda Drive to the base of the Altamont Pass to the east of Livermore. Interchanges near the project site include Dougherty/Hopyard Road, Hacienda Drive, Tassajara Road/Santa Rita Road and Fallon Road/El Charro Road.

**Dougherty Road**
Dougherty Road is a north-south principal arterial roadway and a designated route of regional significance. The roadway continues south of I-580 into Pleasanton as Hopyard Road and connects to Crow Canyon Road in San Ramon to the north. Dougherty Road is generally a four- to six-lane facility, with additional capacity at intersections to accommodate high volumes of turning vehicles to and from I-580.

**Dublin Boulevard**
Dublin Boulevard is a major east-west arterial roadway in the City of Dublin. It is generally a four- to six-lane facility with a landscaped median. Dublin Boulevard is a designated route of regional significance.

**Hacienda Drive**
Hacienda Drive is an arterial designed to provide access to 1-580, and extends from West Las Positas Boulevard in Pleasanton to Gleason Drive in Dublin. From West Las Positas Road to Dublin Boulevard, Hacienda Drive is a designated principal arterial roadway that generally provides three travel lanes in each direction with additional capacity at intersections to accommodate high volumes of turning vehicles. North of Dublin Boulevard, Hacienda Drive is a designated minor arterial with two to four travel lanes in each direction, with a landscaped median.

**Arnold Road**
Arnold Road is a north-south two-lane road parallel to and west of Hacienda Drive. It currently connects Gleason Drive and existing Dublin Boulevard.

Arnold Road / Dublin Boulevard is currently being re-designed to include a southbound right-turn lane. This improvement, which is anticipated to be constructed within the next two years, is not included in the analysis.
Gleason Drive

Gleason Drive is an east-west minor arterial roadway approximately half a mile north of Dublin Boulevard that connects Arnold Road in the west to Fallon Road in the east. It generally provides two travel lanes in each direction.

Regulatory Framework

Alameda County Transportation Commission

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (CTC) does not have adopted thresholds of significance for Congestion Management Plan (CMP) land use analysis purposes. Past analyses within the City of Dublin have used the following criteria to assess roadway segment impacts:

For a roadway segment of the Alameda CTC Congestion Management Program (CMP) Network, the project would cause (a) the LOS to degrade from LOS E or better to LOS F or (b) the volume-to-capacity ratio to increase 0.02 or more for a roadway segment that would operate at LOS F without the project.

Complete Streets Policy

The City of Dublin is committed to creating and maintaining safe, comfortable, and convenient travel along and across roadways that serve all categories of users including bicyclists, emergency responders, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, persons with disabilities, seniors, and users/operators of public transportation.

Complete Streets Principals adopted by the Dublin City Council by Resolution No. 199-12 on December 4, 2013 includes the following:

1. Complete Streets Serving All Users and Modes
2. Context Sensitivity
3. Complete Streets Routinely Addressed by All Departments
4. All Projects and Phases

Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR

The Eastern Dublin EIR contains mitigation measures to reduce anticipated traffic impacts from the General Plan and EDSP project. These measures generally include construction of new roadways, widening of existing roadways and improvements to local freeway facilities to accommodate anticipated increases in the number of vehicles associated with the build out of the Eastern Dublin area.

With the exceptions noted below, the EIR found that all traffic and transportation impacts could be reduced to less-than-significant levels with adherence to mitigation measures identified in the EIR. Several impacts could not be reduced to a level of insignificance even with mitigations.
These include: impacts to the I-580 freeway between I-680 and Hacienda Drive (IM 3.3/B), impacts to the I-580 Freeway between Tassajara Road and Airway Boulevard (IM 3.3/ C), cumulative freeway impacts (IM 3.3/E), impacts to Santa Rita Road and T-580 Eastbound ramps (IM 3.3/I), and cumulative impacts to Tassajara Road (IM 3.3/N).

Cisco IS/MND
The Cisco IS/MND contains the following mitigation measures to reduce anticipated traffic impacts. Their status is indicated in *italics*.

- **Mitigation Measure 6:** The project Applicant shall construct the following traffic and transportation improvements near the project:
  - Dublin/Arnold intersection: a separate right-turn lane for the southbound Arnold Drive approach.
  - Hacienda/Dublin intersection: restripe the northbound Hacienda Drive approach to include a third left-turn lane. *(Completed)*
  - Right-turn lanes to all project driveways *(Completed)*
  - Cisco Systems Access/The Boulevard improvements, to include: Eastbound approach: 1 left-turn lane; Westbound approach: 1 right-turn lane; Southbound approach: 1 left-turn lane, 1 through/right-turn lane. *(Completed)*

- **Mitigation Measure 7:** Commerce One (Sybase project) is responsible for constructing the following traffic and transportation improvements near the Cisco project site. These improvements are also necessary for Cisco to gain access to their site. If these improvements are not constructed by Commerce One, Cisco shall be responsible for constructing the following traffic and transportation improvements:
  - Arnold Drive/The Boulevard improvements, to include Eastbound approach: 1 left-turn lane, 1 through lane, 1 through/right-turn lane; Westbound approach: 2 left-turn lanes, 2 through lanes, 1 right-turn lane; Northbound approach: 1 left-turn lane, 1 through lane, 1 through/right-turn lane, and 1 right turn lane; Southbound approach: 1 left-turn lane, 1 through lane, 1 through/right-turn lane. *(Completed)*
  - The Boulevard/Hacienda Drive improvements, to include: Eastbound approach: 1 left-turn lane, 1 through/right-turn lane, 2 right-turn lanes; Westbound approach: 2 left-turn lanes, 1 through/right-turn lane; Northbound approach: 3 left-turn lanes, 3 through lanes; 1 right-turn- lane; Southbound approach: 2 left-turn lanes, 3 through lanes, 1 shared through/right-turn lane. *(Completed)*
  - Roadway segment improvements on Arnold drive between Dublin Boulevard and The Boulevard (future): Four (4) travel lanes [two in each direction]; The Boulevard between Arnold Road and Commerce One Mid-Block Access (future): Six (6) travel lanes [three in the westbound direction and three in the eastbound
direction]; The Boulevard between Commerce One Mid-Block Access and Hacienda Drive (future): Six (6) travel lanes [three in each direction].  *(Completed)*

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a-b) Conflict with applicable transportation plans standards, including congestion management plans

**No New Impact.** The Carl Zeiss Innovation Center Traffic Consistency Analysis (TCA, Kimley Horn, 2017) evaluated the proposed project’s conformance with the traffic impacts analyzed for the project site in the Cisco Systems IS/MND and the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan area (see Appendix D: Carl Zeiss Innovation Center Traffic Consistency Analysis). It concluded that the proposed project would generate less traffic compared to the project that was analyzed in the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan and Cisco Systems IS/MND. This is due in large part to the fact that the proposed project would accommodate 1,500 employees, as compared to the estimated 3,000 employees analyzed for the Cisco project. The project also includes a TDM program which will result in a 20% reduction in project vehicle trip generation.

Mitigation Measures 6 and 7 in the Cisco IS/MND identified several roadway improvements. All of these improvements have been constructed except for constructing a new a separate right-turn lane for the southbound Arnold Drive approach at the Dublin/Arnold intersection. The Boulevard project, located west of the project site, would be constructing the separate right-turn lane for the southbound Arnold Road approach at the Dublin/Arnold intersection. It is anticipated that this improvement would be constructed in 2018 in advance of the completion of Phase 1 of the Zeiss Innovation Center.

According to the Traffic Consistency Analysis (TCA), all study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable level of service (LOS) D or better during Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the proposed project, for all scenarios analyzed, including cumulative conditions.

**Parking**

Chapter 8.76 (Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations) of the City’s Zoning Ordinance complies with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (City Municipal Code 8.76.060-D), which is designed to comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disability Act.

According to the TCA, the proposed parking supply for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project exceeds the City’s parking requirements. The project is consistent with Chapter 8.76 of the Zoning Ordinance and no new or substantially more severe significant parking impacts would occur with construction of the project.

**Driveways**

The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan did not evaluate the project driveways on Park Place (formerly Sybase Drive); therefore, a separate analysis was performed for the Park Place driveways: located at Dublin Boulevard and Central Parkway. Both intersections would operate at an acceptable condition with the addition of the project traffic and no additional improvements.
are required. No new or substantially more severe impacts would occur with respect to project driveways.

Cumulative Impacts

The Eastern Dublin EIR analyzed cumulative traffic from potential development in the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan area. The City of Dublin has adopted a Traffic Impact Fee program which requires developers to contribute their 'fair-share' of sub-regional traffic improvements required for new development within the Eastern Dublin area. The project is within the scope and level of development and impacts assumed within the Specific Plan and analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR for the project site and area and is required to participate in the Eastern Dublin Traffic Impact Fee Program.

With adherence to previous Mitigation Measures 6 and 7 and required payment of traffic impact fees, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to applicable transportation plans standards beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(c) Change in air traffic patterns

**No New Impact.** The project would have no impact on air traffic patterns, since it involves office development and is located outside of the Livermore Airport general referral area. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to air traffic patterns beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature

**No New Impact.** Approval of the proposed project would add new driveways, sidewalks and other vehicular and pedestrian travel ways where none currently exist. Increases in safety incidents may occur due to the volume of vehicles and pedestrians using nearby roads and other circulation features. The proposed on-site circulation and access for the project has been designed to adequately and safely distribute projected traffic flows per recommendations of the TCA as deemed appropriate by the City Engineer. The City's Site Development Review Permit application ensures that the proposed development meets all City standards relating to safety hazards, design features, on-site circulation and access, and therefore no impacts are anticipated.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts due to a mobility design feature beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.
(e) Result in inadequate emergency access

**No New Impact.** The current need for emergency access is low, since there are no current residents or visitors on the project site. Construction of the proposed office complex on the project site would increase the need for emergency services and evacuation in the event of an emergency. If adequate access is not provided, excessive lengths of time would be needed for emergency vehicles to serve the new development.

For both phases of development, access to the project site would be via two driveways: one full access driveway at Central Parkway/Park Place and one delivery and emergency vehicle only access driveway at Dublin Boulevard/Park Place. Park Place continues through an existing parking lot south of the primary entrance to the project site. Only deliveries and emergency vehicles would use the Dublin Boulevard/Park Place intersection and gain access to the project site via an easement.

Since the proposed site development plan indicates that driveways meeting City design requirements would be provided, potential impacts relating to inadequate emergency access would be less-than-significant. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to emergency access beyond what has been analyzed in Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(f) Conflict with adopted alternative transportation plans

**No New Impact.** The project includes on-site bicycle parking, a bus pick-up/drop-off for an employee bus shuttle, and pedestrian connections between proposed buildings and nearby streets.

The project proposes to implement/construct the following items consistent with the City’s Complete Streets Policy:

1. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant parking spaces
2. ADA compliant sidewalks and curb ramps
3. Emergency Vehicle Access to the project site

Therefore, there would be no impacts to pedestrian or bicycle access or alternative transportation plans, and impacts are less-than-significant.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to adopted alternative transportation plans beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.
Source(s)

City of Dublin. Complete Streets Principals adopted by the City Council of the City of Dublin Resolution No. 199-12, December 4, 2013.


Tribal Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. 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>a) 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>b) 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 Setting

The topic of tribal cultural resources was not analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR or Cisco Systems IS/MND. Since certification of the Eastern Dublin EIR in 1993 and follow-up CEQA documents, CEQA has added this topic as a new section to the Appendix G Checklist in 2016 per Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes 2014). The purpose of AB 52 is to include tribal cultural resources early in the CEQA process to ensure that local and Tribal governments, public agencies, and project proponents would have information available, early in the project.
planning process, to identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources. Cultural resources were analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR or Cisco Systems IS/MND.

**Regulatory Framework**

Per AB 52, to help determine whether a project may have such an effect, the Public Resources Code requires a lead agency to consult with any California Native American tribe that requests consultation and is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project. That consultation must take place prior to the release of a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report for a project. If a lead agency determines that a project may cause a substantial adverse change to tribal cultural resources, the lead agency must consider measures to mitigate that impact.

**Previous CEQA Documents**

The Eastern Dublin area was surveyed in 1988 as part of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan and associated EIR. Several potentially significant archeological resources were identified in the Specific Plan area, several which were located near the former Santa Rita Rehabilitation Center. None of these sites have been recorded on the project site.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources

**No New Impact.** As part of the regulatory permit application assembled by WRA for the project Applicant, a historic survey of the project site was conducted by Tom Origer & Associates. The results of the survey and archival research did not identify any historic resources. Tom Origer & Associates’ analysis is documented in a Historical Resources Survey of APN 986-0014-010, and is included as an appendix to this Initial Study.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to historic resources beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b) Significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1

**No New Impact.** The City contacted the tribal representative of the Ione Band of Miwok Indians (Ltr. from M Battaglia to R. Yonemura, dated 10/13/17). No response was received.

There are no known significant Tribal Cultural Resources on the project site. If Native American artifacts are encountered during construction, work on the project shall cease until compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 is demonstrated. Work on the project may commence under the guidance of an approved resource protection plan. The County Coroner is to be contacted if human remains are uncovered as required by State law.
With adherence to required regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


Personal correspondence, Ltr. from M Battaglia, Associate Planner, City of Dublin to R. Yonemura, Chairman, Ione Band of Miwok Indians, dated 10/13/17.


### Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or 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? (V.4)</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 Setting

The project site is served by the following service providers:

**Sewage treatment**

Dublin San Ramon Services District (DSRSD) provides wastewater collection and treatment service to the City of Dublin. DSRSD owns and operates the Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility in Pleasanton.

**Water supply and distribution**

DSRSD obtains its water supply from Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Zone 7. DSRSD also currently treats and distributes recycled water to water customers in its service area.

**Storm drainage**

The City of Dublin Public Works Department oversees municipal storm drainage within the Dublin City limits.

**Solid Waste**

Amador Valley Industries provides solid waste and recycling collection services on a contractual basis to commercial and residential customers in the City of Dublin.

**Regulatory Framework**

There are no ordinances, regulations, or standards applicable to the proposed project for this section.
Previous CEQA Documents

Eastern Dublin EIR

Regarding water resources, the Eastern Dublin EIR identified overdraft of groundwater resources (Impact 3.5/P) as a potentially significant impact. Adherence to Mitigation Measures 3.5/24.0 and 25.0 would reduce this impact to a level of insignificant. These measures require the City of Dublin to coordinate with DSRSD to develop recycled water resources and otherwise carefully use water resources and that all new development in the Eastern Dublin project area connect to the DSRSD water system. Impact 3.5/Q identified an increase in water demand as a potentially significant impact, but this impact could be mitigated to an insignificant level based on implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.5/26.0-31.0. These mitigation measures require implementation of water conservation measures in individual development projects and construction of new system-wide water improvements which are funded by development impact fees.

Another related impact identified in the Eastern Dublin EIR is the need for additional water treatment plant capacity (Impact 3.5/R). This impact was identified as being reduced to a level of insignificance through the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.5/32.0-33.0, which requires improvement to the Zone 7 water system, to be funded by individual development impact fees.

Impact 3.5/S (lack of a water distribution system) was identified as a potentially significant impact in the Eastern Dublin EIR, but this impact has been reduced to an insignificant level through adherence to Mitigation Measures 3.5/4.34.0-38.0. These mitigations require upgrades to the project area water system and provision of a "will serve" letter prior to issuance of a grading permit. Impact 3.5/T identified a potentially significant impact related to inducement of substantial growth and concentration of population in the project area. The Eastern Dublin EIR found that this was a significant and unavoidable impact.

Regarding sewer service, the Eastern Dublin EIR identified Impact 3.5/B (lack of a wastewater collection system) as a potentially significant impact that could be mitigated through adherence to Mitigation Measures 3.5/1.0-5.0. These measures require DSRSD to prepare an area-wide wastewater collection system master plan, requires all new development to be connected to DSRSD’s public sewer system, discourages on-site wastewater treatment, requires a "will-serve" letter from DSRSD and requires that all sewer facilities be constructed to DSRSD engineering standards. Impact 3.5 noted an impact regarding extension of a sewer trunk line with capacity to serve new development, but could be reduced to an insignificant level since the proposed Eastern Dublin Specific Plan sewer system has been sized to accommodate increased sewer demand from the proposed Specific Plan project. Impact 3.5/G found that lack of wastewater disposal capacity as a significant impact. An upgraded wastewater disposal facility has been constructed by the Livermore Amador Valley Water Management Agency and is operational. Impact 3.5/E identified lack of wastewater treatment plant capacity as a potentially significant
impact, which could be reduced to an insignificant level through adherence to Mitigation Measures 3.5/7.1, 8.0 and 9.0. No additional analysis is needed.

Cisco IS/MND
There are no additional mitigation measures from the Cisco IS/MND.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Wastewater treatment requirements

No New Impact. The addition of wastewater flows from the proposed project would not cause the plant to exceed local, state, and federal water quality standards. The proposed project would not change the urban scale of development anticipated. Mitigation Measures 3.5/1.0 through 22.0 contained in the Eastern Dublin EIR deals with wastewater treatment collection, treatment and disposal. With these adopted mitigation measures, potential wastewater impacts of the proposed project would be less-than-significant. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to wastewater treatment beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(b) Require construction of new facilities

No New Impact. Existing water and sewer lines would need to be extended into the project site from the west. Such extensions have been planned as part of the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan and have been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR. The project would be required to conform to adopted Mitigation Measures 2.5/24.0 through 43.0 in the Eastern Dublin EIR, as applicable, regarding water service. A less-than-significant impacts would therefore result. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to wastewater facilities beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(c) Stormwater drainage

No New Impact. As shown in Figure 7: Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan – Phase 1, new on-site drainage facilities would be constructed as part of project construction. The City’s Public Works Department has indicated that the proposed drainage system is acceptable and overall drainage from the project site would be accommodated by existing or planned local and regional drainage facilities. The proposed project would not change the urban scale of development anticipated in the Cisco Systems IS/MND for this project site. The project would also be required to adhere to Mitigation Measures 3.5/44.0 through 52.0 contained in the
Eastern Dublin EIR, as applicable, regarding drainage. A less-than-significant impact would therefore result. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures and regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to stormwater drainage facilities beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(d) Sufficient water supply

**No New Impact.** Approval of the proposed project would result in an increased demand for water for domestic and irrigation purposes, similar to water use projections previously analyzed, as identified in the Cisco IS/MND. Water use for the proposed project would also be within the projections contained in the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan and analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR. The increased water demand could be accommodated by DSRSD and Zone 7 facilities and long-term supplies. Recycled water would be supplied to the project site for irrigation by DSRSD. The project Applicant would be required to provide any local extensions and connections to nearby facilities.

The Eastern Dublin EIR determined that a less-than-significant impact would therefore result. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to water supply beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(e) Sufficient wastewater capacity

**No New Impact.** Approval of the proposed project would result in an increased demand for wastewater treatment. Presently, the project site is vacant and there is no demand for wastewater treatment services. DSRSD indicated for the Cisco project that the local wastewater treatment plant had adequate capacity to serve the project. The proposed project would not change the urban scale of development anticipated in the Cisco Systems IS/MND for this project site, and impacts for the proposed project would be consistent with the determination in the Cisco IS/MND of a less-than-significant impact.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to wastewater capacity beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.
(f) Adequate landfill

**No New Impact.** Approval of the proposed project would incrementally increase generation of solid waste. Over the long term, the amount of solid waste reaching the landfill would decrease as statewide regulations mandating increased recycling take effect. Information contained in the Eastern Dublin EIR indicates that the solid waste hauler can accommodate this project as it is consistent with overall buildout projections. Furthermore, the project would be required to adhere to Mitigation Measures 3.4/37.0 through 40.0, as applicable, contained in the Eastern Dublin EIR regarding solid waste disposal. Less-than-significant impacts are therefore anticipated regarding solid waste disposal. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to landfill capacity beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

(g) Compliance with solid waste statutes and regulations

**No New Impact.** The City of Dublin and the solid waste hauler would ensure that developers of individual projects constructed under the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan would adhere to federal, state and local solid waste regulations. Less-than-significant impacts are therefore anticipated regarding compliance with statutes and regulations. This determination is consistent with the Cisco Systems IS/MND.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to solid waste statutes and regulations beyond what has been analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

**Source(s)**


Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the 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) 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>

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?

No New Impact. As discussed and analyzed in this document, the proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment. Additionally, for the reasons discussed in Biological Resources, the proposed project, with mitigation, would not 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, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Further, for the reasons identified in Cultural Resources, the project site does not contain any significant cultural resources, and no impacts to such resources would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not
result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as previously analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco Systems IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

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)?

**No New Impact.** The proposed project has the potential to result in incremental environmental impacts that are part of a series of approvals that were anticipated under the Eastern Dublin EIR. The Eastern Dublin EIR considered the project’s cumulatively considerable impacts where effects had the potential to degrade the quality of the environment as a result of build-out of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan. The implementation of the proposed project, with mitigation, would not result in any new cumulative impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant cumulative impact as previously analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco Systems IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.

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

**No New Impact.** The proposed project would not create adverse environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The proposed project would allow for the conversion an existing vacant site to an urban use, specifically the construction of two low to mid-rise (3-story and 5-story) R&D buildings, a parking structure, surface parking, and related improvements, including landscaping. None of these uses or activities would result in any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, as discussed throughout this document. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as previously analyzed in the Eastern Dublin EIR and Cisco Systems IS/MND, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for this impact area.
Appendices

The following appendices are available from the City Dublin upon request:

A  Biological Resources Assessment Report (WRA, 2017)
C  Rare Plant Survey Report (WRA 2017)
D  Historical Resources Survey of APN 986-0014-010 (TRA 2017)
Figure 1: Project Vicinity and Location
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**Figure 2a: Site Plan – Phase 1**
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Figure 2b: Site Plan – Phase 2
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SITE SUMMARY
SITE AREA: 11.36 ACRES
EXISTING LAND USE: CAMPUS OFFICE
PROPOSED LAND USE: CAMPUS OFFICE
PROPOSED BUILDING USES: RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

BUILDING AREA
PHASE 1 BUILDING AREA: 208,650 SF
PHASE 2 BUILDING AREA: 224,440 GSF
TOTAL BUILDING AREA (PHASE 1 + 2): 433,090 SF

PARKING
PHASE 2: 167 SURFACE PARKING
1229 STRUCTURED PARKING
TOTAL PARKING SPACES: 1396 SPACES

ESTIMATED TOTAL HEADCOUNTER
PHASE 1: 750
PHASE 2: 750
ESTIMATED TOTAL HEADCOUNT (PHASE 1 +2): 1500

NOTE: ALL PROPOSED ELEMENTS BEYOND THE PROPERTY LINE ARE TO BE CONSIDERED OFFSITE IMPROVEMENTS.

Source: Gensler and Bionic, 2017
Figure 3: Preliminary Landscape Plan - Phase 1
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Figure 4: Existing Wetlands
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Project Area (11.36 ac.)
Seasonal Wetland (1.03 ac.)
Developed/Ruderal (10.33 ac.)
Figure 5: Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan - Phase I
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Figure 6: Preliminary Utilities Plan - Phase 1
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Figure 7: Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan - Phase 1
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Figure 8a: Conceptual Renderings
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Figure 8b: Conceptual Renderings
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VIEW ACROSS WATERSHED TO MAIN ENTRY
Figure 8c: Conceptual Renderings
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